

Delaware Water Resources Regional Committee Meeting

August 13, 2004
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
The Bourse
111 S. Independence Mall East, 8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106

FINAL Meeting Summary

Attendance

Committee members in attendance:

Maya van Rossum	Darryl A. Jenkins
Gary Kribbs	Leonard Johnson
Irvil Kear	Howard Neukrug
Barbara Smith	Carol R. Collier
Robert Wendelgass	John Hoekstra
Desiree Henning-Dudley	Helen Haun
John Coscia	Honorable Kate Harper
Lisa Hamilton	

Committee members not in attendance:

Leonard E. Crooke	Ted Reed
Clark Connor	David A. Hodge
Julie Lynn Gallisdorfer	Mike Meloy
Jeff Featherstone	Michael Stokes

Others in attendance:

PJ Dhillon, DEP	Dennis Livrone
Ken Davis	Bill Gast, DEP
Sue Weaver, DEP	Barbara Schell-Magaro, DEP
Lale Byers	Eric Grindrod
Ken Hughes	Mike Kaiser
Jan Bowers	Drew Shaw
Chris Linn	Jim Donaghy
Karen Holm	Donna Suevo
Anthony Bonasera	Cynthia Unangst
Kenneth Lomax	Bill Fulton
George Kunkel	Andy Zemba, DEP
Julie Poncelet	John Hines, DEP
Joe Accardi	Richard Bickel
Mark Wejkszner	Patty Elkis
Michael Leventry	

Administrative Items

1. April meeting minutes required changes. Section 4, page 2 should read: Valley Creek is a Class A fishery with a naturally reproducing trout population. Correct the spelling of Schuylkill.

Motion made by:

Motion Second:

Motion was carried

Agenda Items

1. Statewide Committee Report by Howard Neukreg.
 - a. Three subcommittees: Critical Water Planning, Policy and Integration and Public Outreach.
 - b. Statewide committee meetings will be open to the public.
 - c. Alternate committee chairs will be assigned to each committee.
 - d. Will designate process for guidelines of State Water Plan.
 - e. Developed vision statement to be reviewed at September, 2004 meeting.
 - f. Final document presented to Delaware Regional Committee entitled, "PA State Water Plan: Planning Today for Generation Yet to Come."
2. DEP Summary by John Hines.
 - a. Water Registration continues with approximately 6,000 sources registered.
 - b. In the future DEP anticipates 12,000 to 15,000 pre-registration forms total.
 - c. DEP Policy Office and BWM are developing baseline data processing Standards for water registration and USGS Tool.
 - d. Money placed in budget for SRBC and DRBC to assist with SWP process.
 - e. DEP staff is doing excellent job organizing State Water Planning effort.
 - f. Sue Weaver handed out Chat Room handout.
 - g. Robert Wendelgass wanted to know if DEP has a sense of where water Registration effort stands at this time.
 - h. DEP is behind on water registration with public water suppliers and agriculture. There are presently no gross estimates as to the current number of registrants who have not yet registered.
 - i. John Hines and Bill Gast noted that a second follow up letter will be sent out to industry, agriculture, public water suppliers and commercial entities to remind everyone of mandatory water registration under Act 220. DEP is also gearing up for January, 2005 annual SWP reporting.
 - j. Governor announced designees to newly formed State Planning Board.
 - k. Goal is to link planning process with State Water Planning effort. Coordinate with Commonwealth partners, database information, state agencies and consultants.

- l. Utilize PENNDOT watershed data and integrate information in to SWP. Tap into their open ended contracts to effectively use existing data. Incorporate PENNDOT watershed data into SWP.
- m. Program Revision Request was submitted for funding. Funding denied for Water Use Planning. Will resubmit request next year.
- n. Funding was made available to SRBC and DRBC. The Commissions will provide support to DEP regarding SWP effort.
- o. Safe Water Grants now has \$7.5 million available for Pennsylvania. Is there a way to partner this with legislative efforts to help finance State Water Planning efforts in 2005? Additional dollars could be used to match state funds with federal funds.

3. No public comment.

Planning Director Presentations

1. Lehigh Valley – Michael Kaiser and Jeff Reese

- a. Involved in planning since 1960 for two counties. This is the 5th update of comprehensive plans since 1964. Regularly meet with PENNDOT, local and county officials in Lehigh and Northampton.
- b. Comprehensive plans must be consistent with State Water Plan. These plans include:
 - i. Evaluation of water resources. Depicts competition of water usage.
 - ii. Evaluation of surface and ground water contaminants.
 - iii. Storm water management plans completed for 12 counties.
 - iv. Global updates on NPDES requirements associated with State Water Plan.
 - v. Detailed engineering subdivision and land development plan reviews for municipalities under Section 502B.
 - vi. Global updates on NPDES requirements associated with State Water Plan.
- c. Problems encountered while putting Comprehensive Plans together:
 - 1) Lack of water resource planning.
 - 2) Lack of communication between county and municipalities.
 - 3) Absence of good water use data. Need to enhance Act 67 and Act 68.
 - 4) Need to clearly define PA Municipal Planning Code. Specifically address subdivision-planning reviews.
 - 5) Transportation and Storm Water Planning are most intensive parts.
 - 6) What is current industrial power and Agricultural power usage?
 - 7) Need more statistical comparisons.
 - 8) Contaminant threats under wellhead protection.

