



## WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 17, 2000

### MEETING SUMMARY

The Water Management Advisory Committee meeting began at 9:30 a.m. at the Commission (DRBC) office in West Trenton, NJ. The meeting agenda is attached [[see Attachment 1](#)].

#### **MINUTES**

Mr. Young suggested three changes to the draft minutes of the February 17, 1999 Committee meeting. Upon motion by Dr. Mercuri, seconded by Mr. Lovell, the minutes were approved unanimously with these modifications.

#### **COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**

The Committee agreed to change the Committee Procedures so that letters appointing designees would be sent to DRBC, attn: Esther Siskind, rather than to the Committee Chair. [Please see [Attachment 2](#) for a revised version of Water Management Advisory Committee Procedures.]

Mr. Palmer asked whether the Committee was satisfied with the type of minutes being prepared. There was general agreement that the minutes were satisfactory.

#### **IRP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Ms. Bowers reported on the IRP subcommittee meeting that was held on March 16, 2000. At the meeting, Montgomery and Chester County gave updates on their planning processes. The subcommittee meeting focused on the Draft IRP Guidance document prepared by DRBC staff. Issues that were raised on the Draft Guidance included: selection of a target watershed; more emphasis on assessing water resources, not only water supply; defining sound principles of hydrology; consideration of water quality in addition to quantity; relationship of the IRP to other watershed programs and whether it should be an umbrella for these planning efforts. Detailed written comments were submitted to DRBC by subcommittee members. DRBC will provide a revised draft to the subcommittee before they meet again in May.

Ms. Siskind then summarized the main subcommittee comments/outstanding issues on the draft guidance for consideration by the Committee. (1) The scope of IRP: the extent to which water quality should be addressed, emphasis on groundwater vs. surface water, and whether the IRP should be an umbrella for water-related planning efforts in the subbasin or one plan alongside other plans. (2) The geographic area for analysis: the subbasin defined in the regulations or a more regional approach? (3) The scope of the guidance document: whether the document should be prescriptive and provide guidance on how to do an IRP or should primarily address DRBC regulatory requirements. (4) Define good science: how much modeling and data collection would be required and what assumptions would DRBC accept? One suggestion made was for DRBC to sign-off on the workplan at the beginning of the process. (5) More emphasis on water resource assessment in addition to water supply: DRBC staff recognizes that water resource assessment wasn't sufficiently emphasized and will address it in the next draft. (6) Spray irrigation: how the requirement to evaluate subsurface discharge could be limited so that it doesn't require a large study. (7) Implementation by Municipalities: how they will implement the plan given their limited regulatory authority/jurisdiction, in particular over wastewater discharge, and to what extent they need to adopt ordinances to back up the plan.

(8) Define criteria DRBC will use to revise withdrawal limits.

Ms. Siskind asked the Committee to comment on the issues raised. Mr. Palmer asked the Committee to consider the cost to a community when data aren't readily available and they can't finance hydrology or engineering studies.

On the issue of scope of the IRP, Ms. Haskin stated that the IRP should include water quality and that ground water and surface water could not be separated since they are the same resource. Mr. Lavery commented that, by definition, an IRP could be very large, therefore, the Committee should focus on what DRBC adds, its niche. Other plans and how they affect each other should be taken into account. Mr. Neukrug suggested that the discussion should focus on the relationship of the IRP to all the other activities within the watershed such as TMDLs, watershed management plans and river conservation plans. The IRP wouldn't do all of it, but would need to understand it and have a relationship to it.

Ms. Haskin stated that New Jersey is requiring all areas to develop a watershed study that looks at water supply, wastewater, land use and protection of the ecosystem together. Dr. Mercuri stated that any IRP, by definition, must study water resources as a whole; one component cannot be separated from another. Wastewater and water quality must be looked at together.

