974.901
I48

DR 2-3

# ANCODEL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

974.901
I48

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

SUMMARY OF MINUTES

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

A meeting of Incodel's Executive Committee was held on December 3, 1948, during the Council of State Governments' General Assembly at the Book Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Michigan.

Present were: Chairman Pitkin, of Pennsylvania; Senator Anderson, also Assemblymen Milmoe and Ostertag, of New York; Messrs. Beckett and Heal, also Senator Dickerson, of Delaware; Judge Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey; and Incodel Executive Secretary, James Allen.

MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING

The minutes of the preceding meeting, held at Inlet, New York, were approved as read upon motion made by Senator Anderson, seconded by Mr. Beckett and agreed to.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

The report of the Executive Secretary, calling attention to the statements in the agenda items, and particularly to the employment of Mr. Harvey R. Frantz, beginning November 15, 1948, was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Mr. Heal, seconded by Senator Anderson and agreed to.

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The staff report on stream pollution abatement referred to

progress being made by municipalities in treatment of sewage; the advisability of securing judicial approval of municipal use of non-debt revenue bonds and the Incodel November 15 meeting concerning discussion of the Federal Pollution Control Act.

The Committee was particularly interested in the matter of validating the municipal use of non-debt revenue bonds, and authorized the Executive Secretary to pursue this project item diligently.

The report was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Mr. Beckett, seconded by Mr. Heal and agreed to.

## SCHUYLKILL RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT

The staff report on the Schuylkill River restoration project, which referred to the excellent progress being made, was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Senator Anderson, seconded by Mr. Heal and agreed to.

## WATER SUPPLY DIVERSION LEGISLATION

The staff report on water supply diversion legislation called the Committee's attention to the fact that, although the Attorneys General of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania had each prepared his version of a petition asking the Supreme Court to clarify the intent of its retention of jurisdiction over water supply projects in the Delaware Basin, a conference of the legal officials had not been held.

Judge Hartshorne informed the Committee that he expected to be in Washington about the middle of December to attend a meeting in the offices of the United States Supreme Court and would be glad to seek the advice of the administrative officer of the Court as to the best manner in which the

Incodel program could be presented. Judge Hartshorne stated that he would not make the inquiry, of course, if the Attorneys General had any objections.

Your Executive Secretary was instructed to send Judge Hartshorne a memorandum explaining the Incodel program in order that he could make the inquiry during his anticipated conference in Washington. He was also instructed to solicit the approval of the Attorneys General in the matter of having Judge Hartshorne make the inquiry.

The report on the water supply diversion legislation was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Senator Anderson and Mr. Beckett and agreed to.

## SOIL AND FOREST CONSERVATION

The staff report on soil and forest conservation, purely an informative statement, was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Anderson and Heal and agreed to.

## MULTIPLE PURPOSE RESERVOIRS ON THE DELAWARE RIVER

As a result of information given to him on November 29, the Executive Secretary was able to inform the Executive Committee that the Federal Power Commission had agreed to dismiss the application of the Electric Power Company of New Jersey, Inc. for a permit to construct dams and reservoirs on the Delaware River for the production of hydroelectric power. This information supplemented that contained in the office report on the subject.

The report was ordered to be received and filed on motion made by Messrs. Heal and Milmoe and agreed to, Mr. Milmoe having been authorized by Assemblyman Foy to act for him at this meeting.

## DELAWARE BASIN TRI-STATE WATER SUPPLY PROJECT

The office report on the Delaware Basin tri-state water supply project included, in addition to a summary statement, a copy of the minutes of the Technical Committee on Regional Water Supply meeting held in Philadelphia on October 21, 1948, and also a copy of preliminary draft of a proposed act authorizing an investigation to determine the advisability of a regional water supply project.

The subject was discussed in considerable detail. It was suggested that the office devote as much attention to this problem as possible in order that a program could be crystallized and discussed with all interested parties, including members of the Interstate Cooperation Commissions of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, at the earliest convenient opportunity. A recommendation was made that consideration be given to calling a meeting, probably in New York City, sometime in January, of the Regional Water Supply Committee and its Technical Committee, Incodel, and the three Commissions on Interstate Cooperation.

The report on regional water supply project was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Anderson and Beckett and agreed to.

