

**Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC)  
Watershed Advisory Council Meeting  
January 14, 2003  
Trenton, NJ**

*Meeting Summary*

**WELCOME AND REVIEW OF AGENDA**

Facilitator Abby Arnold, RESOLVE, introduced herself and asked others to introduce themselves.

Carol Collier, DRBC executive director, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She commended the Watershed Advisory Council (WAC) on all of the important work done to develop the draft key result areas (KRAs), goals, and objectives. She asked participants at this meeting to focus on what needs to be done to finish the draft plan.

Ms. Arnold reviewed the meeting agenda ([see attachment A](#)). Meeting objectives included

- review the relationship of the *Water Resources Plan for the Delaware River Basin* and the *DRBC Comprehensive Plan*
- present and review the *Basin Plan* table of contents and proposed format
- review and agree on agenda and schedule for remainder of 2003

**UPDATE ON PROGRESS: TASKS AND COMMITTEE WORK**

Jessica Sanchez, DRBC River Basin Planner, presented an update on work in progress by the advisory committees and staff ([see attachment B](#)). She outlined the status of management strategy development for each of the KRAs, noting that information from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) Reconnaissance Study may be helpful in developing flood and waterway corridor management strategies. The advisory committees also are coordinating with states, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Delaware Estuary Program, and other entities on common issues such as instream flow needs and habitat issues.

An update on tasks identified in the Framework document included attention to water budgets, water availability, and instream flow needs. USGS is performing two studies requested by the Sustainable Use Subcommittee of the WMAC:

- 1) *Development of Water Budgets for Selected Watersheds in the Delaware River Basin* and
- 2) *GIS-Based Ground Water Availability Analysis for the Delaware River Basin*.

Costs for the studies will be shared by USGS and DRBC. The study will produce methodologies for water budget assessments based on differentials in geology and degree of development, as well as water budgets for 5 pilot watersheds.

A scope of work for determining instream flow needs is being developed for the *Basin Plan* under the leadership of Leroy Young, PA Fish & Boat Commission, with the cooperation of

representatives from the Academy of Natural Sciences, Cornell University, The Nature Conservancy, USGS and NJDEP.

An additional task addressed by DRBC staff at the request of the executive director, is the delineation of sub-basins. Dr. Sanchez displayed a map showing proposed groupings of watersheds into four basin regions. The watersheds have been grouped by common landscapes into regions which share common elements, programs or mainstem river drainage. These divisions should prove useful for data collection, issue assessment and implementation.

Following the presentation, WAC members reported on other activities in the basin. The state of Pennsylvania has passed a bill to update the state water plan. The state intends to move ahead quickly with developing the plan and will develop water budgets as an early task in the process. New Jersey is also in the process of updating its Statewide Water Supply Plan as required every six years. The US Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) will have its Reconnaissance Study completed in February, 2003. This study will identify issues in the basin and the prospect for a Federal project related to the *Basin Plan*.

#### **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE WATER RESOURCES PLAN FOR THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN AND THE DRBC COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Ken Najjar, DRBC Planning and Implementation Branch Head, explained the relationship between the *Delaware River Basin Water Resources Plan (Basin Plan)* and the *DRBC Comprehensive Plan (CP)* (see attachment C). He explained that the *Basin Plan* is a goal-based direction-setting plan to be created and implemented by all stakeholders. The *CP* is driven by the DRBC Compact and is the basis for setting standards and promulgating regulations. The new *CP* will be restructured to include forward-looking components of the *Basin Plan* so that the *CP* is a planning document rather than simply a compilation of the DRBC's past decisions. Dr. Najjar outlined the *Basin Plan* implementation strategy, noting that DRBC would continue to coordinate and lead the *Basin Plan* process and provide periodic updates of progress. Ms. Collier provided an analogy. She suggested considering the *Basin Plan* to be an umbrella over the basin. DRBC holds the umbrella handle as the driver and trend analyzer for the plan, while the *CP* and the state and federal efforts are the spines of the umbrella holding up the fabric.

Dr. Najjar presented flow diagrams of the proposed process for plan approval and implementation (see attachments D and E). He listed several items that need to be addressed, including

- actions to be taken by the governors
- actions to be taken by the states and federal agencies (possibly through memoranda of understanding (MOU))
- what "signatory" means and which entities shall be signatories
- realistic reporting frequency
- roles and responsibilities
- management strategies

Members discussed the roles and responsibilities of various parties in regard to the *Basin Plan* and what it means to be a signatory to the plan. One member suggested that the *Basin Plan* is an agreement among parties, and signing the plan is a commitment to implement it. Another member observed that because the four state governors are commissioners on the DRBC, the DRBC's approval of the plan should indicate the approval of the four states. Other members commented that each of the four states should sign the plan individually as well to indicate a commitment to implementation.

