

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

Commenter Number	Commenter	Affiliation	Date	Comments
1	Willis W. Smith	Mayor, Village of Deposit	3/01/07	<p>a) R- DRBC should provide clear information to downstream communities regarding reservoir release schedules contemplated as part of future plans for “Flexible Flow Management.”</p> <p>b) S- Mitigation needs to be done with the huge gravel bar underneath the Route 17 overpass that crosses the Delaware River. Minor flooding at this location could impact the Airport Road area and Wastewater Treatment Plan improvements.</p>
2	Dave Burd	Lambertville, Office of Emergency Management	3/08/07	<p>a) Advocates consistency between the Interstate Task Force Report and the NJ Task Force Report.</p> <p>b) S- add an action item to the report providing: <i>Small local flood control that may be beneficial for prevention of stream tributary flooding should be investigated. Backwater flooding along the stream tributaries could be controlled and prevented through the use of flap gates, flood gates, tide gates and pumping stations.</i></p>
3	James E. Eisel	Chairman, Delaware County Board of Supervisors	2/08/07	<p>a) R- The DRBC temporary spill mitigation program for the three reservoirs should be made permanent at its May 2007 meeting. A permanent void should be provided at Pepacton Reservoir. Lowering the Pepacton Reservoir by 10%, by increasing bottom releases would yield a 14 BG void and a tremendous safety net for any event up to approximately 5” of rain depending on soil absorption conditions at the time.</p>
4	William J. Powell	Hunterdon County Emergency Management Coordinator	3/05/07	<p>a) FW-10- All dam/levee emergency action plans should follow a standardized format to facilitate use by Emergency Management Officials. The plans should be available in electronic format and should be included into the EPI-Net system so that they are available on a protected on-line source.</p> <p>b) All-Hazard Mitigation Plan: Federal legislators need to review and possibly modify the DMA-2000 to ease municipal requirements for development of All-Hazards Mitigation Plans. State Mitigation Units need to be better staffed. States should develop a funding source to assist municipalities in hiring planning consultants. States should consider deploying Mitigation Unit employees to lead regional planning processes.</p> <p>c) Flood Hazard Maps-Once completed, make maps available on-line to emergency managers.</p> <p>d) The National Weather Service needs to increase the capabilities of their website. A password protected site should be dedicated to emergency management personnel. Plans for additional gages, a Hunterdon forecast point, and 6 hours frequency forecasting updates are supported.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>e) Citizens should be encouraged to join Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT)</p> <p>f) Each County and Municipal Office of Emergency Management should have a “Mitigation Officer”. This person would be on the Local Emergency Planning Council (LEPC) and be the lead person to deal with all mitigation issues.</p>
5	Charles H. Martin, James F. Cawley, Sandra A. Miller	Board of County Commissioners of Bucks County	2/28/2007	<p>a) County Commissioners were very supportive of the Task Force analysis of flooding problems and indicated that such analysis is helpful tool to explain causes of flooding to the public.</p> <p>b) R-They support the need to evaluate and regulate all upstream reservoirs to minimize their discharge (spills plus releases) during flood conditions.</p> <p>c) They endorse proactive stormwater and waterway corridor management and highlighted progressive implementation activities in the county. They noted, in particular, the home buyout and elevation successes in the Neshaminy Creek watershed involving hundreds of structures in flood prone areas.</p> <p>d) Commissioners supported the Task Force recommendation to emphasize floodproofing and elevation in historic communities and acquisition of floodplain properties elsewhere.</p> <p>e) Specific actions to assist Bucks County include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop reservoir operations plan • Continue federal funding for acquisition and elevation • FM- <u>Identify ways to require municipalities to enforce and implement their stormwater management ordinances. Under Pennsylvania law, stormwater requirements can be waived by the elected officials.</u> • Tools and funding for long-term monitoring and maintenance of stormwater management facilities, as well as funding to retrofit obsolete stormwater facilities, are needed. • FP- Floodplain regulations in the basin need to be upgraded. • Communications of the findings and recommendations of the Task Force report is critical to fostering public support, funding and political action.
