



WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
July 13, 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 AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

Upon motion by Dr. Mercuri, seconded by Mr. Lovell, the minutes were approved unanimously.

Mr. Palmer announced that Thomas Schuyler resigned from the Committee. Mr. Palmer will be searching for a replacement and welcomes suggestions.

**IRP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

**Presentation**

Ms. Bowers reported on two IRP subcommittee meetings that were held on May 23, 2000 and July 11, 2000. Ms. Bowers reported that there were a number of issues surrounding the IRP process that needed clarification. The subcommittee decided that prior to further work on the IRP Guidance document, a mission/definition statement was needed. Ms. Bowers presented the IRP Definition Statement prepared by the subcommittee. The Statement includes the purpose of the IRP and the role of DRBC and the municipalities in the process. She discussed the major issues that were debated by the subcommittee to lay the groundwork for DRBC's IRP process including:

1. *The IRP process should not be used as a tool to preclude growth.*
2. *DRBC's and the local governments' roles in the process.*
3. *The extent to which water quality is addressed.* Municipalities would not be required to undertake expensive water quality assessments, but would be encouraged to evaluate the inter-relationship of water quality and water availability.
4. *The scope of the guidance document.* The guidance document would not only address DRBC's requirements, but would also provide broader guidance to municipalities.
5. *How interbasin transfers should be addressed.* Municipalities should first look within the subbasin, but not exclusively within subbasin, and should evaluate interbasin transfers as a possible option.

The IRP Definition Statement reflects the subcommittees' consensus on each of these issues. (See [Attachment 2](#) for the IRP Definition Statement circulated to the Committee for consideration.)

**Discussion/Issues Raised**

1. Several committee members voiced concern that the first item in the IRP Definition Statement was that an IRP is a tool to "evaluate the need to lower ground water withdrawal limits." This places too much importance on lowering ground water withdrawal limits. The IRP should be an "integrated" plan and address all water resources as specified in Item 2 of the statement. A question was raised as to whether there was a legal reason to include it. It was noted that Integrated Resource Planning was established

under the Ground water Protected Area Regulations (GWPAR) as a process whereby municipalities could apply to DRBC to lower ground water withdrawal limits.

The Committee debated whether to delete Item 1 or move it to the end of the list. There was general consensus among Committee members that Item 1 be deleted because it is also stated on the IRP Definition Statement under the section describing the role of DRBC and because it is implied in Item 2.

2. DRBC's role in the process was discussed. The IRP Definition Statement defined DRBC's role as being limited to lowering the ground water withdrawal limit and providing assistance for water resources management in the basin. DRBC's role was not to adopt, approve or implement the IRP. A question was raised as to whether DRBC had a legal basis for implementing or approving other elements of the plan. For example, if the IRP demonstrates the need for a pipeline or demonstrates that a pipeline will have environmental harm, will DRBC support it? It was stated that DRBC's authority to implement other aspects of the plan comes from other powers of the Commission, not from the GWPAR. DRBC's review of these proposals occurs during the docket approval process.
3. The second sentence of Item 6 -- "...an IRP is not intended to be a tool to preclude growth that is inconsequential to water resource protection" -- was discussed. It was noted that the language was meant to emphasize that the study has to be tied to water. It was suggested that "inconsequential" is too difficult to define. The wording also could be interpreted to mean that the IRP could be used to preclude growth that is consequential to water resource protection. The Committee agreed that the sentence be changed to: "...an IRP is not intended to be a tool to arbitrarily preclude growth."
4. The section describing the role of DRBC in the process states that DRBC would modify withdrawal limits to correspond to the limits in the proposed IRP. It was suggested that DRBC should have the flexibility to approve something other than what was proposed. It was argued that if the municipalities all agreed on a limit, why wouldn't DRBC approve it? The Committee agreed that the subcommittee should further review this issue.
5. The potential for expanding the IRP process in the future was discussed. For example, expanding it to other areas of the Basin and removing it from the context of lowering ground water withdrawal limits. However, it was generally agreed that expanding the process should not be considered until it is tested in the Southeastern Pennsylvania.
6. With the IRP Definition Statement in its final stages, the subcommittee would continue its work on the Guidance document.