Ms. Siskind asked for more definition in terms of the level of effort: Can a group of three to four municipalities be expected to undertake such a large assessment? Should water supply be the niche for DRBC's IRP process? Mr. Palmer stated that IRPs should use existing or readily available documents so that developing water resources does not become too costly for a community. He suggested that the IRP begin with the goals of the community - how many people will there be in 20 years. The effect of that demand on water resources would be evaluated including groundwater and surface water management, importation and instream flow needs.

Mr. Gast stated that the primary focus of the IRP should be on whatever limited amount of information is needed to justify to the Commission that the limits should be lowered. Mr. Gast suggested that the guidance can provide a host of optional tasks. However, DRBC should not place so many requirements that it will make it impossible for a group of municipalities to develop an IRP, particularly when the information is not essential to justify a lower withdrawal limit. The guidelines should be flexible by having a core requirement with the option to do more.

Mr. Palmer stated that, at a minimum, the IRP should evaluate other planning processes in the subbasin to ensure compatibility with those plans.

On the issue of geographic area for analysis, Mr. Palmer stated that under New Jersey's municipal land use laws, master plans are required to consider abutting communities and the county. An IRP should consider adjacent communities, the county and the watershed. Ms. Bowers added that the IRP process provides an opportunity in Pennsylvania where, under land use statutes, adjacent municipalities are precluded from working together and there is no mechanism to mobilize an integrated effort. Dr. Mercuri stated that under the municipal planning code municipalities can create a jointure to address water resources.

Mr. Palmer asked whether the IRP should consider bringing in water from other areas if municipalities want to develop and don't have sufficient resources. Dr. Mercuri responded that this lead to urban sprawl in Southeast Pennsylvania. The IRP process should do water resources planning, but should not be used as a tool for stopping development. If limits are lowered and resources aren't available, then importing resources can't be stopped and this will lead to sprawl. An IRP should not do land management; importing water is land management. IRPs should be more localized and should study the subbasin. Either the subbasin is evaluated or we go into land development planning and importation and needs for 2050 which would make the scope of the IRP much wider. Ms. Bowers stated that importation needs to be looked at and the IRP process provides

the opportunity to do so. Mr. Gast stated that the decision to bring in water from outside has nothing to do with justifying the need for a lower withdrawal limit. Ms. Bowers stated that DRBC needs to know that reasonable options have been evaluated. Mr. Palmer stated that in the IRP, the community should set out goals and how they intend to supply water. If it wants to import water than that would be a flag for the reviewer.

Mr. Palmer raised the issue that IRPs ought to be expanded to areas other than the ground water protected area (GWPA). Dr. Mercuri added that IRPs should be developed so that other areas can do the studies. Mr. Palmer suggested that the GWPA IRP process could serve as a model. Ms. Bowers stated that the current process was limited to Southeast Pennsylvania and therefore the IRP guidance should address the nuances of that region.

Next, the issue of whether the IRP guidance document should define good science was discussed. Ms. Bowers clarified that the GWPA regulations require IRPs to be based on sound principles of hydrology. Mr. Milan stated that good science was reproducible and defensible. Mr. Gast stated that the IRP should be based on accepted scientific practice. Ms. Bowers commented that the IRP process should allow for innovation. There was general agreement that it would be difficult to define sound principles of hydrology in the guidance document.

On the issue of spray irrigation, Mr. Palmer stated that it was important for the IRP to assess different types of land application and quantity and quality impacts on groundwater and surface water. Dr. Mercuri added that there are new approaches to management of the water resources cycle such as returning tertiary treated effluent to the groundwater system instead of building a pipeline to discharge effluent to the Delaware River. Ms. Siskind stated that the issue raised was the extent to which the subsurface discharge evaluation could be limited by, for example, relying on the USGS for water quality data and narrowing the assessment to identifying potential areas for implementation.

With regard to implementation by municipalities, Ms. Bowers noted that municipalities don't have the authority to set groundwater limits, they can only adopt a plan. Mr. Palmer stated that municipalities undertaking an IRP would likely adopt zoning ordinances. Mr. Gast concurred. He stated that the Commission will require municipalities to back up their plans with zoning ordinances. Otherwise, the Commission will be hanging on a limb supporting land use controls; the Commission is not in land use business.