6	Donna M. Lewis	Planning Director County of Mercer	3/06/07	<p>a) Support was expressed for six priority management areas, a combination of mitigation measures, and holistic watershed approach.</p> <p>b) Representation—Better representation of scientists, policy-makers, and lay people are needed to effectively implement the policies of the Plan.</p> <p>c) They were supportive of companion process to the Task Force, involving a NJ four county approach to developing a Multi-Jurisdictional Flood Mitigation Plan, as a first step toward a regional All-Hazards Plan.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>d) Stormwater Management Plans and Ordinances need to be integrated with local and regional flood management plans.</p> <p>e) Better communication is needed between the counties, FEMA and NJDEP as part of the floodplain map update process.</p>
7	Michael W. Herbert	On behalf of Mercer County Board of Chosen Freeholders	3/07/07	<p>a) The comments enumerated in Comment #6 were reiterated.</p> <p>b) The Freeholders also support a higher level of participation and coordination between the County, the municipalities and the Delaware River Basin Flood Mitigation Task Force.</p>
8	John J. Bonacic	New York State Senator	2/08/07	<p>a) R- DRBC should endorse the creation of sizable voids in the New York City Reservoir System. Reservoir levels are 15% above average and the Supreme Court Decree parties should seek to maintain them at average levels. This should be done without further “studying” of the issues.</p>
9	Patrick J. Murphy	Congressman 8 th District, PA	2/27/07	<p>a) The Preliminary Action Plan represents a strong step in the right direction, offering both long term and immediate solutions to be taken up by all levels of government.</p> <p>b) Changes in the New York Reservoirs’ operation could significantly reduce flood damages downstream. Immediate action is necessary if we are to best protect our residents living along the river. The DRBC should pursue every avenue possible to bring the parties to the 1954 Supreme Court Decree together for a more permanent agreement before the current reservoir operation agreement ends on May 21, 2007.</p>
10	Joyce Andreoli	New Jersey Assoc. of REALTORS	3/06/07	<p>a) Recommendation FR-4 (Flood Hazard Disclosure Requirements) proposes a flood hazard disclosure requirement for real estate transactions, requiring either the property owner or the “realtor responsible for selling the property” to inform prospective buyers of the property’s flood history, including permits, tax records, insurance records and other information as described in FR-4. NJAR does not believe real estate licensees should be responsible for conveying this information.</p> <p>b) The term REALTOR®, as used in FR-4, is a trademark that refers only to those real estate professionals who are members of the National Association of REALTORS®.</p>
11	Derenda Updegrave	PA Assoc. of REALTORS	3/05/07	<p>a) The term REALTOR® is a registered mark from NAR and may only be used by members of the association. The term “real estate licensee” is the more general term and should be used for purposes of this report.</p> <p>b) Pennsylvania property sellers are required to provide a Seller’s Property Disclosure Statement to a potential buyer. We believe that the recommendation that the disclosure</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>requirements be made “either by the property owner <i>or the realtor responsible for selling the property</i> (emphasis added) is an unrealistic responsibility to place upon a real estate licensee. Disclosing the flood history of a property could render the licensee liable for inaccuracies regardless of the extent of actual knowledge of prior flooding.</p> <p>c) The recommendation adds that “the existence of permits or other documentation from the States, flood insurance records, easements onsite or tax records should be part of the disclosure requirements. “ We believe that this requirement is an unreasonable burden to place on a property owner or a licensee.</p> <p>d) The requirement for a municipality to store individual property flood history would place a liability on the municipality and they question the storing of this information and what it would be used for.</p>
12	Charles Staro	NY Assoc. of REALTORS	2/28/07	<p>a) The New York State Association of REALTORS®, Inc. strongly objects to the Commission’s preliminary recommendation that real estate licensees become responsible for certain property condition disclosures that appropriately should only apply to sellers. We suggest that any final recommendation limit property condition disclosure obligations to sellers only. The onus is on the seller only to make these disclosures prior to a buyer being bound by a contract of sale.</p> <p>b) The preliminary recommendation also would require the disclosure of “permits or other documentation form the states, flood insurance records, easements onsite or tax records” by sellers and realtors (sic). Such a significant disclosure obligation on a real estate licensee for information that is not within the personal knowledge of the licensee without extensive investigation is unreasonable and could unfairly place the licensee in jeopardy of legal or administrative prosecution.</p>
13	William Vogt	D.D. S and former Task Force Member	2/6/07	<p>a) After much consideration, I have decided to withdraw from the Governors’ Interstate Flood Task Force. Upon reviewing the latest update to the recommendations I am sorry to say that there is nothing in the recommendations that would effectively create any meaningful flood control in the near future. Considering we have had three devastating floods in the last 2 years the proposals are woefully inadequate. Therefore, neither the Delaware Riverside Conservancy nor I wish to be associated with these recommendations.</p>
14	George Kelchner	President, Delaware Riverside Conservancy	2/05/07	<p>a) The Delaware Riverside Conservancy (DRC) and its membership refuse to take part in a flawed and inadequate process that fails to provide and/or recommend immediate and emergent flood relief.</p> <p>b) The DRC accepted the Interstate Task Force invitation, with the assumption that our interests would be properly and adequately taken into consideration. Unfortunately for the</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>DRC, its membership, the Interstate Task Force has failed to address, recommend, and/or consider emergent measures designed to protect lives, safety and property. Part and parcel to any discussions regarding flooding in the basin, is the potential impact of the reservoirs located in the upper basin. The DRC’s recommendations with respect to these reservoirs were not incorporated in the final recommendations of the Task Force. The DRC cannot and will not condone the current management and operations of the reservoirs which are reckless, dangerous, and maintained at levels which represent extreme indifference to the lives, safety and property of all of those downstream.</p> <p>c) While the DRC certainly understands the need for comprehensive studies regarding the reservoirs and the basin as a whole, studies are not required or necessitated for immediate and substantial relief in the form of reservoir voids and proper reservoir management. A simple calculation regarding drainage areas and percentages evidences the potential of the reservoirs to provide substantial and significant reductions in downstream flooding damage and devastation.</p>
15	Preston Luitweiler, P.E.	Aqua America	3/07/07	<p>a) R-Flood mitigation at reservoirs should not diminish the availability of water supplies, should not increase the risk of water supply shortages, and should preserve the rights of parties with interest in the purposes for which reservoirs were constructed such as water supply, flow augmentation, power generation, and recreation.</p> <p>b) General-The recommendations that deal with improved floodplain mapping, targeting of flood prone properties for land acquisition, and improved management of future development in floodplains, are reasonable and commendable.</p>
16	Robert F. Molzahn	Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin	2/27/2007	<p>a) General-There should be a continuing open dialogue with all stakeholders in the basin and balancing of interests in developing implementation strategies for flood loss reduction.</p> <p>b) R-Privately funded storage systems should not be converted to public use without the consideration of their needs. Historic rights and reservations should be honored and preserved.</p> <p>c) General-It must be acknowledged that we cannot completely control all natural events.</p> <p>d) General-Flood mitigation needs long term commitment. DRBC and the Task Force should focus on providing a maximum range of options for government entities to select and implement. In order to accomplish goals, appropriate political, structural, and financial support and commitment must also be provided.</p>
17	Robin L. Dingle	Environmental Planning	3/07/2007	<p>a) General-The holistic, watershed based approach developed by the Task Force is supported. Flood management practices need to be adopted in tributaries because local</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

		Consultants		<p>actions have cumulative benefits.</p> <p>b) General-Locally implemented watershed management programs are likely to result in the most significant reduction of flood impacts.</p> <p>c) General-Education is integral to the successful implementation of watershed based planning.</p> <p>d) S-Cost benefit and ecological analysis should be conducted to evaluate wing dam removal and replacement where these structures raise flood levels.</p> <p>e) SM-Stream restoration guidelines should be developed that include measures to mitigate existing flooding and prevent future degradation of water quality and stream habitat resulting from flood induced erosion and sedimentation.</p> <p>f) FM-Floodplain mapping needs to extend to the headwaters of the tributaries.</p> <p>g) SM-Future designs of bridges and culverts should minimize concentrated flows and promote natural channel stability.</p>
18	Dr. Brent Blackwelder	Friends of the Earth	3/06/2007	a) S -The further expenditure of tax dollars on any main stem dam building scheme for flood mitigation is adamantly opposed, especially given the history of the Tocks Island Dam proposal.