## UNDERGROUND WATER RESOURCES

The suggestion was made in the staff report on underground water resources that it probably would be advantageous to have the Pennsylvania and New Jersey appropriations of $15,000 per year each specifically earmarked for the ground water investigations in the Philadelphia-South Jersey region.

The Executive Secretary was instructed to make further inquiries in regard to this recommendation with such officials of state government as Admiral Draemel in Pennsylvania and Mr. Howard T. Critchlow in New Jersey.

The report on underground water resources was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Messrs. Heal and Anderson and agreed to.

## PORT AND TRANSPORTATION

The staff report on port and transportation, informing the Executive Committee of the completion of the Knappen Engineering Company's survey of this problem for the Delaware River Joint Commission, was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Senator Anderson and Mr. Beckett and agreed to.

## ROUTE 97 COUNCIL

The staff report on Route 97 Council was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Messrs. Beckett and Heal and agreed to.

## ANNUAL REPORT

The office statement calling attention to the fact that printed copies of the annual report were being distributed to the Commission's mailing list was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Heal and Beckett and agreed to.

## FINANCES

Upon motion made by Senator Anderson, seconded by Mr. Heal

and agreed to, the staff report covering the financial status of the Commission, as of November 30, 1948, was ordered to be received and filed, and the bills current and payable for the months of September, October and November, in the amounts of $4,183.21, $3,214.89 and $4,807.36, respectively, were approved.

* * * * *

Delaware New Jersey — THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS — New York Pennsylvania

# INTERSTATE COMMISSION
*on the Delaware River Basin*

BROAD STREET STATION BUILDING • PHILADELPHIA 3 • PENNSYLVANIA

MR. F. A. PITKIN
CHAIRMAN

HON. FLOYD E. ANDERSON
VICE CHAIRMAN

MR. R. C. BECKETT
VICE CHAIRMAN

MR. WILLIAM T. VANDERLIPP
VICE CHAIRMAN

JAMES H. ALLEN
SECRETARY-TREASURER

*MEMBERS OF COMMISSION*

*DELAWARE*

MR. R. C. BECKETT
STATE SANITARY ENGINEER

HON. BURTON S. HEAL
RECORDER OF DEEDS,
NEW CASTLE COUNTY

HON. RALPH S. KEENAN
MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MR. WM. A. McWILLIAMS
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

HON. RAYMOND B. PHILLIPS
MEMBER OF THE SENATE

*NEW JERSEY*

HON. AMOS F. DIXON
MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
STATE TREASURER

HON. ALFRED B. LITTELL
MEMBER OF THE SENATE

HON. JOSEPH C. PAUL
COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE
COOPERATION

MR. WILLIAM T. VANDERLIPP
DEPT. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

*NEW YORK*

HON. FLOYD E. ANDERSON
MEMBER OF THE SENATE

HON. GEORGE W. FOY
MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY

HON. NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. HAROLD KELLER
COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

HON. JOHN S. THOMPSON
MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY

*PENNSYLVANIA*

HON. WELDON B. HEYBURN
MEMBER OF THE SENATE

HON. FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER
MEMBER OF U. S. CONGRESS

HON. ORUS J. MATTHEWS
SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MR. F. A. PITKIN
DIRECTOR, STATE PLANNING BOARD

HON. CHARLES C. SMITH
MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## INCODEL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

I. Minutes of Preceding Meeting.

II. Executive Secretary's Report.

III. Stream Pollution Abatement.

IV. Schuylkill River Restoration Project.

V. Water Supply Diversion Problem.

VI. Soil and Forest Conservation.

VII. Multiple Purpose Development of Delaware River.
(Jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission)

VIII. Delaware Basin Tri-State Water Supply Project.

IX. Underground Water Resources.

X. Port and Transportation - Philadelphia Metropolitan Region.

XI. Route 97 Council.

XII. Annual Report.

XIII. Finances.

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER I: Minutes of Preceding Meeting.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

## SUMMARY OF MINUTES

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Inlet, New York
September 12, 1948

An Incodel Executive Committee Meeting was held at Inlet, New York, Sunday, September 12, in conjunction with the Annual Executive Business Meeting of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation on September 13-14.

Present were: Chairman Pitkin and Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Smith, of Pennsylvania; Messrs. Anderson and Foy, of New York, and also Mr. Don Davenport, representing Commissioner Harold Keller; and Messrs. Beckett, Heal and Phillips, of Delaware.