### **INSTREAM FLOW NEEDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Mr. Young reported that he met with DRBC staff on March 8, 2000 to discuss study needs for assessing instream flow needs in the Southeast Pennsylvania Groundwater Protected Area. He then presented his proposed approach for the study. The first step would be to develop a database to determine the types and number of streams that would need to be evaluated. The database would include stream names, geology, stream length, drainage area, gradient, Chapter 93 classification, biological data and flow statistics. DRBC staff has provided some of these data to Mr. Young. Once the database is developed, streams in the study area would be stratified according to drainage area, stream length, geology and biology. Field data would be collected on selected study streams and hydraulic models would be developed for each study stream. Biological modeling would be performed based on either species, guild or community based approaches. A habitat model integrating the hydraulic and biological models would be developed. This model would assess either "flow vs. weighted usable area" for a specific species, as was done for the Pennsylvania and Maryland Instream Flow Study, or "flow vs. percent dissimilarity" that would evaluate how flow affects the aquatic community as a whole. The last step would be an impact assessment that applied the habitat models developed for the study streams to all streams in the study region. The assessment would predict the impacts of withdrawals on habitats or communities.

There was discussion as to whether the instream flow needs subcommittee should be merged with the IRP subcommittee. There was general agreement that it should remain a separate committee. Mr. Young suggested

that the next step would be another discussion with DRBC staff.

### **DATA NEEDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Dr. Mercuri reported on the Data Needs subcommittee meeting that was held on March 21, 2000. At the meeting, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware reported on the status of their data. In most states, most of the needed data are available, but not always in electronic format. The data being requested by DRBC is important for projections and water resource management. There was general consensus amongst subcommittee members that a resolution requiring purveyors and the States to supply DRBC with the information was the best way to go. DRBC staff developed a draft resolution which is being proposed for consideration by the Committee. He strongly urged the adoption of the resolution and stated that hard data are critical for making informed decisions on water resource management.

Ms. Siskind summarized a number of outstanding issues on the draft resolution for consideration by the Committee. (1) Wastewater treatment plant discharge data. Discharge data was added to the list of data needs for purposes of developing consumptive use estimates, at the suggestion of several committee members. The resolution would require two different levels of reporting, one for self-supplied users and another for public water suppliers. Self-supplied users would be required to supply more data (i.e. monthly flow volumes and location) since they often have more knowledge of their wastewater than do larger, more complex public water suppliers. Public water suppliers would be asked to identify the wastewater facility if known. DRBC would gather detailed wastewater data directly from the States. (2) Definition of service area. DRBC's current database provides withdrawal data only and does not specify service area. Service area information would not need to be provided for each municipality, but rather, would be aggregated at the county level for withdrawals serving more than one county. Multiple county service areas are most prevalent in Pennsylvania. In the Delaware River Basin portion of other States, withdrawals occur in the same county as the use, with few exceptions. (3) Data to be reported annually. Most data would not be reported annually unless changes occur. Monthly withdrawal volumes, breakdowns by user category and monthly wastewater flows (for self-supplied) would be reported annually. (4) Breakdowns by user category. This is new information that is critical for assessing the effectiveness of water conservation programs and projecting water use. It will take time to get purveyors to report this way and subcommittee members suggested that this requirement be phased in. In the meantime, purveyors could provide the information based on the categories they currently utilize. (5) State resources for data collection. To address this issue, a sentence was included in the resolution encouraging States to collect and automate the data.

Ms. Siskind asked the Committee to comment on the issues raised. Dr. Miri noted that there were two instances in New Jersey of cross county connections: the tri-county pipeline and the D&R Canal. Mr. Lavery noted that in addition to the data listed that would be reported annually, some identifiers would also need to be reported. Ms. Siskind concurred stating that it would depend on the forms and collection process used by the States.