- 9) Erosion and sedimentation problems in watersheds
- 10) Land use, water supply and sewer management.
- 11) Sinkhole problem in Carst geological areas.

2. Chester County – Jan Bowers and Bill Fulton

- a. Provided handouts: *Watersheds*, the adopted component of *Landscapes*, consists of water and land use planning efforts. “Lessons Learned, Implementation and Implications, “ portrays good county interaction and reinforces the effort.
- b. Summary of *Watersheds* contents was provided.
 1. Part 1 – Explains why the Chester County plan was necessary.
 2. Part 2 – Explains why the plan was needed.
 3. Part 3 - What facts were uncovered?
 4. Part 4 – Future.
 5. Part 5 – Watershed priorities.
 6. Part 6 - Water availability and demands.
 7. Part 7 – Encourage stakeholder involvement.
 8. Part 8 – Strategies.
 9. Part 9 – Measure the effectiveness of *Watersheds* over time.
- c. Water balance concept is how *Watersheds* was developed. How much water withdrawal is too much? What is the acceptable environmental consequence for insufficient recharge? Evaluate net withdrawals and develop policy that specifies the necessary criteria. Non-withdrawal uses also taken in to account. Science comes up with the numbers.
- d. State Water Plan will not be this comprehensive.
- e. Storm water management is critical component of planning effort. Used countywide approach to develop model storm water management practices under Act 167. This was also due to limited funding. This work must be performed in conjunction with landscape process.
- f. NPDES II, MS4 process reviewed for consistency with planning process.
- g. Chester County Conservation District wove these plans in to their ongoing planning efforts.
- h. Planning officials and volunteers constantly read and reread *Watersheds* to use as a guide to concisely meet objectives. Steering committee volunteered 3,000 hours to develop *Watersheds*.

i. Although *Watersheds* serves as a guide to meet planning objectives within the watershed, local ordinances must still be adhered to. Implication is that “plan” is not “law.”

j. Must maintain communication to maintain consistent administrative changes. The grass roots consensus is good. Public outreach and education needed to reach Commissions, Developers, Administrators, Committee Members and the General Public.

k. The downside of this planning effort was a small staff and limited funding. Grant money was used to develop *Watersheds* and *Landscapes*. Rivers Conservation Grant provided \$200,000 and the Brandywine Valley received \$100,000 from the William Penn fund.

l. *Watersheds* received the National APA Award for the best planning document in the United States.

3. Montgomery County – Ken Hughes (handout provided)

a. Handles planning for 62 municipalities. Address similar water and land use management situations as Chester County.

b. Vision Plan, Water Resource Plan, and Community Facilities Plan address water resources issues.

c. 20/20 vision Comprehensive Plans that include:

1. Water Quality.
2. Storm Water Planning
3. Farmland Preservation
4. Water and Sewer System Study
5. Water Resources Initiative – City appointed task force.

4. Berks County – Michael Leventry

1. Berks County Sewer and Water System Regional Study
2. Goals and Policies for Sewer and Water Systems as outlined in the 20/20 Vision Comprehensive Plans.

5. Bucks County – Dennis Livrone (handout provided)

1. Bucks County Comprehensive Plan addresses water resources issues in various sections of the plan
2. Various water resources studies prepared for the county including the Pennridge water resources plan

6. Delaware County – Karen Holm

- a. Highly urbanized and rapidly suburbanizing.
- b. Home of Philadelphia Suburban Water Company and the Octoraro Springton Reservoir.

- c. Comprehensive Planning:
 - 1. Revitalization of urban areas is priority.
 - 2. Efforts underway to protect western borders of the city.
 - 3. Stream corridor protection is a major environmental concern addressed during planning.
 - 4. Delaware County embraces the planning recommendations of Chester County.
 - 5. Sewage facility planning underway to repair and replace old sewer lines.

- d. Development Planning Division is responsible for:
 - 1. Administration of environmental planning.
 - 2. Assessment of environmental conditions.
 - 3. Block grants.
 - 4. Landfill regulations.
 - 5. Flood plains since 1979.
 - 6. Local parks.
 - 7. Review storm water measures for adoption in to municipal plans.