### **Conclusions/Follow-up Items**

1. Item 1 of the Statement -- The IRP is a tool to evaluate the need to lower ground water withdrawal limits -- will be deleted.
2. The second sentence of Item 6 of the Statement -- "...an IRP is not intended to be a tool to preclude growth that is inconsequential to water resource protection" will be changed to "...an IRP is not intended to be a tool to arbitrarily preclude growth."
3. The subcommittee will review whether DRBC would adopt an IRP's proposed lower withdrawal limit or would have the flexibility to approve another limit.

[Note: See [Attachment 3](#) for a revised IRP Definition Statement based on Committee comments.]

### **DATA NEEDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

## ***Proposed Data Needs Resolution***

### **Presentation**

Dr. Mercuri reported on the Data Needs subcommittee meeting that was held on May 24, 2000. He reported that the subcommittee revised the data needs resolution based on comments made by Committee members. The revised resolution was distributed to Committee members for their consideration. Dr. Mercuri requested their approval for Commission action.

Ms. Siskind summarized the differences between the last version sent to the Committee and the current version. The primary changes included: (1) the addition of a "whereas" section explaining the resolution's purpose, (2) a one year phase-in of reporting requirements, (3) separate sections to differentiate between data to be reported during the first reporting year and data to be reported annually thereafter, (4) a reduction in the number of water usage categories, and (5) the addition of a bulk purchases section.

### **Discussion/Issues Raised**

1. It was recommended that "if known" be stricken next to all latitude/longitude data. The current format is inconsistent because it requires latitude/longitude for certain facilities and not others. The reason for the inconsistency was to lessen the requirements for self-supplied users who may not have latitude/longitude information. It was argued that self-supplied users are providing the information on withdrawal and discharge latitudes/longitudes already so it wouldn't be a new burden. There was general agreement that "if known" be stricken in all areas.
2. An issue was raised as to whether manufacturing facilities would be required to report sanitary use separately from manufacturing process use because it could be a burdensome requirement. It was clarified that the resolution would not require separate reporting for these items. It was noted that evaporative loss and product loss data would be requested, *if known*.
3. An issue was raised as to whether population should be requested on an annual basis. It was stated that most small residential users, the bulk of the accounts, wouldn't change on an annual basis and therefore shouldn't be required to report this information annually. Those that did change would be required to report the changes when they occur.
4. It was suggested that Basin States may want to consider creating forms using data from their databases. The current data would be printed on the form and users would change it only when necessary.
5. An issue was raised with regard to distinguishing between leakage, unmetered and unaccounted-for-water. For example, fire hydrant use is unmetered but is not necessarily unaccounted for. It was stated that the resolution allowed for the option of providing a finer breakdown of unaccounted-for-water.
6. An issue was raised with regard to how much of the data being requested is not currently being reported. It was stated that it differed for each Basin State. The most significant new information being requested is *breakdowns by water usage category* and *service area information*. It is likely that much of the usage category breakdown information is currently maintained by purveyors. Service area information is only being requested if the service area county is different from the withdrawal county. This situation almost exclusively occurs in the Pennsylvania which already collects these data. The primary purpose of the resolution is to get consistent data from all four Basin States.
7. It was noted that the Mr. Lavery indicated via e-mail that he believes the NYS Department of Health concurs with the resolution and that New York's vote would be in favor. It was noted that it is uncertain

whether the issue concerning collection of self-supplied data by New York State has been resolved.

