

WATER SUPPLY COORDINATING COUNCIL
May 5, 2009
MINUTES

ADMINISTRATIVE – Kathy Bunting-Howarth

Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Self Introductions

Minutes

A few minor typographical corrections were made to the February 20, 2009, minutes.

Note: A point was made that some notes were missing regarding someone recusing himself from voting on a motion. I must have been out of the room at that time and didn't capture it. I reviewed the tapes a number of times and cannot find this conversation. If someone would please send me a few sentences on what was said, I can update the minutes accordingly.

STATE CLIMATOLOGIST REPORT – DGS – David Legates

Precipitation for February through April 2009 was below normal over most of the state except for southern Kent and northern Sussex Counties where it was near normal. This was due to a very dry February and March that was offset by a relatively wet April. The *US Drought Monitor* has all of Delaware in abnormally dry (but not drought) conditions. This is an improvement over a year ago when 41.5 percent of the state was listed in moderate drought. Drought tendency for July is likely improvement with impacts easing through July.

Long-term climate forecasts from the Climate Prediction Center indicate the existing La Niña conditions should give way to ENSO-neutral conditions as spring progresses. For Delaware, this suggests equal chances of above normal, near normal, and below normal precipitation and air temperature probabilities through summer into fall. There is a slight chance of above normal precipitation probabilities for May 2009.

Copy of presentation can be found at www.dnrec.delaware.gov/Admin/Pages/WSCC.aspx.)

WATER CONDITIONS REPORT – DGS –Stefanie Baxter

New Castle County

The Water Conditions Index for April remained in the normal range at 6.67. Actual rainfall at Wilmington for the month of April was 4.03". Normal rainfall for the month of April is 3.39". The water level in well Db24-18 near Ogletown was at 14.04 feet below land surface, which is at the top of the Drought Watch stage. The normal water level in this well during April ranges between 8.37 and 11.34 feet below land surface. The 30-day moving average for the period

ending April 29, 2009 on the Brandywine was 255.3 mgd. The guideline for Drought Watch is 85 mgd.

Kent County

Actual rainfall at Dover for the month of April was 5.31". Normal rainfall for the month of April is 3.47". The water level in well Hb14-01 was 8.77 feet below land surface. The normal water level in this well during April ranges between 3.44 and 6.59 feet below land surface. The 30-day moving average for the period ending April 29, 2009 on the St. Jones River was 35.22 mgd. The mean flow for April is 39 mgd.

Sussex County

Actual rainfall at Lewes for the month of April was 7.23". Normal rainfall for the month of April is 3.54". The water level in well Qe44-01 near Trap Pond was 5.92 feet below land surface. The normal water level in this well ranges during April between 6.10 and 8.37 feet below land surface. The 30-day moving average for the period ending April 29, 2009 on the Nanticoke River was 84.5 mgd. The mean flow for April is 92 mgd.

The presentation is located on the DGS website at

http://www.dgs.udel.edu/Hydrology/waterconditions/pdf/2009_WSCC-0220_sjb.ppt.

Vic Singer: Asked Steff if there was any way to track monthly or seasonal averages. **Steff:** Yes, and she will have this information at the next meeting.

Jerry Kauffman: In March, the stream flows for the Brandywine and White Clay were lower than this time in 1995 and 1999, but above 2002. He observed that by monitoring conditions and coordinating between purveyors, there was no concern because of the below normal streamflow. Ten years ago under these conditions, the governor probably would have convened the Drought Advisory Committee. This is another indication of how far this group has come in 10 years.

Stewart Lovell: Good point. Before the rain, if trends continued, indicators would have thrown us into a drought watch, if not a drought warning. This raises the question that if given so much improvement in the supply end of the equation, do we ignore indicators and remain status quo or declare drought based on the indicators? This is something to ponder. **Steff:** That's why we call them indicators and not triggers. **Stewart:** Conditions were about the same the last time we made the declaration whereas this time, we didn't.