19	Jim Davis	Mill Rift Civic Association	2/28/2007	<p>a) General-The recommendations, if followed through, will go a long way towards helping those living near the river to be better able to cope with future floods.</p> <p>b) R-Why is the arbitrary number 50 percent used in the water equivalent snowpack calculation. Won't a greater percentage reach the reservoir?</p> <p>c) R-Why is snowpack not considered when calculating voids?</p> <p>d) R-It is crucial that data pertaining to reservoir storage be made more readily available to the public.</p> <p>e) R-The basin reservoirs, even when intended for water supply and not for flood control, can be managed to better help mitigate downstream flood events without compromising their intended mission of drought aversion, and such management practices should be thoroughly explored.</p>
20	Deborah Rousell, PhD.	Personal Comments and Letter from Trenton Island Civic Association	3/08/2007	<p>a) General-Trenton should be included in the report with other communities mentioned for historic significance. Modified wording is provided for Recommendation S-6</p> <p>b) General-Neither Trenton or Mercer County were represented on the Flood Task Force.</p> <p>c) SM-Delaware River backflow prevention is a means of flood proofing most appropriate for Trenton. Modified wording is provided for recommendation SM-1.1 to highlight backflow prevention as a means of flood mitigation for main stem communities as well as tributaries and for existing as well as new development and re-development.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>d) S-Elevation of utilities is another element of flood proofing for Trenton considered most appropriate. Modified wording is provided for recommendation S-6.1 that includes elevation of basement utilities as an effective means of flood proofing.</p> <p>e) General-The Island Civic Association commends the breadth of the topics covered in the recommendations and would like the same commitment and thoroughness in implementation.</p> <p>f) General-The Island Civic Association recognizes that studies are needed, but notes that commitment to act on the results of studies is also needed.</p> <p>g) General-All communities should have representation during the prioritization of recommendations and the fund allocation process.</p> <p>h) General-Recommendations to immediately remedy obvious deficiencies are endorsed, if there is data and consensus to support the potential effectiveness of such measures. These include such measures as funding mechanisms to elevate basement utilities in the Island Section of Trenton, and backflow prevention. These measures should be given priority for funding in addition to considering funding for longer term measures.</p>
21	John Miller	New Jersey Association of Floodplain Managers (NJAFM)	3/03/2007	<p>a) General-The Task Force is to be commended for their work. If implemented, the recommendations will reduce damages and save lives.</p> <p>b) General-Identification of areas of greatest risk, ranking of mitigation strategies, and specific funding sources should be considered for inclusion in the document.</p> <p>c) General-Due to limited state resources, the recommendations should be prioritized.</p> <p>d) General-The report should place high priority on those measures which alleviate flood damage under existing conditions, and on measures which will both prevent flood damage under existing conditions and prevent increases in future flood damages.</p> <p>e) FR-Section V.E should address the need for streamlined and consistent permitting specific to maintenance cleanouts.</p> <p>f) R-A basin wide model that includes real time data for decision support should be pursued, and should be GIS based and coupled with flood inundation mapping.</p> <p>g) S-DRBC participation Corps of Engineers evaluation of basin-wide mitigation strategies is encouraged.</p> <p>h) S-The Task Force should note that flood mitigation projects require proper record keeping. A centralized GIS data base may assist with future planning and help focus mitigation dollars.</p> <p>i) S-Dam failure inundation mapping should be more readily available. Adding dam failure inundation limits to Flood Insurance Rate Maps is supported.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>j) S-Dam safety enforcement is not adequately addressed in the action plan.</p> <p>k) General-There is a need for extensive training in various areas such as responsibilities under the National Flood Insurance Program, developing Hazard Mitigation Plans, and application for flood mitigation grants.</p> <p>l) Specific-On page 3, it is not clear if private business was represented on the flood task force.</p> <p>m) Specific-On page 8, the reference to the frequency for a 10 inch rainfall should be clarified.</p> <p>n) Specific-On page 9, a map should be added to show the drainage for each of the four basin states.</p> <p>o) Specific- On page 10, it would be valuable to know the percentage of floodplain properties where flood insurance has actually been purchased.</p> <p>p) Specific- On page 10, there is a need for a policy on prioritizing repetitive loss areas.</p> <p>q) Specific- On page 13, SM –Strengthening regulations must be backed by education to land use decision bodies.</p> <p>r) Specific- On page 13, SM- Regional stormwater management plans must be promoted and enforced at the local level.</p> <p>s) R-On page 17, a six hour time step for the flood analysis model is questioned as being too long.</p> <p>t) S-On page 32, mention should be made that Growing Greener in PA and Green Acres/Blue Acres in New Jersey are important for local matches to FEMA funds, which require local matching funds.</p> <p>u) S-On page 34, a levee safety and inspection plan is supported.</p> <p>v) SM-On page 40, the EPA Clean Water Act generation of the MS4 permit system under NPDES should be mentioned.</p> <p>w) SM-On page 41,the DRBC should work at the State/County level to implement ordinance changes</p> <p>x) SM-On page 41, consider rewording recommendation SM 3.1 to allow for structural measures such as backflow preventers where they are the proper mitigation solution.