- e. Demolition and Redevelopment – Gary Jastrzad, Philadelphia Planning Commission - planning for ordinance revision
 - 1. Innovative Act 167 approach taken to improve Cobb Creek and Tachony Frankfurt area.
 - 2. How do you deal with infiltration? Take demonstration projects and move them through large infrastructure planning, development and maintenance.
 - 3. Replacement of sewer lines and using combined sewer overflows.
 - 4. Utilize fluvial geomorphology in Philadelphia area.
 - 5. Goal is to reverse trends in the city of Philadelphia in the next 5-years.
 - 6. Need to complete Wissahickon Creek TMDL – Must implement recommended best management practices.

- 7. Summary of issues to address for Comprehensive Planning:
 - a. Funding for upstream and downstream.
 - b. Storm water MS4 and Act 167. Act 167 is being stretched to put water back into the ground.
 - c. Best Management Practices.
 - d. How do we successfully link land use management and water resource management?
 - e. Need adequate transportation planning and integration of these efforts into the State Water Plan.
 - f. Act 537 plans need to be linked into all planning efforts. Need to use Planner’s experience to gain greater insight in to Act 537 so that it can be changed to better accommodate a higher quality of water and land use management efforts.
 - g. Address rapid urbanization and the affects on natural resources.
 - h. Encourage multi-county planning.
 - i. Management and integration of small and large public water supply systems.

- j. Water quality and quantity issues and how these issues will define Critical Water Planning areas.
 - k. Further resolve issue pertaining to Senate Bill 1102 and House Bill 2069.
 - l. Interagency decisions must relate logically in all areas of planning.
 - m. Act 537 must have full return analysis, Monitor decisions and implementation closer from DEP. Is there a manpower shortage here?
 - n. Look at economically sound and environmentally viable solutions to address water supply and sewage systems on subdivisions. Must use revenue to address court challenges between township and developer.
 - o. *Landscapes* was not incredibly innovative. Act 247 was addressed by 73 municipalities. Changed population densities. Public hearings were challenging. Energized community involvement. Funding was key. Only one municipality did not participate.
 - p. Need to make sure landowners know how to maintain infiltration swales, detention basins, etc. There needs to be adequate points of contact available to assist owners with providing required routine maintenance. Liability of these systems is crucial issue. Look at developing simple low maintenance designs.
 - q. Content of State Water Plan must be reliable resource well into the future.
 - r. Planning needs more punch since it is not law. Ordinances are below standard and many times do not fit the needs of final planning decisions. In many situations the ordinance does not fit project demands. Zoning ordinances and Act 537 should be tied in to allow for innovative planning practices to be implemented.
 - s. Dollars, authority and data are necessary to complete SWP. Grass roots efforts will be crucial.
 - t. Maintain dialogue between all parties to embark on public education and outreach.
 - u. Sufficient data gathering imperative. Must maintain integrity of databases for State Water Planning accuracy.
8. Draft letter to indicate acceptable action plans to assist with development of the State Water Plan. Send to State Water Planning committee. Carboncopy this letter to all regional committees.

Motion made by: Maya K. Van Rossum
 Motion Second: M.Irvil Kear
 Motion was carried

9. Recommended using email handout (addressed to Carol Collier) from Barbara L. Smith, Esq. To serve as backdrop for defining criteria.
10. A list must be summarized to reflect all drainage areas that will be defined as Critical Water Planning areas. Carol Collier to draft letter to include this summary and will forward copy to State Water Planning committee. This letter must be ready prior to next Critical Water Planning subcommittee meeting.
11. Recommended nomination for alternate to Howard Neukreg to serve on the CWP subcommittee.

Motion made by: Carol R. Collier
 Motion Second: John Hoekstra

Motion was carried

12. Bob Wendelgass was recommended as Mr. Neukreg's alternate to serve on CWP subcommittee.

Motion made by: Howard Neukreg
Motion Second: John J. Coscia
Motion was carried

13. John Coscia was recommended to serve as alternate on the Policy and Integration Subcommittee for six months.

Motion made by: Honorable Kate Harper
Motion Second: Howard Hoekstra
Motion was carried

14. CWP subcommittee will have draft critical water planning process worked out for submission to State Water Planning Committee to review at November, 2004 meeting. Final action on these proposals will be reviewed again in the spring of 2005.

15. September 13 – 15, 2004 is the watershed summit in Delaware where four Governors will sign resolution of Basin Plan.

16. Regional Committee appointees have been emailed notices that their 1-year appointments are up. They have been notified that should they wish to serve for an additional year they must notify the Policy Office. Policy office will send nominees to Governor's office.

17. Delaware regional committee meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Motion made by: Carol R. Collier
Motion Second: M.Irvil Kear
Motion was carried