Bruce Krauter: You have to look at the supply side and not just indicators in order to make the call.

Vic: It's really an indicator of storage. If the in-system storage capability is a few hours' worth of supply, must pay attention to hourly fluctuation of demand. If it's a year, you don't care about daily, weekly, or monthly fluctuations, because it doesn't make any difference. We're somewhere in the middle. Getting to the duration of the period that triggers the response can be bigger than it once was.

WATER UTILITY REPORTS

Artesian: Bruce Kraeuter: Demands continue to be less than at this time last year and less than projected for this year. Groundwater levels are good to very good. There are over 100 million gallons in storage. Recharge this cycle is about 90 gallons and probably will continue to recharge another 1 or 2 months. There were about 35 million gallons carryover from last season.

Newark: Roy Simonson: Demands are down slightly in the City. Not sure what's it due to. System is operating well and the reservoir is full. No issues.

New Castle: Chip Patterson: Demands slightly down in March and significantly down in April.

United Water: Susan Skomorucha: Demands are down quite a bit. ASR is in recharge mode—have about 30 million gallons stored and continuing to recharge.

City of Wilmington: Sean Duffy: Water production is down—barely hit 18 mgd last week, which is low. Hoopes is lowered due to contract work. It is 4 feet below top of spillway—will pump in water in during the next couple of weeks to 1 foot below top of spillway.

Tidewater: Sheila Shannon: Looking at statewide productions from 08-09, statewide about 24% below that level.

Sussex Shores: Kelly Glenn: Same as everyone else—down from last year.

Bruce K: Looking at per customer demand, it's continuing to decline. This may be due to educational efforts to some degree and plumbing code changes to low water use fixtures in 1993.

Ed Rapiewicz: We had a mini-July in April—thought we'd have to turn on back-up supply, but that didn't materialize. Didn't see an increase. Per customer use, it's a steady decline.

KENT/SUSSEX WATER SUPPLY PLAN – STEWART LOVELL

Referred to an attachment that was sent with meeting notice—also on screen. Jerry took template of work done for New Castle County and the subcommittee met (no Sussex Co. or Rural Water representation). The meeting was very productive. The only point of discussion that came out was the format of the final presentation—would it be one report for each county or a combined report into one (could be a lot of commonality, which would save replicating information). He leaned to having a combined report with two separate chapters for each county. This was the easy part. **Kathy:** What do the jurisdictions think—Kent and Sussex Counties: **Mary Ellen Gray:** Ok either way. **Tom Roth:** Thought that combined with chapters will be fine. **Stewart:** There are numerous individual municipalities versus the past, e.g., 28 utilities, going to take time to get a good grip on what their supply capabilities are. **Steff:** Read John Talley's input from the subcommittee meeting stating that John "feels strongly that a detailed proposal must be developed, completed, and approved by the WSCC prior to work beginning.

We must agree on what we are trying to accomplish and how we are going to be successful in doing so. The outline provides a good starting point for developing the proposal. Each section of the outline must be described so that we are all comfortable with what we are trying to achieve. All must know what is being undertaken, what our goals and objectives are, what is involved in what we are undertaking, what the assumptions are going to be for each section, responsibility must be established – who (person, people, or organization) is going to do what, who is going to review drafts of the various sections of the proposal, who is going to review the draft of the report, etc.” He feels strongly that all details of outline need to be fleshed out before starting work.

Jerry Kauffman: Spoke with John, and John is looking for WSCC to authorize a detailed scope of work.

Lorraine: Point well taken and assuming that the rest of the subcommittee is agreeable and willing, shouldn't try to flesh it out at this stage. **Vic:** Seems that as far as the administrivia is concerned, it's appropriate to have a plan and follow it. Can't foresee at the outset what the conclusions will be. Good to have a clear plan at the outset, but need to learn something from the items that work and be prepared to change some details of the plan. Need to have an interchange arrangement whether we adopt an overall plan at the outset or not. Technical details are contingent on surprises as we move along.