A member commented that he originally envisioned that the plan would be signed by DRBC, the four states, and the federal government, but he now sees the importance of having other parties sign the plan and assist in implementation as well. Another member observed that much of the plan will be implemented at the local level. He stressed that DRBC needs to consider how to tie the plan to local communities and how to help communities understand the importance of implementing the plan in order to sustain the basin. Other members commented that the roles of nongovernmental entities, both nonprofit and for profit, need to be defined as well and added to the flowcharts for plan approval and implementation.

A member suggested an analogy of a tent with DRBC as the center pole and the four states and the federal government as five corner poles, all equal partners. Each pole supports part of the tent just as each of the six partners covers some of the issues in the basin; none of them can cover all of the issues alone, and some issues are not yet covered by any of the partners. Also, the area covered by each of the partners overlaps with the areas covered by the other partners. The member suggested that other entities, such as municipalities and nongovernmental organizations, serve as "stakes and guy lines" to add additional support to the tent.

DRBC staff suggested there might be different levels of supporters, such as signatories, partners, and "friends of the basin" or charter supporters. DRBC, the states, and the federal agencies would be signatories, possibly bound through MOUs. Local units of government and other entities might be partners, also possibly bound through MOUs. Nongovernmental organizations might be charter supporters. A member suggested determining an entity's level by the level of commitment made rather than by the type of entity. For example, a partner might be an organization that commits to implementing certain parts of the plan, while a charter supporter would support the concepts of the plan but not commit to implementing any management strategies. A member commented that counties and municipalities will have to commit to the plan because their financial support will be needed, if nothing else; so being a partner should not be optional for them. Other members commented that DRBC and the states should do all they can to encourage local government participation, but partnership cannot be mandated beyond the six "tent pole" entities. One member commented that she did not see a need for nongovernmental organizations to sign the plan in order to have a status in regard to the plan or to work on implementing parts of it. She observed that it could get cumbersome to establish MOUs for all of the entities involved in implementation. DRBC staff will further develop the plan adoption and implementation processes and discuss possibilities with the Commission at a workshop in March.

Members requested clarification of when and by whom the management strategies would be developed. DRBC staff explained that the current expectation is that the staff and advisory

committees will develop general management strategies over the next several months. More specific management strategies will take longer to develop as many will require assessment information before they can be drafted. Beginning with more general strategies will allow the plan to be approved and implementation to begin sooner than if the plan was held until specific strategies could be developed. Members commented that the management strategies need to provide direction without being overly constraining, so that different programs and entities have the flexibility to choose how they will work toward the various shared goals.

Members also discussed the role and responsibilities of the DRBC and the relationship of the *Basin Plan* to the *CP*. A member expressed concern that with two separate plans, the *Basin Plan* would receive less attention than the *CP*. Another member commented that as long as DRBC decision-making was properly informed and guided by the Basin Plan, she was not concerned that the *Basin Plan* would be separate from the *CP*. A member observed that when the DRBC was formed, water conservation was not as significant an issue as it is now. Noting that the DRBC has been able to evolve to incorporate conservation considerations into its docket decisions, he commented that DRBC does have the ability to take into account the kinds of concepts expressed in the *Basin Plan*.

Several participants stressed that each WAC member should review the draft *Basin Plan* to determine what impact it will have on the organizations and constituencies he or she represents and should be gathering input on the plan from those entities.

The WAC agreed to move forward with the two-plan approach, but noted that the implementation section of the *Basin Plan* needs to be elaborated and the roles of municipalities and nongovernmental entities need to be clarified.

## **IMAP**

Mr. Warren Huff, Ms. Karen Reavy and Mr. Karl Heinicke of DRBC presented a demonstration of iMap, a project of the Information Management Advisory Committee (IMAC). The goal of the project is to present information about the basin in a useful, easily accessible way. Through the iMap website, people will be able to access a variety of recreation-related resources and information. Additional information will be added in later phases of the project. Rather than storing all of the data on the DRBC server, iMap retrieves and compiles the data from the original sources (e.g., state and federal agency servers) each time the data are requested by a user, thereby providing the most up-to-date information. The website also will include links to other sites with relevant information, such as USGS information for a particular gauging station or state fish advisories for a chosen body of water.

## **ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE “FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT”**

Dr. Sanchez presented an overview of the advisory committee recommendations for the “framework document” (i.e., the consensus language document of KRAs, goals, and objectives developed by the WAC) (see attachment F). She noted that the most extensive revisions are being proposed for the goals and objectives of KRA 3. The WAC did not discuss the proposed revisions; members were asked to submit written comments to Dr. Sanchez or work with the appropriate advisory committee if they had any comments or concerns. At the June WAC

workshop, members will have further opportunity to review and discuss specific proposed revisions.