8. The issue of staff resources needed to automate the data was raised.
9. New York City (NYC) representatives were asked whether NYC maintains data on water used within the NYC watershed. NYC representatives responded that there are three types of consumers of water originating in the watershed: (1) consumers in the watershed who rely mostly on ground water, (2) consumers in several communities that draw water from the aqueducts, and (3) consumers in New York City. NYC representatives were asked if they could provide data on the first group. They replied that they would look into what was available.
10. An issue was raised regarding the placement of nurseries under the category *non-agricultural irrigation*. It was stated that nurseries consider themselves to be agriculture. There was general agreement that nurseries should be removed from *non-agricultural irrigation* and made into a separate category. It was noted that agricultural use is estimated and not required to be metered. It also was noted that it may be difficult to separate livestock use from other types of agricultural use since they can take place at one location.
11. It was recommended that language in the resolution be changed from "subject to source metering requirements under subsection 2.50.2 and service metering requirements under subsection 2.50.1" to "subject to subsection 2.50.2 and subsection 2.50.1." This recommendation was made because section 2.50.2 of the Water Code regulates certain entities that are not required to source meter. There was general agreement that this change be made.
12. It was suggested that more information on wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) should be required, particularly when water supply and WWTP service areas are not coterminus. This information is important for doing watershed analysis. It was stated that in New Jersey and New York the information is maintained electronically and is readily available, but in Pennsylvania, for example, it is not.
13. The discussion ended by noting that the resolution could not be voted on due to the lack of a quorum. It was agreed that an e-mail be sent notifying all members that there would be a vote at the next meeting and encouraging their attendance. The e-mail would transmit the latest draft resolution and an explanation of the changes.

### **Conclusions/Follow-up Items**

1. "If known" will be stricken next to all latitude/longitude data.
2. NYC representatives will look into whether they have data on water use in the NYC watershed.
3. Nurseries will be removed from *non-agricultural irrigation* and made into a separate category.
4. Language in the resolution will be changed from "subject to source metering requirements under subsection 2.50.2 and service metering requirements under subsection 2.50.1" to "subject to subsection 2.50.2 and subsection 2.50.1."
5. An e-mail will be sent notifying all members that there would be a vote at the next meeting and encouraging their attendance. The e-mail will transmit the latest draft resolution and an explanation of the changes.

### ***Unaccounted-for-Water***

## **Presentation**

The representatives from the three Basin States in attendance were asked to report their progress on collecting 1999 unaccounted-for-water data from purveyors supplying over 1 mgd as agreed to at the previous meeting. Mr. Lovell reported that they have collected the data with 2 exceptions - Wilmington and Milford. Both purveyors have assured Delaware that they are working on it. A question was raised as to whether the Delaware utilities defined unaccounted-for-water consistently. Mr Lovell responded that some defined it as unmetered, while others did not.

Dr. Miri reported that New Jersey sent letters to the purveyors and have started to receive some responses. They anticipate, with some summer intern help, that they will have a report in September or October. They requested the unmetered ratio and will compare it to previous years.

Mr. Gast reported that they have recently received 1999 annual reports that include unaccounted-for-water information from purveyors. They are working on the analysis and will complete it by early September.

It was noted that New York State had reported via e-mail that beginning this week they will review what unaccounted-for-water data are available and will go out to the field to collect data. The e-mail also noted that, ultimately, DRBC may need to collect the data directly from the purveyors.

## **Conclusions/Follow-up Items**

The Basin State representatives agreed to complete the data collection effort and present the results at the next Committee meeting in September.

### ***Update on DRBC's Water Use Database***

Esther Siskind reported that Karen Reavy of DRBC staff just completed transferring the water demand data from Excel to an SQL database. The database is linked to DRBC's Geographic Information System (GIS), will allow the data to be processed much more quickly and has eliminated many of the inconsistency problems associated with the Excel spreadsheets.

## **SPRAY IRRIGATION**

### **Presentation**

Mr. Palmer asked the Committee to consider where they think DRBC should go with spray irrigation. He then asked each Basin State representative to report on policies and regulations in their States.

Dr. Miri reported that New Jersey is encouraging golf courses to consider spray irrigation. There have been no recent regulation changes. The current regulations address discharges to ground water which includes spray irrigation. New Jersey has a Manual that discusses beneficial reuse of wastewater effluent. One golf course is known to be using spray irrigation and there have been no reported problems.

Mr. Gast reported that spray irrigation is being discussed in Pennsylvania, but there are no specific policies or regulations that have been established. Golf courses that spray irrigate are not treated differently from those that do not. A number of golf courses are spray irrigating as well as a stadium. Although the concept of reuse is promoted, the recent drought taught a lesson that it may be more important to return water to the streams than to use it on golf courses during a drought. However, spray irrigation can be discontinued in favor of other sources during a drought.