Lorraine: Wondering about timing. Not sure if it's a good idea to wait 3 more months. Work should start now. **Jerry:** Start work in June and have done by 12/2010. Has built it into WRA work plan. **Kathy:** When you say commence the work, do you mean commence the scope? And by scope, you mean this is what we mean by “purpose and scope”? John concerned that we all agree on assumptions. **Vic:** Need a specific scope justifying anticipated man-hours. **Kathy:** How long do you think it will take to get this detailed scope of work? **Steff:** When will subcommittee meet again? **Stewart:** Not yet set up but will do so immediately. **Kathy:** Can't wait until next WSCC meeting. If wait, some of sections should be outlined or written. How many of the assumptions that were used in NCC plan will be the basis for the assumptions in the Kent and Sussex plans. **Steff:** They'll have to iron out assumptions before then to determine how much labor will be needed:

Bruce: Suggested sitting down some afternoon at 1 p.m. and working to 7 p.m. to get this scope done in that amount of time. **Kathy:** Is the scope something that we need to deliberate in this forum or is it something that we can do via email? To what extent does John feel that the issues needing approval by the Council are ones that necessitate real-time dialog or can be done through email? **Steff:** Felt it can be done by emails or conference calls. **Kathy:** **Action:** The subcommittee will meet within next 4 weeks and get something back to the Council. Juanda will send out to Council for comments within 6 weeks. **Jerry:** It would be nice to tell Legislature that we'll have a detailed work plan by the end of June. Jerry volunteered to be the central person to gather comments on the plan with copies to Juanda. Need comments returned to him with copies to Juanda within 2 weeks of receipt. We then can determine if a conference call is needed at that time. **Jerry:** Thinks we'll be in good shape if we have a draft work plan by the end of June. **Kathy:** Asked for comments on the outline. **Jerry:** Said it is based on the data that we have available here in DE. Certain areas will take some extra work.

Lorraine: Does this assume any original research work or not? **Steff:** This is why John wants a plan laid out ahead of time so that it can be determined if additional work is needed.

George: With regard to reduction in use, he asked how difficult it would be to look at an old community versus a new community to see the ratio difference and if it is significant to make it a factor.

Kathy: This is in line with CWAC wastewater disposal.

Sheila: This is valuable information—careful how to control data. It can be a problem in collecting for long period of time.

Ed: Summer use needs to be removed before billing.

Vic: Need to consider area/size of house/land and use of water in new landscaping survival would be up.

Kathy: This all is kind of related to the water supply plans. A couple of things that have happened include the appointment of a House and Senate irrigation task force last year. Stewart has a copy of this for the subcommittee's review, if necessary. We are doing a water supply plan for the southern part of the county, the spray irrigation task force formed, and CWAC is looking for 100 % beneficial use. This appears to be the time to be putting together these plans.

Vic: At some point, somebody has to think about costs. If costs of sewage treatment raises to an extent that it is economically advisable to build new houses with two sewer systems, one for sanitary and one for gray water, then there's an economic argument to go there. If the dollar argument doesn't go there, then it's not going to happen.

Kathy: New developments need to be more environmentally friendly, more than just water quality and storm water but also energy, water use, and water efficiency. So, Jenn is here to give an update on that program

CONSERVATION – SUPER GREEN – DNREC – JENNIFER CAMPAGNINI

A voluntary green building initiative called “Super Green” or “Delaware’s Environmentally Sustainable Development Initiative” is getting underway in Delaware. The purpose of the project is to encourage green and low impact development practices that protect critical environmental resources and promote energy efficiency. The Super Green Initiative incorporates local watershed based water quality plans and pollution reduction strategies (Total Maximum Daily Loads [TMDL] and Pollution Control Strategies), energy plans, wildlife action plans, and recreational plans into a comprehensive checklist of building criteria which promote connectivity, resource protection and improvements, and energy efficiency. Similar to LEED and the National Association of Homebuilders Green Standards, the Super Green system is points based, flexible and has a verification process built in.