## **OVERVIEW OF *BASIN PLAN* FORMAT AND CONTENTS**

Dr. Sanchez outlined the general principles staff followed in developing a new format for the *Basin Plan* and incorporating the desired results, goals, and objectives from the framework document:

- collect repetitive language and put into guiding principles
- highlight essential elements and desired outcomes embedded in original text
- describe importance and add context
- explain connections and linkages
- simplify where possible, expand only where necessary
- organize objectives and find overlaps

Dr. Sanchez referred participants to the draft table of contents and explained that the draft *Basin Plan* is a first attempt at drafting text to fill out the table of contents (see attachment G and H). The intent of this draft is to build on the concepts of the framework document, adding explanatory text and streamlining language to make it more easily understood by the intended audience. In revising the language, staff sought to maintain the intent of the original consensus language while clarifying certain points and eliminating redundancies. For example, the concepts of some phrases that were repeated in several objectives were moved instead to the guiding principles section that precedes the KRA sections.

After some discussion, the WAC agreed to the general proposed format of the *Basin Plan*. Individual members offered the following suggestions for refining the proposed format and contents:

- “Key strategy” may be a confusing term since the plan also contains management strategies. Suggestions of other terms were “key approach” and “core objective.”
- Consider adding a section for “update and evaluation.” Noting that the management strategies will need to be updated more quickly than the rest of the plan, one member suggested moving the management strategies to a separate appendix. Another member responded that the management strategies are too important to not be included in the main body of the plan.
- Many readers will not read the whole plan but will look for the few pages that say what will be done under the plan. It would be helpful to have a short fact sheet of key points, perhaps with the management strategies attached.
- The intent of the management strategies needs to be clarified. If they are strategies, they should be included under “water resource key result areas”; if they are action items, they should be under “plan implementation.”
- An explanation should be included of how the *Basin Plan* relates to the *CP* and other plans in the basin.

Members discussed whether to agree to the proposed revisions of the desired results, goals, and objectives language or return to the consensus language. Many supported the goal of making the language more accessible, but some expressed concern that some of the nuances and points of

the consensus language would be lost in the revisions. Participants agreed to review the proposed revisions over the next few weeks to determine whether the proposed revisions capture the important points and nuances of the original consensus language or whether the changes are too significant to accept.

## **DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE**

Participants reviewed the proposed schedule for the remainder of the plan development process. Suggested revisions to the schedule are reflected in attachment I. Some members also commented that in general, the schedule is extremely ambitious. Several participants stressed that each member should start soon to gather input from the organizations and constituencies he or she represents. To help in doing this, members requested that the next draft of the *Basin Plan* be a document that is fairly complete so that it can be understood and reviewed by people who have not been involved in drafting it.

Some members suggested that in order to show support for an investment in the *Basin Plan*, it may be helpful to have several WAC members participate in presenting the draft *Basin Plan* to the commissioners at the March commission workshop.

Members discussed the format and goal of the public meetings tentatively scheduled for next fall. One member suggested drawing on the experience of the “Flowing Toward the Future” effort. Another member suggested that focus groups may be useful. Participants identified possible questions to ask at the public meetings:

- What is important that is missing from the plan?
- What is confusing? What could be said in a more compelling or more understandable way?
- How would you prioritize the objectives and actions in the plan?

The WAC did not decide on the format in which public comments are to be presented to them for review or whether outreach should be to the public in general or through targeted interest groups and focused issue discussions.

## **NEXT STEPS**

### *Action Items*

- By February 5<sup>th</sup>, WAC members will respond to a questionnaire to indicate whether they agree to revisions proposed by DRBC staff for the KRAs, goals, and objectives in the *Basin Plan*.
- By February 5<sup>th</sup>, members will send comments on the proposed revisions to KRA 3 and its goals and objectives to Pamela V’Combe (pvcombe@drbc.state.nj.us). The next Land and Water Resource Management Advisory Committee meeting will be held at DRBC on Tuesday, February 25<sup>th</sup>.
- A commissioners workshop will be scheduled. Members interested in helping to present the draft *Basin Plan* at the workshop should contact Jessica Sanchez (jsanchez@drbc.state.nj.us) or Ken Najjar (knajjar@drbc.state.nj.us). DRBC staff will coordinate the presentation. DRBC staff will notify members as soon as the date has been selected.

*Next WAC Workshop*

The next WAC workshop will be held **June 10-11, 2003**.