Mr. Lovell reported that there is not much spray irrigation occurring in Delaware. The drought provided an opportunity for use of reclaimed water. An athletic field received water from a local wastewater treatment

plant. The regulations state that project applicants should consider using less than potable water quality where feasible. It is usually more expensive and complicated and not considered unless water is not available. Two golf course projects are using reclaimed water. There has also been some support for using tertiary-treated effluent for residential landscaping. As supplies get tighter, people will look at it closer. Mr. Lovell also expressed concern about reducing surface water discharges during low flow conditions. Spray irrigation has been advanced as means of deflecting away point source discharges from receiving waters for water quality reasons.

### **Discussion/Issues Raised**

1. *Uses other than golf courses:* There was general agreement that reclaimed water be considered not only for golf courses, but also for other large non-potable uses. Examples would be athletic fields, industry, nurseries and institution turf. Other reasons that golf courses should be de-emphasized are: (1) new data are showing that reclaimed water may be bad for turf; (2) golf courses are often in rural areas and not near dischargers; and (3) golf courses shouldn't be unfairly burdened.

Other uses of reclaimed water were discussed. Its use is restricted on food crops. On other crops, it is not encouraged or discouraged. Use for fire fighting is not feasible in most situations because water is taken from the potable water distribution system. New York City has explored using reclaimed water for the paper industry. However, it encountered obstacles including transmission costs from the WWTP and water quality issues.

2. *Focus on reclaimed water rather than spray irrigation:* There was general agreement that the focus of the issue being considered by the Committee should be expanded from spray irrigation to reclaimed water use in general.

3. *Balancing reclaimed water use with stream flow needs.* Concern was expressed over using reclaimed water during low flow conditions. Under these conditions, it may be more beneficial to discharge to a stream. One option is to discontinue reclaimed water use during drought conditions and rely on another source. This issue has to be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Often reclaimed water use is good for quality, but not quantity. Eliminating discharges for water quality reasons is promoted when every drop is needed during droughts.

It was suggested that because stream flow needs must be balanced with water supply needs, reclaimed water use should be addressed in an IRP. However, it was noted that IRPs are not site-specific and could not be used to assess these type of issues. Rather, IRPs should provide strategies and guidance for encouraging reclaimed water use. At the same time, individual users should be encouraged to evaluate resources from an integrated perspective.

Other issues to consider in determining whether reclaimed water use is more beneficial than stream discharge are: (1) whether the wastewater discharge originated as ground water or surface water and whether the alternative source for the user is ground water or surface water and (2) evaporative losses from spray irrigation (drip irrigation may be a better alternative).

4. *Focus on UAW vs. Reclaimed water use.* Concern was expressed that too much focus was being placed on reclaimed water rather than on unaccounted-for-water (UAW). UAW should be addressed before placing more burdens on the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) operators. It was noted that this focus is a result of water quality and WWTP programs having more regulatory clout and funding than water supply programs. Another reason is that purveyors claim that leakage isn't a big problem because it goes back into the ground water.

It was further noted that reuse is more costly than addressing UAW incrementally over a period of time. Why, then, isn't UAW prioritized over reuse for economic reasons? It was suggested that a possible answer is that reuse is more capital intensive which enables purveyors to increase revenues and charges. However, if water main replacement is part of a UAW program, it also can increase the rate base and at the same time increase the amount of water that can be sold to customers.

A question was raised as to whether DRBC should tackle UAW first or whether UAW and reuse should be tackled at same time. Reducing demand and lowering UAW before reuse was suggested. However, there was general agreement that both are opportunities for better managing water resources and both should be promoted. It was suggested that there could be opportunities for encouraging water users to link the two issues and look at both supply and discharge. It was noted that an individual user often doesn't deal with both issues; UAW is most prevalent in large, older public water supply systems, while spray irrigation/reuse would be implemented by individual businesses such as golf courses. However, it was suggested that the two issues can be meshed at the policy level. Also, purveyors providing the wastewater should have low UAW.