Dr. Mercuri raised the issue of whether New York State had the authority to implement the resolution. Mr. Lavery explained that under New York State law, the state will not accept delegation where it does not already have authority. New York State does not have the authority to require non-public water suppliers to submit information. This does not mean the Commission doesn't have the authority to request the data. Ms. Siskind stated that the issue was being addressed by David Goldberg.

The issue of whether the resolution would be an additional burden to water users already reporting to the States was discussed. Mr. Schuyler stated that his company already filed withdrawal and wastewater data with New Jersey and asked why more was needed. Dr. Miri responded that the resolution doesn't, but needs to, clearly state that additional information is not being requested from those already submitting it and that the resolution would not represent an additional burden. Ms. Siskind added that most of the data are already being reported by most of the purveyors to the States and few new data would need to be reported.

Dr. Featherstone explained that when the source metering requirements were adopted in the mid-1980's, it was recognized that a number of agencies were requesting similar data from purveyors. To reduce this burden, this and subsequent resolutions provided that data would be submitted to the States, rather than DRBC. The States would then submit it to DRBC. Mr. Gast agreed. Dr. Mercuri noted that the resolution stated that "to avoid duplication of effort" the States would collect the data.

Dr. Miri noted that the draft resolution seemed to put the onus on the purveyor, rather than the State. Mr. Gast stated that the resolution can't be directed to the States if they don't have the authority to collect the data and, therefore, must be directed to the users. If the users are already submitting the data, it is not an issue. Dr. Featherstone agreed and noted that it was important to get consistent information from users in four States and directing the resolution to the purveyors seemed to be the most logical way to achieve this.

Mr. Palmer expressed concern that if the resolution was unclear to the Committee, it will be more unclear on the streets. The resolution must define upfront what it is trying to achieve. He asked the Committee how much data the States have. He added that the wastewater and consumption data are often in more than one department within an agency.

Dr. Miri commented that no States have breakdowns by usage categories. Mr. Palmer replied that utilities would have this information. Dr. Miri continued that some purveyors are concerned with billing and their categories aren't necessarily the same as those needed to measure conservation programs. Dr. Mercuri asked the utilities to comment on this. Mr. Milan stated that Superior Water Company had only residential customers, but that based on his experience utilities maintained a comprehensive and careful breakdown by commercial, residential, industrial and public users. Mr. Neukrug stated that he could give DRBC the information in five minutes for 2 million people. American Water and Philadelphia Suburban could do the same. This would cover a large portion of the Basin. Mr. Palmer stated that utilities have the data because they charge different rates to residential, commercial and industrial customers. He volunteered to talk to the major purveyors in the Water Resources Association to identify what data are available.

Mr. Lavery stated that in mixed use and downtown areas the data would be difficult to separate. Phasing in new data requirements is important because it could be a big job for small systems.

Mr. Gaston asked whether the resolution was meant to address data for 1997 through 1999. Ms. Siskind responded that the intent of the resolution was to standardize data received from the States and to gather additional data that DRBC is not getting. Mr. Gaston suggested that 20 users can provide 90 percent of the information.

Mr. Palmer expressed concern that the resolution would be perceived as another level of bureaucracy. Dr. Mercuri stated that most States have most of the data with one exception but don't have resources to continue to collect and automate it. The intent is not to impose new requirements on utilities.

Mr. Neukrug commented that Philadelphia and New York City would not fill out the forms in the same way. The further you get from the data collector, the less useful the data will be to draw conclusions. DRBC should work with a number of the players to get the data. Dr. Miri concurred that it was important how the data are collected and who is filling out form. He emphasized that it was important that the new data being requested be phased in. Mr. Milan suggested setting up a users group that would reach a consensus on how to interpret the data. Mr. Gast disagreed with these comments and stated that 95 percent of the data has been collected by Pennsylvania and there has not been a problem with interpretation or with filling out water reports.

Mr. Lovell stated that he would ask Delaware purveyors for the usage category breakdowns and that he has the authority to do it. There will be slightly different categories of use reported, but he'd learn to live with it. The bigger issue is the quality of the data.