</p> <p>y) SM-For SM 4.1 on page 42, the phrase “more consistent implementation” could be replaced by “thoughtful enforcement” of existing standards.</p> <p>z) SM-For SM 4.2, on page 42, include a note on the inspection requirements under the MS4, NPDES Phase II regulations.</p> <p>aa) SM-For SM-5, on page 43, DRBC should review how smart growth and stormwater</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>requirements can be addressed for re-development. Requirements for flood mitigation retrofits should be strengthened.</p> <p>bb) SM-For SM-5, on page 43, consider adding the USDA-NRCS programs as means of reducing stormwater runoff from existing development.</p> <p>cc) SM-For SM-5.1 on page 43, consider providing BMPs to older sites with not stormwater control when retrofit is feasible.</p> <p>dd) SM-For SM 6.1 on page 45, data maintained by the DRBC, USGS, NWS/NOAA and the States should be made available to the public in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>ee) FM-For FM-2 on page 51, the Task Force should consider the Report entitled “Reducing Flood Losses – Is the 1 percent Chance Flood Standard Sufficient” – The report of the 2004 Assembly of the Gilbert F. White National Flood Policy Forum.</p> <p>ff) FM- For FM-3, page 53, the Task Force is encouraged to view documents provided by the ASFPM on this subject.</p> <p>gg) FR- For FR-1, page 56, the action plan should recognize the resources required for producing the level of detail in the Pennypack Creek floodplain restudy.</p>
22	Elizabeth George-Cherniara, Esq.	New Jersey Builders Association	3/13/2007	<p>a) General-The Task Force is commended for identifying many practical and necessary recommendations.</p> <p>b) General-Some of the recommendations should be reconsidered.</p> <p>c) General-There are no members of the regulated community on the Task Force.</p> <p>d) General-Statements that development, stormwater management, and floodplain encroachment are potentially contributing and exacerbating factors for flood loss is not supported by data and are without merit.</p> <p>e) R-For R-1 and R-2, A high priority should be given to developing a flood analysis model and the procurement of hydrologic data. All available forecasting technology should be used to better inform release decisions and to reduce total discharge from reservoirs during flood conditions.</p> <p>f) R-For R-3 and R-4, These measures are supported</p> <p>g) R- For R-6, DRBC should ensure accurate reporting of data and conditions for all the basin’s reservoirs and dams. DRBC should use services offered by the National Weather Service and USGS to provide relevant data on-line for the public.</p> <p>h) S-For S-6, A process is needed to insure that property acquisition is appropriate and justified.</p> <p>i) S-For S-8, A funding mechanism is needed to support private dam owners and government in dam inspection and maintenance activity when they cannot afford it.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>j) SM- For SM-1, SM 1.4 should be clarified to note that if a regional stormwater management plan is created, such site specific measures as low impact development, and best management practices may not be needed.</p> <p>k) SM-For SM-3, Basin wide flood control should be pursued in addition to non structural stormwater management strategies.</p> <p>l) SM-For SM-5, The impacts of agricultural practices on flooding should be investigated by the Task Force. A regulatory mechanism for agricultural activities in needed.</p> <p>m) SM-Some of the statements related to channel clearing and permitting seem at odds with the flood mitigation purpose of the report or appear out of context.</p> <p>n) FM-For FM-2, it is unclear why a 25 percent safety factor is necessary if the area is already built out.</p> <p>o) FM-For FM-2, there are not technical reports that support the 25 percent safety factor for the 100 year flow rate. Without this documentation, it is arbitrary.</p> <p>p) FM-For FM-2, if the ‘no net fill’ restriction is imposed, it is unnecessary to apply the 25 percent safety factor.</p> <p>q) FM-For FM-2, potential flooding impacts from existing development should be controlled by retro-fitting existing conditions, not by curtailing future development.</p> <p>r) FM-Compensation must be provided to those property owners who are prevented from using their property.</p> <p>s) FM-For FM-3, The cited 0.1 ft allowable rise standard is directed at preventing development rather than at mitigating flooding. Analysis and documentation is needed to justify this rather than the New Jersey of FEMA flood standard.</p> <p>t) FR-For FR-1, The Task Force should encourage adoption of uniform, region-wide standards administered by state or county and not municipal entities.</p> <p>u) FR-For FR-1, If floodplain protection requirements are adopted to prevent future construction, fill, or devegetation, then the Task Force should emphasize that compensation must be made to property owners by the respective governments.</p> <p>v) FR-For FR-2, The certification of all local floodplain managers and local officials is supported.</p> <p>w) FR-For FR-3, All flood prone structures should be required to carry flood insurance.</p> <p>x) FR-For FR-3, Rather than financing repeated reconstruction as under the Flood Insurance Program, better access to mitigation monies would enable communities to acquire flood prone properties.</p> <p>y) FR-For FR-4, Supported</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>z) FR-For FR-5, The Task Force’s recognition of the need for flexibility should be adopted as a core principal of its report.</p> <p>aa) FW-Additional financial sources should be sought to support the operation and maintenance of gages.</p> <p>bb) FW-DRBC should invest in tools that provide real time warnings and images for emergency manager use.</p> <p>cc) FW-DRBC should strive to meet the National Weather Service standards for telemetry, rain gages and other forecasting tools.</p> <p>dd) General Implementation-How will the recommendations of the report be implemented without funding? The Task Force should explore and pursue all flood mitigation funding.</p> <p>ee) General Implementation-The Task Force should explore all opportunities to mitigate flood risk that will complement policies to assure adequate employment and housing are maintained.</p>