5. *DRBC's Role*. DRBC's role was discussed. Since the feasibility of reclaimed water use varies on a case by case basis, what can be done at a macro level? One role for DRBC is to encourage users to consider using reclaimed water. It was suggested that the Committee should develop a policy for Commission consideration. A number of members asked whether the Commission had ever espoused a policy on reclaimed water use. [Note: The Commission's directive to the Water Management Advisory Committee on this issue is attached ([Attachment 4](#)).]

It was suggested that the Committee may want to consider requiring golf courses to do a spray irrigation feasibility study as part of the DRBC docket application. Through these studies, DRBC would gain an understanding of site-specific issues surrounding spray irrigation and encourage users to explore it. The study would be short, possibly a form, and would present basic information; costly water quality assessments would not be required. A similar requirement is in place for water conservation pricing studies. Purveyors applying for new or expanded withdrawals over 1 mgd are required to do a feasibility study of implementing a water conservation pricing structure if they don't have one in place. They are not required to implement the pricing structure, only to study it.

There was general agreement that DRBC should encourage users to evaluate using reclaimed water and that the concept of requiring a feasibility study/alternatives evaluation should be explored. Uses other than golf courses should be included. The Committee asked DRBC staff to develop a purpose and need statement and outline what would be included in a feasibility study as part of a docket application.

6. *Economic Issues*. Economic issues were discussed. (1) Reclaimed water use works when potable water prices are high; it then makes sense to treat wastewater to a tertiary level and use it for cooling water. (2) Reclaimed water use is more feasible for facilities with package treatment plants because transmission costs are low and the discharge can more readily be treated to tertiary levels. (3) Incentives could be offered for using reclaimed water. For example, the user would be exempt from drought restrictions.

### **Conclusions/Follow-up Items**

The Committee asked DRBC staff to develop a purpose and need statement and outline what would be included in a feasibility study as part of a docket application.

### **WATER USAGE TERMINOLOGY**

The agenda item related to water usage terminology was tabled and DRBC staff was asked to prepare an issues paper discussing the agenda item.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on September 12th at 9:30 a.m. at the DRBC office in West Trenton. The following meeting will be held on November 2nd at the same time and location.

---

## **WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**July 13, 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. Stewart Lovell          | Delaware DNREC                           |
| 5. Bruno Mercuri           | Mercuri & Associates                     |
| 6. John Mello              | USEPA, Region II                         |
| 7. Joseph Miri             | New Jersey DEP                           |
| 8. William Palmer          | Water Resources Association              |
| 9. Warren Liebold          | New York City DEP                        |
| 10. Frank Schaefer         | US Army Corps of Engineers               |
| 11. Ferdows Ali (designee) | NJ Dept. of Agriculture                  |

### **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. Joseph Rutkowski | New York City DEP                     |
| 2. Robert Brabston  | NJ Division of the Ratepayer Advocate |
| 3. Van Polhemus     | Greeley-Polhemus                      |

---

**Attachment 1**

**AGENDA  
WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Delaware River Basin Commission**

**July 13, 2000 - 9:30 A.M.**

**1. Minutes**

**2. IRP Subcommittee Report (Bowers)**

- IRP Draft Guidance

**3. Data Needs Subcommittee Report (Mercuri)**

- Proposed Data Needs Resolution (Mercuri)
- Unaccounted for Water (States to report progress)
- Update on DRBC's Water Use Database (Siskind)

**4. Spray Irrigation**

- States to report on policies/permitting requirements for golf courses

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

- Consumptive & Depletive Use
- Greywater & Reclaimed water

**6. Next Meetings**

---

**Attachment 2**

**IRP Definition Statement Distributed at the July 13, 2000 WMAC Meeting**

**AN IRP (under DRBC regulations) IS A TOOL TO:**

1. Evaluate the need to lower ground water withdrawal limits.
2. Evaluate and develop management objectives and strategies on a subbasin basis to ensure that ground and surface water withdrawals are managed in a manner that protects both instream and withdrawal uses in the subbasin.
3. Evaluate the adequacy of existing ground and surface water resources to meet all existing and future needs in the subbasin, and assess options for meeting those needs.
4. Engage stakeholders as active participants in developing effective, long-term water resource management objectives and strategies.
5. Consider the inter-relationship of water quality and water availability for current and future water uses in a subbasin.