Mr. Lavery suggested that if the holes are different from each State, an agreement with each State may be needed, rather than a resolution. Or, perhaps DRBC should deal with the large utilities directly.

Mr. Palmer stated that agreements could be used to get most of data. Or, simply a resolution that DRBC implores States to automate the data and get it to DRBC.

Dr. Miri stated that one of main purposes of the resolution was to obtain data from New York. If New York has a statute that won't allow this, the resolution is less useful. Mr. Palmer stated that New York State not being able to deliver the data isn't bothersome because DRBC needs to deal with New York City on this issue. For New York City, DRBC will go to the source to get the information. Mr. Lavery asked whether New York City ever provided water use data to the Commission. Ms. Siskind replied that they had.

Ms. Siskind clarified that the resolution would not apply to New York City. Mr. Palmer replied that, even if it didn't, the Commission had to collect data from New York City because it would be integral to developing a water budget for the basin. Mr. Lavery cautioned that it was important to understand that under the agreements that were in place with New York City, they have a set allocation that can't be affected by any action of the Committee or Commission. They can do whatever they please with the allocation. Mr. Palmer responded that New York City might not be required, but should be encouraged, to submit the data to the Committee.

Dr. Mercuri explained that the resolution would not change the rules. The intent is to get information to do better planning. The subcommittee explored the possibility of DRBC collecting the raw data in paper format. DRBC doesn't have the resources and neither do the States. A legally bound resolution would help get staff to put data into an electronic format.

Dr. Featherstone commented that one of the goals of the resolution was to raise the level of consciousness on the issue. Data are not being automated and there are consistency problems. The Committee would raise these issues to the Commissioners and advocate additional personnel for the State agencies. One approach is a resolution, there could be other ways as well.

Mr. Palmer stated that there were already regulations that required the data to be collected, sorted and sent to DRBC. Dr. Featherstone replied that there weren't any with this level of specificity.

Ms. Siskind distributed a handout listing the data the resolution would provide DRBC that it is not already getting including: water use breakdown by category, service area linked to withdrawal, and wastewater data linked to withdrawal. In addition, it would provide for consistent reporting amongst the four States.

Ms. Bowers stated that the wastewater data being requested was not sufficient. The data are not available in Pennsylvania in electronic format. She suggested that there be a separate section of the resolution requiring data to be submitted by dischargers. Dr. Mercuri replied that this would open up another set of reporting entities and there weren't resources available to do what is already being suggested. Mr. Gast commented that wastewater data are essential for basin budgeting. Dr. Miri commented on the magnitude of the effort. Mr. Palmer stated that DRBC has jurisdiction over wastewater data and the States can be asked to submit NPDES data.

Mr. Palmer asked Mr. Lavery if the Commissioners would seriously consider the resolution. Mr. Lavery replied that the resolution needed more explanation, perhaps in a "Whereas" section, regarding its intent, that it is not duplicative and that it is aimed at the users rather than the States. It should also state that it empowers the executive director to make different agreements with the states. If these changes were made, the resolution would likely be supported. Mr. Schuyler emphasized that the resolution should be clear about what it is trying to accomplish. Dr. Miri added that the resolution should avoid the appearance of duplication.

Ms. Bowers stated that the four Committee members representing the States have the best sense of what their Commissioners would think. She did not quite hear from them that the resolution would work. She suggested that additional work is needed at the subcommittee level. Dr. Miri and Mr. Gast agreed that a meeting was needed to redraft the resolution.

Mr. Palmer stated that on May 2nd he would let the Commission know the Committee's concerns with regard to the data. He would ask the Commission to work with the States in a spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Palmer asked how the Committee should work with the utilities and whether it should be left up to the subcommittee to address this. Ms. Siskind replied that Mr. Neukrug was a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Lavery ended the discussion by stating that it was important to collect the data to do water budgets. Although we won't get much today, we should keep trying.