23	Alicia Batko	Montague, N.J.	3/6/07	<p>a) FR: Laws in place for floodplain regulation need to be enforced.</p> <p>b) R: NYC reservoirs should be drawn down to catch more water from hurricanes, etc.</p> <p>c) S: Opposes a main stem dam; (we have already changed the natural ebb and flow of the river, which causes problems)</p> <p>d) S: Mashipacong Island ice flow channel needs to be cleared of debris that has collected from the last three floods.</p> <p>e) General: Maximizing prevention through advance forecasting, use of warning systems, educating people in flood plains...., and diverting water through better stormwater policy and reservoir control, etc. will serve us best into the future.”</p>
24	Lloyd Best, Jr.	Alpha, N.J.	2/26/07	<p>a) SM: catch basins and reservoirs do not do the job. Stormwater retention and detention is needed along with recharge onsite. Advocates infiltration trenches.</p> <p>b) General: To blame the flooding on the Upper Delaware Basin is a waste of money and time</p>
25	Robert Castagna	Milford, N.J.	2/12/07	<p>a) S: Erosion of the riverbank is a significant problem following the past three floods; Milford, N.J.’s (and across river in Bridgeton Twp., Pa.) Feels this is b/c of a few things: higher river flows due to reservoir releases/spills during already high water events, wakes created by jet skis/motor boats that pound the shores (also mentioned “no wake” rules are unenforced), pervasive invasive species, esp. Japanese Hops, which have shallow roots, geese & deer, development in the floodplain, etc.</p> <p>b) S: Financial relief is needed for riverbank restoration</p> <p>c) R: use the NYC reservoirs for flood control first and water supply second. Get NYC to</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>build WTP on Hudson for NYC to get drinking water. Keep levels at 50-60%. Additional damage in recent floods b/c these reservoirs at 105%.</p> <p>d) FR: Consider the long-term financial impact to riverside towns of more restrictive building codes; (for example, in Milford there are two old mill sites for which developers have multi-million dollar plans), these types of riverside properties that comprised over 30% of the tax ratables for the town would be rendered useless and remove these ratables. This loss would have to then be shouldered by the townspeople, an “unbearable load”)</p>
26	Philip Chase	Port Jervis, N.Y.; Town of Deerpark representative to the Upper Delaware Council	2/13/07	<p>a) R: New York City should be prohibited from selling Delaware water to new customers in the Hudson watershed.</p> <p>b) R: New York City should seek a water supply from the Hudson in order to lessen its reliance on the Cannonsville, Pepacton and Neversink. This additional supply would allow for a void for flood management without endangering the NYC water supply.</p> <p>c) R: The federal government should fund the cost of a filtration plant and pump system in order to allow NYC to take 325mgd from the Hudson. (In 1951, NYC’s own “Little Hoover Commission” claimed that 325mgd could be taken from the Hudson above Poughkeepsie)</p> <p>d) R: NYC must move forward with effective conservation techniques; tunnel repairs and individualized metering units.</p> <p>e) R: Supreme Court Decree should be revisited.</p>
27	John D. Coffin	Flood Victim Aberdeen, N.J., (Owns property in Wayne Co., Pa.)	2/6/07	<p>a) General: Task Force did an outstanding job and is supportive of all recommendations</p> <p>b) General: Emphasizes the need to enact the recommendations quickly.</p> <p>c) Specific: Explain Supreme Court Decree in report, list Decree members; possibly include the Decree as an Appendix</p> <p>d) FR: Better explain the impact on the definition of the floodway of a 0.2 foot rise in depth vs. a 1.0 foot rise in depth; recommends providing an example or a graphic.</p>
28	James H. Cox	Flood Victim Matamoras, Pa. (Rental property flooded in Westfall Twp., Pa.)	2/12/07	<p>a) R: The Reservoirs created the flooding; New York City Reservoirs and Lake Wallenpaupack. They held excessive levels when heavy rain was forecast.</p> <p>b) R: Advocate of voids in the reservoirs for flood management</p> <p>c) SM: Stormwater is a problem, “run off between us and South Eastern Pa really added up to big woes.”</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

29	Barbara Curtis	Flood Victim (attended Easton meeting)	2/28/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) S: river’s capacity is decreasing. Options to increase its capacity include: removal of islands and flood debris, dredging silt, increase capacity of its tributaries, build additional flood control reservoirs, build a dam. (Doesn’t understand the opposition to a dam - Dams are good: store more water, manage the river, and provide non-polluting power to reduce our carbon footprint. b) R: Supports revisiting the Supreme Court Decree c) R: Emphasizes need for coordinated releases, better reservoir management. d) R: Release water into the Hudson in times of need e) FW: Supports better forecasting to give homeowners sufficient notice in advance of a flood. f) SM/R: Support better stormwater management. Pa. is recognized as being a development-friendly state: it’s time the state took steps to protect its citizens over the interests of developers. g) S: ACOE study should be a priority. h) S: Most cost-effective recommendation is to strongly support, expedite, assist and fund at adequate levels property acquisition and elevation. (She is currently trying to have her home bought out and is “in limbo” waiting for PEMA/FEMA.)