Criteria are being developed for a range of categories: Site Location, Site Conservation, Site Design, Site Construction, Streets and Parking, Landscaping, Stormwater Management and Building Materials/Energy Efficiency; projects had to achieve a minimum points threshold in each category to achieve the “Super Green” designation. The proposed incentive is radically fast-tracked approvals and permits at the local and state level—including the State Department of Transportation.

The Super Green Initiative addresses water quality and TMDL issues by including options and requirements for sustainable landscaping practices; low impact development, including the use of rain gardens, rain barrels, cisterns, pervious pavement, and green roofs; and other green technologies. Conservation, restoration and/or enhancement of wetlands and forested areas, including riparian buffers, are highly encouraged and rewarded as well. Finally, implementation of pollution control strategy recommendations, which address and implement TMDL requirements, have been included within the criteria for Super Green Certification.

More information about Super Green can be found DNREC’s Landuse and the Environment webpage found at <http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/landuse/>.

Martin Wollaston: One of the points made was that developers must commit to ensuring long-term viability and legacy of Super Green; sounds challenging. How do you go about doing that?

Jennifer: Have development covenants – easements, etc.

Ed: Need to take into consideration the long-term upkeep because sometimes homeowners’ associations fail. It has to be designed so that the type of upkeep is minimal as far as expenses.

Martha Keller: She and her husband were land developers in Ohio and standards were municipal; but the State kept bonds, and the homeowners provided money. The homeowners did what they said they would do and the way to assure that the homeowners had the money to keep up the green technology is to build a line item into the fees.

OTHER BUSINESS

Reauthorization of WSCC / Draft Legislation – CHAIR/WSCC

Senate Bill 72, Senate Environmental and Natural Resources Committee—expect to be on the calendar soon, and we will let you know when.

NEXT MEETING – Chair

A date of September 24, 2009, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. was approved by the members for the next WSCC meeting.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>Kathy</u>	<u>Bunting-Howarth</u>
<u>Steffanie</u>	<u>Baxter</u>
<u>Joseph</u>	<u>DiNunzio</u>
<u>Sean</u>	<u>Duffy</u>
<u>Ed</u>	<u>Durst</u>
<u>Lorraine</u>	<u>Fleming</u>
<u>Kelly</u>	<u>Glenn</u>
<u>Mary Ellen</u>	<u>Gray</u>
<u>Brenda</u>	<u>Goggin</u>
<u>George</u>	<u>Haggerty</u>
<u>Ed</u>	<u>Hallock</u>
<u>Rich</u>	<u>Heffron</u>
<u>Andrew</u>	<u>Homsey</u>
<u>Gerald</u>	<u>Kauffman</u>
<u>Martha B.</u>	<u>Keller</u>
<u>Bruce</u>	<u>Kraeuter</u>
<u>David</u>	<u>Legates</u>
<u>Stewart</u>	<u>Lovell</u>

<u>Andrea</u>	<u>Maucher</u>
<u>Laura</u>	<u>Mensch</u>
<u>Dorothy P.</u>	<u>Miller</u>
<u>Matt</u>	<u>Miller</u>
<u>G. Arthur</u>	<u>Padmore</u>
<u>Francis (Chip)</u>	<u>Patterson</u>
<u>Edward</u>	<u>Rapciewicz</u>
<u>Thomas A.</u>	<u>Roth</u>
<u>John W.</u>	<u>Rudd</u>
<u>Joanne C.</u>	<u>Rufft</u>
<u>Sheila</u>	<u>Shannon</u>
<u>Roy</u>	<u>Simonson</u>
<u>Victor</u>	<u>Singer</u>
<u>Susan</u>	<u>Skomorucha</u>
<u>Robert</u>	<u>Tudor</u>
<u>Jonathan J.</u>	<u>Urbanski</u>
<u>Martin</u>	<u>Wollaston</u>