**CLOSING REMARKS**

Following a brief summary of the day's discussions by Robert Tudor, DRBC deputy executive director, each participant was invited to share a comment on the meeting ([see attachment J](#)). In particular, many members complimented DRBC staff on their progress with the draft *Basin Plan* and said they look forward to next steps. Ms. Collier and the DRBC staff thanked everyone for their participation.

**Referenced Documents & Attachments**

Items A (Agenda) and J (Participants' Closing Comments) are attached to this summary.

**A. Agenda - attached**

B. A Water Resources Plan for the Delaware River Basin: Where we are . . .

C. Relationship between Water Resources Plan for the Delaware River Basin (Basin Plan) and Delaware River Basin Commission Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan)

D. Plan Approval Flowchart

E. Plan Implementation Flowchart

F. A Water Resources Plan for the Delaware River Basin: Committee Recommendations for Framework Document

G. Draft Basin Plan Table of Contents

H. First Draft Basin Plan

I. Revised Proposed Schedule for Development of Basin Water Resources Plan

**J. Participants' Closing Comments and Observations - attached**

***DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION***  
**WATERSHED ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING #7**

THOMAS EDISON STATE COLLEGE  
101 W. STATE STREET  
TRENTON, NJ

**January 14, 2003**

***Proposed Agenda***

***Desired Outcomes:***

- ***Review progress of committees***
- ***Review the relationship of the Delaware River Basin Plan and the DRBC Comprehensive Plan***
- ***Present and review Basin Plan Table of Contents and proposed format***
- ***Review and agree on agenda and schedule for remainder of 2003.***

- 9:00-9:15 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
- Welcome and Purpose – *C. Collier*
  - Introductions - *A. Arnold, All*
  - Review meeting objectives and agenda – *A. Arnold*
- 9:15 – 9:45 UPDATE ON PROGRESS: TASKS AND COMMITTEE WORK - *J. Sanchez*
- COMMITTEE WORK
  - WATER BUDGETS AND OTHER TASKS
  - SUB-BASIN MAP
- 9:45-10:45 REVIEW THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE COUNCIL’S WATER RESOURCES PLAN FOR THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN AND THE DRBC COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - *K. Najjar*

***Desired Outcome: Clarity and Agreement on the Relationship and Intended Use of the Two Plans. [Plenary]***

- Clarify relationship of two plans
- Agreement to move ahead with Basin Plan
- DRBC implementation

***Questions and Discussion***

- 10:45-11:00 **BREAK**
- 11:00-12:00 REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT) – *J. Sanchez*
- Review and Discuss Proposed Revisions to KRAs 1, 2, 4, and 5
  - Review and Discuss Proposed Revisions to KRA 3
- 12:00-1:00 **LUNCH** (Note: this will be a working lunch)  
12:25- 12:45 - **iMAP PRESENTATION** – *K. Heinicke*



- 1:00-2:00      OVERVIEW OF BASIN PLAN FORMAT AND CONTENTS - *J. Sanchez*
- Review Table of Contents
  - Review Principles, Purpose, Implementation
- Desired Outcome: Agree on plan elements and intended purpose/use of Basin Plan.*
- 2:00-3:00      REVIEW DRAFT FORMAT FOR BASIN PLAN KRA SECTIONS - *J. Sanchez*
- Desired Outcome: Council comments and ideas on final document format and use.*
- Who is the primary audience?
  - How to we best present the vision for the Basin in order to motivate action?
  - Role of Management Strategies
- 3:00-3:45      DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE 2003 – *K. Najjar*
- Desired Outcome: Discuss and agree on tasks, schedule, and timeline for 2003.*
- Establish schedule of products and meetings for remainder of 2003
- 3:45            CLOSING REMARKS – *R. Tudor*
- 4:00            *ADJOURN*

## Attachment J

### Participants' Closing Comments and Observations

- This is a good location and meeting space.
- Materials are needed well in advance of the next meeting to allow time for preparation.
- I would prefer to have sections as they are completed rather than wait for the whole document.
- It is important to use the proposed revised language because it is more readable.
- The presentations were well done. Thanks for highlighting the changes without getting us buried in them.
- The staff should be commended on the work they have done. It was good to take the time to do this work.
- The staff has done a good job. The staff should focus on the details, while the WAC focuses at a higher level. We need to speak with one voice as we go forward.
- Staff should do a comparison of the changes made to the plan. I do not have the time to do a detailed comparison.
- I am interested in seeing the management strategies; we have not seen much of them yet.
- The draft *Basin Plan* format is good.
- Controversial points were removed from the Delaware Estuary Program plan in order to get all the parties to sign it. I would like us to do all we can to move the Basin Plan forward with the concepts it now includes.
- I still have some reservations about moving forward with two plans rather than one.
- As we review the plan we need to be looking for anything prohibitive in it.
- Public input should be sought sooner rather than later.