30	Kathy Davis		3/1/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) R: Need safety voids in the NYC reservoirs to prevent flooding along the river
31	Harold Deal	Northampton County, Pa.	3/6/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) General: Recognizes the complexity of the issues. b) General: (Coordination) Task Force should continue to work closely with environmental organizations like the Delaware Riverkeeper Network. c) R: Better regulation and management of the existing reservoirs is needed. d) R: Supports revisiting the Supreme Court Decree e) R: Supports that NYC divert water to the Hudson in times of need and look to create a new water supply from the Hudson f) R: Flow plans should take into account real-time weather conditions and actual rainfall. g) S-1: Opposes the ACOE study (an unencumbered flood study up and down the river that would allow them to create their own plans to mitigate future flooding.) h) S: Opposes revisiting Tocks Island, or any dam on the main stem or its tributaries. (Dams do not prevent floods) i) S: Do not channelize natural streams for artificial drainage, nor fill in any streams for construction projects. Do not remove debris haphazardly. j) S: Remove low head dams on tributaries to restore natural riparian areas and prevent

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>flood waters from backing up, for example those on the Pequest in Belvidere, N.J. Also, remove abandoned structures in floodplain and on islands.</p> <p>k) S: Don’t use eminent domain for acquisitions but do so with incentives and fair market buyouts.</p> <p>l) S: Floodproof historic structures</p> <p>m) S: Remove roads, waste water facilities, and public infrastructure that sustain repeated damage from flooding.</p> <p>n) SM: Opposes channelization. Hopes the Task Force “understands the insanity of public suggestions to dredge river, removing trees from islands and shorelines and removing entire islands to expedite flow during periods of heavy runoff.</p> <p>o) FR: Prohibit new construction in the floodway.</p> <p>p) FR: Enforce existing regulations. Make agencies oversee their duties. Continued oversight or disinterest by agencies only compounds the problem. The best intended recommendations cannot be effective without the methods and the power to implement them.</p> <p>q) General: (Implementation): The best intended recommendations cannot be effective without the methods and the power to implement them.</p> <p>r) FR: Require training of local official for intelligent management of floodplain requirements and to understand the benefits of natural riparian buffers.</p> <p>s) FW: Need improved gaging, forecasting, and warning systems.</p>
32	Robert Gavin	Bucks County, Pa.	3/7/07	a) R: NYC reservoirs are mismanaged and should have a 15% void at all times and a 25% void when heavy rains are predicted. This gives NYC enough drinking water. “We cannot continue to absorb the financial costs of reservoir mismanagement.”
33	Mina Hamilton	former President of the Delaware Valley Conservation Association	3/7/07	<p>a) S: went into detailed description of river’s geography, Wild and Scenic Status, recreational resources, and Tock’s Island Dam proposal.</p> <p>b) S-1: Opposes a main stem dam. Family’s property seized by ACOE for Tocks in 1971. Feels having the ACOE do a basin-wide flood mitigation study equals the DRBC and ACOE wanting to “get a main stem Delaware River dam back on the books.” Mentioned Garlits’ proposal at Walpack bend and feels it would be a waste of taxpayers money; called it “Tocks 2.”</p> <p>c) S: A re-analysis of appropriate flood control and flood mitigation methods is warranted.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

34	Douglas and Linda Hay	Flood Victims Mill Rift, Pa.	2/13/07	<p>a) General: Says plan is excellent, overall.</p> <p>b) R: wants voids to absorb run-off and asks why not use 100% snowpack water equivalent estimate instead of 50% (R-4) when determining releases.</p> <p>c) Also regarding the temporary spill mitigation program, why not extend the months it is in effect (2 of the last 3 floods were in April and June, when the program orders no releases for flood mitigation) and increase release volumes allowed.</p> <p>d) Commended PPL’s discharge mitigation program for Lake Wallenpaupack and said Mongaup and other watershed pools should do the same.</p> <p>e) Also wanted dam safety inspections.</p> <p>f) SM: wants stronger stormwater management requirements</p> <p>g) FR: wants restrictions on floodplain building</p>
35	Joan Homovich	Flood Victim Downsville, NY	Dated 1/16/07; submitted 2/8/07 at Delhi Public Meeting	<p>a) R: wonders why report does not mention DRBC Resolution 2006-18 (wants immediate adjustment of its figures). Also says NYC profits from selling excess water and suggests this “influences the figures agreed to in Res. 2006-18”. (Most of this document focuses on numbers, figures, and aspects of Resolution 2006-18, not the task force report)</p>
36	Joan Homovich	Flood Victim Downsville, NY	3/5/07 - Supplemental comments to 1/16/07 document	<p>a) R: Wants voids in all NYC reservoirs; worried that existing snowpack or any heavy rain will fill reservoirs and spill over. (all “R” comments still mainly focused on Resolution 2006-18 and how its numbers do not work)</p> <p>b) FW: wonders why there are USGS gages at Downsville (#0141700) and Stilesville (#01425000), yet public does not have access to this data. The public living downstream from these gages needs access to real-time data for these gages. Wonders “is there something to hide?”</p>
37	Ronald Godshalk	Easton, Pa.	2/27/07	<p>a) R: suggests building another reservoir/holding area adjacent to present reservoirs. This way, when there is high water, simply pump it from one to the other.</p>
38	Uke Jackson	Delaware Water Gap, Pa.	2/24/07	<p>a) S: Supports acquisition and converting floodplains to open space rather than large engineering projects.</p> <p>b) FR: “Those of us smart enough to live on high ground are being asked to sacrifice not only the natural health and beauty of our beloved river, but also our tax dollars, for plans that serve a few folks too silly or too stubborn to move...” Also wary of greedy developers who would sell “every square inch of riverfront property as habitable.” Should discourage waterfront development and get people out of the floodplain, raze</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
 “Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
 Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				structures, and protect the riparian areas from invasive species. Offer them fair dollar for their homes and businesses; getting people out of the floodplain will also make “tapping the river for drinking water more practicable.” In this time of sea level rise and increasingly brackish water, looking for more drinking water intakes upriver is surely important. c) S: Protect and support a self-sustaining river.