### **WATER CONSERVATION - NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Siskind began the discussion on water conservation efforts by stating that a Committee member suggested at a prior meeting that DRBC write an issues paper that explained the current program and proposed next steps. The issues paper was prepared and distributed via e-mail to Committee members for comment. The proposed next steps focused on monitoring and assessing existing programs put in place in the 1980's and 1990's, rather than on developing new initiatives for water conservation.

Ms. Bowers asked whether DRBC staff had a recommendation on which proposed next steps are most needed. Ms. Siskind replied that DRBC staff would like to do all of them eventually, but due to limited staff resources wanted prioritization from the Committee. Leak Detection & Repair (LD&R) was clearly a program that should be prioritized because according to DRBC regulation, there should have been 2 updates since 1993 that weren't submitted. LD&R is important because it is one of the primary mechanisms DRBC has to reduce existing withdrawals.

Ms. Bowers asked whether LD&R can be accomplished without the data collection effort discussed earlier. Ms. Siskind responded that one suggestion from the first Committee meeting was that States would gather unaccounted-for-water (UAW) data for one year. These data would be compared with data from 1989 and 1993 to determine whether UAW was increasing or decreasing. Once DRBC was able to determine a trend, the Committee would decide on possible next steps. Only Delaware has submitted data so far. She cautioned that because UAW fluctuates from year to year depending on leaks, it was difficult to develop a reliable trend with data from 1 in 3-5 years. For this reason, Mr. Lovell had expressed interest in collecting yearly data for Delaware.

Dr. Miri explained that yearly UAW data were not collected in New Jersey, but could be obtained for 1999. Mr. Palmer agreed that the States should be asked to collect 1999 data. He further suggested that 2000 data be collected at the same time to get a short term trend. Mr. Gast asked whether LD&R plans or UAW data only should be collected for 1999 and stated that Pennsylvania already collects yearly UAW data. Dr. Miri responded that UAW data should be collected first. Mr. Palmer suggested that the plans be collected for 1999.

Mr. Neukrug asked what DRBC did with the plans submitted in 1993. Dr. Featherstone replied that the States were responsible for reviewing and enforcing the plans. DRBC compared 1989 and 1993 data to determine trends. The trend analysis showed that UAW dropped during this period.

Mr. Lovell questioned whether metered ratio should be requested since leakage would be a better indicator. Ms. Siskind noted that metered ratio was the indicator defined in the LD&R regulations. Dr. Miri explained that metered ratio was used because it is less burdensome than estimating leakage loss. Dr. Featherstone agreed noting that, for example, it was difficult to estimate fire hydrant water use. The intent had been to

adopt a consistent protocol amongst the four States to enable comparisons to be made. He added that using metered ratio encourages purveyors to meter institutional uses.

Mr. Lavery stated that the goal of the LD&R regulations is to address leaks; the question should be how to encourage leak detection. Dr. Featherstone stated that the LD&R regulations specified what had to be included in the plan. While the regulations did not contain performance standards, more frequent reporting was required from purveyors with UAW higher than 15 percent. Each State implements the program slightly differently. Pennsylvania, for example, has a survey form.

Mr. Lavery asked if the Committee would be requesting 1999 LD&R plans and UAW data as a one-time special effort. Ms. Siskind responded that once DRBC received the data and plans and determined the status of UAW in the basin, the DRBC and the Committee could propose additional measures. For example, should LD&R plans be submitted on a 5 year, rather than 3 year cycle because UAW is dropping? Should purveyors with UAW over 15 percent be addressed?

Mr. Neukrug asked whether New York City would be submitting LD&R plans. Ms. Siskind replied that New York City was not subject to the resolution. Mr. Neukrug stated that there should be a distinction made between UAW that remains within the Delaware River Basin and UAW that is transferred outside the Basin. He stated that Philadelphia, with a very old system, has a very aggressive LD&R program. There are many reasons for having a strong LD&R program; however, because Philadelphia water remains within the Basin, the reason for implementing LD&R is not a water budget issue. Dr. Featherstone replied that LD&R is also a micro issue and addresses interbasin transfers of water from areas with declining water tables. He noted that DRBC regulations had already established the policy that LD&R was important.

