

---

# DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION TRI-COUNTY WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT BOARD

## MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 22, 2001

---

Place: Burlington County Land Use Office  
Mount Laurel, New Jersey

### WQMB Membership

Burlington County Freeholder	William Haines, Jr.
Burlington County Elected Municipal Official	not present
Burlington County Citizen	not present
Camden County Freeholder	not present
Camden County Elected Official	Curtis Noe
Camden County Citizen	Edward Shorr
Gloucester County Freeholder	not present
Gloucester County Elected Official	Joseph Smith
Gloucester County Citizen	not present
Camden City	Paul H. Redman
Camden City Citizen	not present

### Staff and Guests

Camden County Division of Planning	Doug Griffith
New Jersey Conservation Foundation	Don Kirchhoffer
Delaware River Basin Commission	Pamela Kanke
Burlington County Freeholders Office	Mary Pat Robbie
Gloucester County Planning Department	Rick Westergaard
New Jersey American Water Company	Art Shearman
Wenonah Borough	Jack Sheppard
DVRPC	Chris Linn
DVRPC	Mike Ontko

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Bill Haines of the Tri-County Water Quality Management Board.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of March 19, 2001

The minutes of the meeting of March 19, 2001 were approved without changes on a motion by Mr.

Haines and seconded by Curtis Noe.

2. Nomination of Officers for CY2002

Mr. Ontko nominated Rob Damminger as an officer for CY 2002

3. Amendments to the Tri-County Water Quality Management Plan

a. Mansfield Township Board of Education, Burlington County

Mr. Linn described the proposed amendment in Mansfield Township as expanding the sewer service area to accommodate the construction of a new elementary school. The proposed elementary school would be located on a 30 acre tract and would not require an expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. The township had previously allocated 12,000 GPD of wastewater treatment capacity for use by the school. This amount is sufficient to cover the school's needs.

b. Northern Burlington County Regional School District, Burlington County

Mr. Linn described the proposed amendment in Mansfield Township as expanding the sewer service/franchise area for the Mapleton at Mansfield WWTP to accommodate the construction of a new middle school. The remaining capacity of the Mapleton at Mansfield WWTP, 67,460 GPD, is more than sufficient to handle the proposed flow of 56,150 GPD from the existing high school and the proposed middle school. The proposed middle school is located in Planning Area 4, which is intended to promote agricultural preservation. However, since the proposed middle school site is adjacent to the existing high school and because no other undeveloped site exists within the District which is not already located in Planning Area 4, municipal and county officials have approved the plan for the school's construction.

Mr. Shorr and Mr. Haines and Mr. Ontko suggested that the 11,000 GPD remaining capacity should be designated for public use.

A motion was made by Mr. Haines and was seconded by Mr. Shorr and Mr. Noe to approve the Mansfield Township Board of Education and the Northern Burlington County Regional School District amendments.

4. CY2002 Work Program and Budget

Mr. Ontko stated he wanted to review the Work Program and Budget for 2002 and he asked if there were any questions regarding this matter. There were no questions.

Mr. Ontko inquired about the impacts of Subchapter 8 on the Work Program and Budget. Mr. Ontko said there may be as many as 200 Subchapter 8 applications on file with DEP. However, Mr. Ontko did not know if the applications were actually "applications" or just forms.

Mr. Shorr asked what the financial impacts of Subchapter 8 on the budget would be. Mr. Ontko said he didn't really know. Mr. Shorr suggested the possibility of setting up a "rainy day fund" to cover potential expenses relating to Subchapter 8 amendments. Mr. Ontko pointed out that changing county budgets is difficult. Mr. Haines stated the counties could allocate more funds if the need arose.

Mr. Ontko said that we will need to determine how much more work Subchapter 8 will create. Mr. Noe asked Mr. Ontko if he would reach out to DEP. Mr. Ontko responded that he would. Mr. Ontko asked if there were any more questions regarding Subchapter 8. There were no more questions.

5. Amendments Status Report - Update

Mr. Ontko initiated a discussion concerning GCUA approval. He said the certain townships would remain their own WMP agency. There were no comments on this matter.

Mr. Ontko remarked that Regan Consultants requested a 40,000 GPD capacity on their Hartford Square amendment, but they were only approved for 20,000 GPD. As a result, the Tri-County WQMB could not act positively on the amendment as it stood.

6. Status of Water Quality Management Planning Rules and Watershed Rules

Mr. Ontko asked what would happen when an applicant applies for septic approval in a SSA. Would they have to become sewerred. Mr. Ontko asked if we should raise this issue with DEP. Mr. Shepard responded that the connection issue is a local issue and that each municipality has its own policies. Mr. Shorr asked if we could make dry connections an option and encourage developers to do it under Subchapter 8.

Mr. Ontko reported that septic systems may be responsible for Mercury contamination. Mr. Sheppard responded that we should make a dry-connection a strong recommendation. Mr. Ontko agreed with Mr. Sheppard and stated the Tri-County WQMB need to craft language for submission to DEP on the dry connection issue.

7. Water Supply for South Jersey

Mr. Ontko stated that a project was denied for the first time because water was no available and that this circumstance prompted a discussion on water supply in South Jersey. Mr. Ontko said that the Gibson Bill had been passed and as a result \$5,000,000 in funding was allocated for the Kirkwood-Cohansey study. He said that the Pinelands Commission was the lead agency for the Kirkwood-Cohansey study. However, \$5,000,000 may not be enough to fund the whole study. Mr. Haines asked what the time frame of the study would be. Mr. Ontko: 5 years.

8. Initiatives for CY2002

Mr. Ontko asked if there were any initiatives for CY2002. There were none.

9. Watershed Management Planning Activities

Mr. Ontko informed the WQMB that the next meeting of the Mullica PAC would be on November 15 and the lead for this watershed was Atlantic County. Mr. Westergaard said that Atlantic County was establishing water monitoring stations, but he did not know when their next meeting would be.

Mr. Ontko stated that DVRPC just finished a report that identifies the current character of Watershed Area 18. He also said that Burlington County is the lead agency for Watershed Area 19, and that DVRPC, which is the lead agency for Watershed Area 20, was working on characterization of the watershed and the organization of committees. Mr. Griffith inserted that there is no central objective to the process and that it is disorganized. Ms. Kanke responded that

all the up-front work pays off when it comes time to produce a plan. Mr. Ontko said that we are forced to plan and then wait for people to react.

10. New Business

Mr. Ontko introduced two items of new business. First, he raised the issue that Freeholders cannot have an alternate at Tri-County WQMB meetings and asked if the Board thought that they should be allowed to have one. Mr. Haines thought this was a good idea. Mr. Ontko said that maybe we should have one Freeholder meeting so we can figure out what they want to do.

The second issued of new business raised by Mr. Ontko was dredge spoils in Gloucester County. Mr. Sheppard asked if the spoils were clean, because they were being transported from National Park Borough to other areas. Furthermore, Mr. Sheppard reported that Chuck Forsman was concerned about the derelict dredging equipment underneath the Commodore Barry Bridge. Mr. Westergaard reported that the county was keeping an eye on the derelict equipment. He also said that a remediation plan was supposed to have been developed, but he hadn't seen one yet.

Mr. Sheppard initiated a conversation about dredge spoils and passed out a bottle containing a sample of dredge material. He said that the material was like fine silt and it could not be used for building fill. Mr. Shorr inquired if we could put the dredge material inside strip mines. Mr. Westergaard reported that The Army Corps was not a good communicator... they said they wanted to use dredge spoils for a ballfield and other things but no one really knew what they intended to do with the dredge material.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.