39	William Kays			a) S: Getting water from Top of basin to ocean unencumbered and as quickly as possible will reduce flooding. Need to remove all trees and vegetation from river islands and some banks is necessary, and perhaps remove some islands completely. If no islands, there is nothing holding debris, ice, and the flow of the river back. “Some areas will require special attention to facilitate movement, that is any S curves be cut straight through.”
40	J. Kennedy	Lower Mount Bethel, Pa.	2/28/07	a) FR: There is a failure to enforce at the federal, state and local level. Policy makers need to make sure that all agencies communicate and interface with each other. b) S: Municipalities should be required to do hazard mitigation plan. Lower Mount Bethel Twp. (LMBT) was only one in Northampton County to not complete one, forcing its residents to not be eligible for funding. Wants policymakers to put strict enforcement on agencies to help with mitigation and compliance. c) SM: who enforces this? Feds or state? Seen some locations developed in LMBT where even the Planning Commission recommended them not be developed due to steep slopes and being flood prone. Who has final say? d) FM: “talk to anyone on the river and we will tell you the maps are wrong.”
41	David Laird II	Trenton, NJ	02/15/07	a) There seems to be a bias to flooding north of the Trenton railroad bridge, there is also a flood problem south of the bridge in the Broad Street Park neighborhood. b) Flooding in the Broad Street Park neighborhood is due to water table rise, backflow and tidal intrusion. c) SM: Culverts and retention basins are in dire need of restoration and maintenance.
42	James and Doris MacPherson	Upper Mt. Bethel, Pa.	03/06/07	a) S: A main stream dam is not the answer and will not stop flooding. d) General: (Prioritization)The Task Force needs to emphasize & prioritize education, with a focus on stormwater management and protection/benefits of natural vegetation in the watershed.
43	Thomas W. McBrien IV	Flood Victim Upper Black Eddy, Pa.	03/06/07	a) R: The reservoirs must have a permanent year-round void for flood mitigation. b) R: The size of the reservoirs should <u>not</u> be increased. c) R: Reservoir recommendations not aggressive enough.

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

44	John McVeigh		03/07/07	<p>a) SM: Development of upriver municipalities is partially to blame for these flood events, planning has been inadequate in upriver regions.</p> <p>b) FR: No more building permits should be issued until the flood issue is settled.</p> <p>c) General: A political solution is needed to stop the flooding.</p>
45	Sandy McNichol		03/07/07	<p>a) R: All reservoirs must have a permanent year-round void for flood mitigation.</p>
46	Kelly Offerman	Flood Victim Belvidere, NJ	03/07/07	<p>a) What role does the DRBC play in helping local municipalities? Is there support for mitigation, grants and funding?</p> <p>b) S-5 & S-6: What is the timeframe for this, in particular Belvidere, Warren County?</p> <p>c) FR-3: Will counties/communities that have severe rep loss properties be prioritized for funding? What is the timeframe that funding will become available? Funding is dependant on each municipality having a mitigation plan in place, can DRBC help expedite this?</p>
47	Rita Ohman	Flood Victim Equinunk, Pa.	02/15/07	<p>a) R: Keep all reservoirs at the level necessary to accommodate rain and runoff. Releases must be addressed!</p> <p>b) R: After 50 years, New York City must revisit its water needs and take into account the needs of its downstream neighbors. They must take the responsibility that comes along with ownership.</p> <p>c) SM: Stream maintenance must be done on the tributaries. Permits and funding must be streamlined in order to make improvements easier.</p> <p>d) S: FEMA mitigation funding should be made available to all structures and situations affected by flooding.</p>
48	Mike O’Hare	Flood Victim Upper Black Eddy, Pa.	03/07/07	<p>a) R: The 1954 Supreme Court Decree must be revisited.</p> <p>b) R: Permanent year-round voids are needed.</p> <p>c) R: Rainfall accumulation must be taken into account.</p> <p>d) R: Investigate the possibility of increasing the size of the reservoirs.</p> <p>e) General: Technical specifics of the plan are baffling and unintelligible.</p>
49	Kirk Pierson	Columbia, NJ	02/28/07	<p>a) General: Something besides heavy rains has changed. A “wall of water” was seen in the June flood that was not ever experienced before.</p> <p>b) S: If global warming or natural weather patterns are going to continue causing torrential rains and severe flooding, stop spending money on analysis and instead acquire homes in the floodplain and create open space.</p> <p>c) R: Why are the reservoir levels so much higher than years past? Reservoirs need to be lowered for flood management. Once full, reservoir releases need to be managed and</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>coordinated with other reservoir owners.</p> <p>d) S: Obstructions in the river should be cleared so as to not prevent flow during high water events. Examples include widening the river, removing islands, removing unused bridges. Such a move would require coordination between the three states.</p> <p>e) FR: The flood plain needs to be protected from development. Builders, engineers, inspectors, etc. need to be held accountable.</p> <p>f) SM: Stormwater must be addressed onsite.</p> <p>g) R: Finish the flood control reservoir in the upper basin (NY) that was never finished.</p> <p>h) S: More diversions to the Hudson via the aqueduct should be made in the event of a flood.</p> <p>i) S: Build a new reservoir specific for recreation and flood control.</p> <p>j) S: Remove the shallow shelves in the Delaware and dig deeper channels where ice jams have the potential to accumulate in the winter.</p>
50	James Reuss	Flood Victim Forks Township, Pa.	2/28/07	<p>a) R: Voids in the Reservoirs must be maintained year-round until modeling is complete and analyzed.</p> <p>b) R: Believes the Army Corps of Engineers feels that the reservoir spills only effected the crest by 1’.</p> <p>c) R: Suggested a massive controlled release in order to study the effects of stage downstream.</p> <p>d) Get supplemental water from the Hudson for NYC.</p> <p>e) S: Advocate for a main stem dam.</p>