Dr. Miri added that it was important to consider the environmental and financial costs associated with water that was not delivered to the consumer. Mr. Neukrug noted that these issues were related to the economic management of a utility, not water budgeting.

Mr. Lavery suggested focusing on a number of critical water suppliers. Mr. Palmer stated that DRBC should begin by taking a few steps including asking for LD&R plans for 1999 and UAW for 1999 and 2000. DRBC would then assess whether there was a problem. The Commission does not know if the program has worked or not because of a lack of data.

Dr. Featherstone asked Mr. Gast if Pennsylvania could do the suggested effort. Mr. Gast replied that review of plans is labor intensive and the person who had been responsible for LD&R is no longer on staff. He believes that plans were obtained for 1996.

Dr. Featherstone stated that DRBC could initially request UAW data, compare it to 1993 and then make a decision on whether to require plans. Dr. Miri concurred that DRBC should begin by asking for UAW data.

Mr. Palmer expressed frustration at the lack of ability to get the needed data and recommendations on how to get it. Mr. Lavery and Mr. Gast empathized with Mr. Palmer's frustration. Mr. Gast responded that the time is ripe for the Commission to make known the importance of the data to the officials who make personnel decisions. It is important to be aware that there are a lot of competing programs driven by court decisions.

Mr. Palmer stated that the Committee had to seek ways to get things done. One possibility would be to meet individually with Commissioners to get them to commit to providing more data. Mr. Neukrug emphasized that the issue was not with the utilities who could supply the data. He also noted that despite the lack of data, LD&R was being implemented. Mr. Palmer replied that perhaps DRBC should deal directly with the utilities. Ms. Bowers commented that it was doubtful that the utilities would provide a person to compile the data. Mr. Palmer stated that he would provide a person to enter the data if the States agreed, but he had doubts that they would agree to this.



Mr. Gaston stated that the top 20, 50 or 100 purveyors should be asked to provide the information. This limited effort would provide most of the data needed. He asked how many purveyors supplied more than 5 or 10 mgd and suggested targeting this limited group. Mr. Young added that a random sample of utilities could be surveyed. Mr. Lavery stated that these types of ideas should be explored and perhaps this type of effort could be conducted by DRBC staff. Mr. Gast noted that electronic reporting would be in place in a few years and would address many of the data collection problems. Dr. Mercuri suggested asking the major purveyors if they can already provide the data in electronic form. Mr. Neukrug suggested calling in a number of utilities to present their LD&R programs.

Dr. Featherstone suggested that the States gather UAW for 1999 from purveyors supplying over 1 mgd. DRBC would then compare it to 1993 and decide where to go from there. There was general concurrence with this suggestion.

Mr. Palmer added that he would attempt to get a utility official at the next meeting to discuss the types of data available and he would talk to the significant utilities. In conclusion, he stated that DRBC was going to get some data.

#### **PRESENTATION OF COMMITTEE REPORT AT MAY COMMISSION MEETING**

Mr. Palmer asked the Committee to comment on what he should present in his report to the Commissioners at the May 2nd Commission meeting. He noted that the lack of data is a real problem that he would relay to the Commissioners. He asked the Committee whether it was their vision to be those things discussed at today's meeting.

Dr. Miri stated that the Committee shouldn't be overly pessimistic because it is not known how the Commissioners would react. They may be supportive.

Ms. Bowers stated that it was important to get the message to the Commissioners that the data are desperately needed. Historically, water use data were not deemed important. Now watershed management and source water protection are coming together and the data are needed for all programs. The IRP process and many EPA programs require these data. Nobody has told the people making decisions loud enough that more priority should be placed on data collection and water resource management functions. The longer we don't have data, the less effective the Committee will be.