6. Assist planners to better integrate water resource protection in land use planning. However, an IRP is not intended to be a tool to preclude growth that is inconsequential to water resource protection. The availability of ground or surface water, individually, may not be a limiting factor for growth, since a combination of both or sources of potable water outside of the subbasin may exist. By evaluating all water resources options, existing and future needs may be met while simultaneously protecting other uses including instream flow needs.

The role of DRBC in the IRP process is to:

1. Review an IRP for consistency with the DRBC's regulations and to modify withdrawal limits to correspond to the limits proposed in the IRP.
2. Provide guidance and assistance for improved water resource planning at the local level.

Note: The responsibility for adoption and implementation of IRP's lies with the local governments.

The role of the Municipalities in the IRP process is to:

1. Adopt and implement an IRP and incorporate the IRP into the municipalities' Comprehensive Plan.
- 

**Attachment 3**

**Revised IRP Definition Statement Based on WMAC Member Comments**

AN IRP (under DRBC regulations) IS A TOOL TO:

1. Evaluate and develop management objectives and strategies on a subbasin basis to ensure that ground and surface water withdrawals are managed in a manner that protects both instream and withdrawal uses in the subbasin.
2. Evaluate the adequacy of existing ground and surface water resources to meet all existing and future needs in the subbasin, and assess options for meeting those needs.
3. Engage stakeholders as active participants in developing effective, long-term water resource management objectives and strategies.
4. Consider the inter-relationship of water quality and water availability for current and future water uses in a subbasin.
5. Assist planners to better integrate water resource protection in land use planning. However, an IRP is not intended to be a tool to arbitrarily preclude growth. The availability of ground or surface water, individually, may not be a limiting factor for growth, since a combination of both or sources of potable water outside of the subbasin may exist. By evaluating all water resources options, existing and future needs may be met while simultaneously protecting other uses including instream flow needs.

The role of DRBC in the IRP process is to:

1. Review an IRP for consistency with the DRBC's regulations and to modify withdrawal limits to correspond to the limits proposed in the IRP.

2. Provide guidance and assistance for improved water resource planning at the local level.

Note: The responsibility for adoption and implementation of IRP's lies with the local governments.

The role of the Municipalities in the IRP process is to:

1. Adopt and implement an IRP and incorporate the IRP into the municipalities' Comprehensive Plan.
- 

**Attachment 4**

**Minutes from the Commission Meeting of September 30, 1999 Related to Wastewater Reuse**

Public Hearing: Project Review Applications. In response to a question from Mr. Lavery, Ms. Bush reported that no one had indicated an interest in speaking on any of the projects proposed for approval at the hearing. Nor did any of the members of the Commission have any questions or comments relating to a particular project. Mr. Tudor made a general comment, however, relating to applications for ground water withdrawals by golf courses. The State of New Jersey, he said, was attempting to do more in the area of re-using wastewater for golf course irrigation. He observed that the Commission is presented on the one hand with requests for new and increased wastewater discharges, and on the other, with requests for new ground water withdrawals. Mr. Tudor observed that the situation appeared to present the Commission with opportunities for the re-use of wastewater. He asked Dr. Featherstone to comment on this suggestion. Dr. Featherstone agreed that an opportunity exists and suggested that the topic be placed on the agenda of the new Water Management Advisory Committee. He added that the United States Geological Survey (USGS) is currently studying techniques for re-using wastewater to recharge ground water. Mr. Sloto of the USGS reported, however, that his agency intended to collect data for at least two more years before issuing its report. Mr. Tudor suggested that the Commission be more aggressive in pursuing this issue. Dr. Featherstone agreed, stating that with the Commissioners' concurrence, the subject would be placed on the Water Management Advisory Committee agenda. The Commissioners agreed.

---

[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)