51	Edwin Rogusky	Catasauqua, Pa.	2/20/07	<p>a) S: Advocate for a main stem dam; partial-gated dam along with some levees and a roadway elevation. (learn from the Netherlands gated-control-dam principle)</p>
52	Ellen Sapienza	Flood Victim Upper Black Eddy, Pa.	3/4/07	<p>a) General: The public meeting held in Easton and also others over the last 7 months have been very informative and everyone at DRBC is courteous.</p> <p>b) Understands that living in the floodplain incurs the risk and possibility of flooding.</p> <p>c) R: There must be year-round safety voids in all reservoirs.</p> <p>d) R: Reservoirs should not be enlarged and future structures should not be added. Fears mismanagement of future or larger structures and also the effect they will have on the health of the Delaware.</p> <p>e) R: The 1954 Supreme Court Decree should be revisited.</p>
53	Nancy Shukaitis		03/07/07	<p>a) FW: A proven public notification system of a dam break or any other pre-eminent danger is the No. 1 priority.</p> <p>b) FR: Enforce floodplain regulations, if violated – refuse flood insurance to violators.</p> <p>c) FM: Revise floodplain mapping based on the last three floods, predict El/Nino/Global Warming effect</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

				<p>d) FR: New floodplain building codes are needed after redelineation</p> <p>e) S: Require New York City’s cooperation to pursue filtration and water from the Hudson.</p> <p>f) S: Structural flood control can turn a natural disaster into a manmade disaster (example: 1970’s collapse of dry dams on the Brodhead Creek)</p> <p>g) S: Advocates non-structural solutions</p>
54	Sheila Uris Stern	Flood Victim Upper Black Eddy, Pa.	03/02/07	<p>a) R: There must be year-round safety voids in all reservoirs.</p> <p>b) Floods are expensive for homeowners and FEMA – Please help.</p>
55	Karen and Wayne Tittle	Flood Victim Upper Black Eddy, Pa.	03/02/07	<p>a) R: There must be year-round safety voids in all reservoirs.</p> <p>b) Why was there a double-peak (5-6”) in the June 2006 flood?</p>
56	Joan Van Gilson	Flood Victim Island Section, Trenton, NJ	03/07/07	<p>a) General: (Implementation) Quick implementation of any suitable plan is absolutely necessary to alleviate the flooding problem and appropriate prioritization by responsible government agencies is required to make it happen.</p> <p>b) S: Morrisville, PA has a retaining wall, why doesn’t the Island Section have one?</p> <p>c) S: The riverbank has been eroded about 10’ due to erosion from the floods. Are there plans to replace this land? More riverbank would better hold back the water.</p> <p>d) S: Backflow from the river through the storm drains is a problem.</p> <p>e) Can the National Guard be sent to sandbag the river in times of need?</p> <p>f) General: (Implementation) Going forward, announcements, notices and flyers regarding meetings and discussions are needed to keep residents advised.</p> <p>g) General: The work that DRBC and the Task Force is doing is appreciated.</p>
57	Barry Ziff	New Hope, Pa.	03/02/07	<p>a) R: Reservoirs should be maintained at 80%</p> <p>b) S: Pipelines should be constructed along highways to carry floodwaters to deep abandoned coal mines; turbines for electricity generation, irrigation or geothermal are presented as possible end uses for the water.</p> <p>c) SM: All construction in the basin since 1975 must have retention basins, all need to be reevaluated for size and adequate maintenance.</p> <p>d) R: What effect do <u>all</u> reservoirs have on the flood levels?</p> <p>e) R: Siltation in the reservoirs must be addressed. This would create a greater storage capacity to allow for greater voids.</p>

**Summary of Comments by Commenter, on the
“Preliminary Action Plan Public Review Draft, January 2007”
Issued by the Delaware River Basin Interstate Flood Mitigation Task Force**

58	Michelle Kintner	Flood Victim Minisink Hills, Pa.	02/22/07	<p>a) R: Keep the New York City reservoirs at 70% capacity year-round.</p> <p>b) General: People are more important than selling or drinking water.</p> <p>c) General: (Implementation) The plan needs to be implemented now. “Preliminary” is not good enough.</p>
59	Magoleath Berman	Morrisville, Pa.	02/23/07	<p>a) General: It is vital to maintain the health of the river and its natural inhabitants.</p> <p>b) S: Is opposed to damming the Delaware.</p> <p>c) SM: Encourages stormwater management and floodplain protection.</p>
60	Mary Lou Delahanty, Esq.	Lawrenceville, NJ	3/07/07	<p>a) R-If reservoir management by government entities increases the area of the floodplain, how can floodplain residents living in areas occupied prior to management by these entities be blamed, as page 10 of the draft plan suggests.</p> <p>b) R-The plan does not fully address what actions can be taken to reduce the amount of water stored in the reservoirs for flood mitigation purposes.</p> <p>c) R-It is likely that overfilling the reservoirs and reservoir management had the most significant impact on the three recent floods. What will be done to study this issue.</p> <p>d) R-DRBC and the states must make flood prevention a primary mission with regard to the management of reservoirs.</p> <p>e) General-The exclusion of representatives from Trenton and Mercer County in the development of the plan was a mistake.</p> <p>f) The historic significance of Trenton should be included with that of other river towns in the document.</p> <p>g) R-Recommending property acquisition as a flood mitigation solution further victimizes residents who cannot control the decision to keep reservoirs at 100 percent capacity.</p> <p>h) R-Is the DRBC of New York City selling water stored in the reservoirs? If so, a more balanced and objective group should develop the Plan.</p> <p>i) R-Does the possibility of citizens of New York City not being able to wash cars and water lawns tip the balance in their favor when weighed against 9 flood deaths and 265 million dollars in property damage?</p>