Mr. Schuyler emphasized that it was important to present a strong case of why the data are needed. Mr. Lavery agreed that it was important to let the Commissioners know why the data are important to DRBC, water suppliers, the environmental community, etc.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Agenda items related to spray irrigation and water usage terminology were tabled for the next meeting. The next meeting will be held on June 7th at 9:30 a.m. in the DRBC office in West Trenton.

---

### **WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**April 17, 2000**

#### **Members Present**

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| 1. Janet Bowers | Chester County Water Resources Authority |
| 2. William Gast | Pennsylvania DEP                         |

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 3. John Gaston      | Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority |
| 4. Peggy Haskin     | League of Women Voters                  |
| 5. Warren Lavery    | New York State DEC                      |
| 6. Stewart Lovell   | Delaware DNREC                          |
| 7. Bruno Mercuri    | Mercuri & Associates                    |
| 8. David Milan      | Superior Water Company                  |
| 9. Joseph Miri      | New Jersey DEP                          |
| 10. Howard Neukrug  | Philadelphia Water Department           |
| 11. William Palmer  | Water Resources Association             |
| 12. Frank Schaefer  | US Army Corps of Engineers              |
| 13. Thomas Schuyler | Roche Vitamins, Inc.                    |
| 14. Ronald Sloto    | US Geological Survey                    |
| 15. Leroy Young     | Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission     |

**DRBC Staff present**

1. Evelyn Borbely
2. Greg Cavallo
3. Jeffrey Featherstone
4. David Pollison
5. Hernan Quinodoz
6. Esther Siskind

**Others in Attendance**

- |                |                              |
|----------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Ben Greeley | PADEP                        |
| 2. Ferdows Ali | NJ Department of Agriculture |
| 3. Hal Haskin  |                              |
| 4. John Mello  | USEPA Region 2               |

---

**Attachment 1**

**AGENDA  
WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

## Delaware River Basin Commission

April 17, 2000 - 9:30 a.m.

### 1. Minutes

### 2. Subcommittee Reports

- **Integrated Resources Planning (Bowers)**
- **Instream Flow (Young)**
- **Data Needs (Mercuri)**

### 3. Water Conservation - Next Steps (Featherstone/Siskind)

### 4. Spray Irrigation

- **States to report position on golf courses; state permitting requirements**

### 5. Water Usage Terminology (Featherstone/Siskind)

- **Consumptive & Depletive Use**
- **Ground water & Surface water**
- **Greywater & Reclaimed water**

### 6. Presentation of Committee Report at May Commission Meeting (Palmer)

### 7. Next Meeting

---

## Attachment 2

### WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

- **Voting**. Decisions will be made by consensus, whenever feasible. When a consensus cannot be reached, a vote will be taken. At least 2/3 of the members - 14 members - are required to hold a vote. Decisions that will require a vote include Committee recommendations on which the Commission would need to take action. For recommendations on staff activities with no Commission action required, only a consensus and/or vote of members present will be required. The Committee Chair will prepare a report expressing the opinions of the dissenters including reasons why a consensus could not be reached.
- **Quorum**. No quorum is needed to hold a meeting.
- **Committee Chair**. Responsibilities of the Chair include: conducting meetings, consulting with Commission staff on meeting agendas, and reporting to the Commission once a year. The Committee will have a Chair and Vice Chair. The Vice Chair will carry out the responsibilities of the Chair when the Chair is not present. Members of State agencies representing the Governor on the Commission will not serve as Chair or Vice Chair. The term of the Chair and Vice Chair will be one year. After completion of the Chair's term, the Vice Chair will assume the role of Chair and a new Vice Chair will be selected. The Committee will endeavor to ensure that, over time, members elected to the positions of Chair and Vice Chair represent all member interests.
- **Designees**. Members may send designees to Committee meetings. However, a member may only assign a designee for a specific meeting and must do so by writing or e-mailing to the Delaware River Basin Commission. The designee will have the same privileges as the member including voting rights.

- **Meeting Schedule**. Meetings will be held four times a year, unless the Committee decides otherwise.

---

[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)