Mr. Allen represented the staff.

## MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING

The minutes of the annual meeting, held at Pocono Manor, June 28-29, 1948, were approved as read upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Beckett and Anderson and agreed to.

## REPORT OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

The Report of the Executive Secretary, which briefly referred to the highlights of the session, was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Heal and Lichtenwalter and agreed to.

## STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The staff report upon progress made in advancing the Commission's stream pollution abatement was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Messrs. Smith and Phillips and agreed to.

## SCHUYLKILL RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT

The summary report concerning the remarkable progress being made in advancing the joint federal-state Schuylkill River Restoration Project was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Beckett and Smith and agreed to.

## WATER SUPPLY DIVERSION PROBLEM

The Executive Committee was pleased to learn that at long last it appears that the Attorneys General are approaching a mutual understanding concerning procedure for petitioning the United States Supreme Court for a clarification of its decree relative to retention of jurisdiction in the matter of water supply diversion. The report was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Senators Anderson and Phillips and agreed to.

## SOIL AND FOREST CONSERVATION

The comprehensive statement relative to Incodel's activities in advancing programs for the conservation of soil and forests was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Phillips and agreed to.

## MULTIPLE PURPOSE DEVELOPMENT OF DELAWARE RIVER

(Jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission)

The Executive Committee complimented the staff for its careful analysis of the matter of scope of the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction in issuing licenses for construction of dams and reservoirs for the production of hydroelectric power. It commended the careful reading of this report to all of the members of the Commission.

Upon motion made by Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Heal and agreed to, the Chairman and Executive Secretary were authorized to take such steps as they might deem advisable in working for congressional legislation for the improvement of relations between the Federal Power Commission and agencies of State government.

The report upon Multiple Purpose Development of the Delaware River was ordered to be received and filed on motion made by Messrs. Anderson and Heal and agreed to.

## DELAWARE BASIN TRI-STATE WATER SUPPLY PROJECT

The office report on Delaware Basin Tri-State Water Supply Project, referring to the recommendations of the group composed of representatives of the New York City Board of Water Supply; North Jersey District Water Supply Commission; Bureau of Water, City of Philadelphia; and Incodel, which met at Wanaque, New Jersey, August 11, to formulate a program for the advancement of a preliminary investigation of the advisability of a Delaware Basin tri-state water supply project to meet the future needs of metropolitan municipalities in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, met the full approval of the

Executive Committee.

The Committee took formal action in this regard upon motion made by Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Phillips and agreed to.

A further motion by the same sponsors called upon the Chairman to appoint, from the membership of Incodel, a Regional Water Policy Committee to supervise the survey. Chairman Pitkin named Senator Anderson, of New York; Representative Smith, of Pennsylvania; Senator Littell, of New Jersey; and Mr. Beckett, of Delaware.

A motion, also sponsored by Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Phillips, approved the appointment of the technical sub-committee composed of:

James H. Allen, Incodel --- Chairman
John C. Thompson, New York Water Power & Control Commission
H. T. Critchlow, New Jersey Division of Water Policy & Supply
R. J. Gillis, Pennsylvania Water & Power Resources Board
Roger W. Armstrong, New York City Board of Water Supply
Charles H. Capen, North Jersey District Water Supply Commission
Elbert J. Taylor, Bureau of Water, City of Philadelphia

The Executive Committee instructed its Executive Secretary to lend full assistance to the furtherance of the regional water supply project investigation.

The report was ordered to be received and filed upon motion made by Messrs. Foy and Heal and agreed to.

## UNDERGROUND WATER RESOURCES

The office report on Underground Water Resources was ordered

to be received and filed upon motion made by Messrs. Beckett and Anderson and agreed to.

PORT AND TRANSPORTATION - PHILADELPHIA METROPOLITAN REGION

Adding to the information contained in the staff report on Port and Transportation, Chairman Pitkin informed the Executive Committee that Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, was scheduled to sign a port authority bill, passed by the New Jersey Legislature. The office was instructed to carefully analyze this bill, with the particular view of reporting its conclusions to Secretary of Commerce Orus J. Matthews, Governor Duff's personal representative in the handling of port development activities.

The report was ordered to be received and filed upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Lichtenwalter and Foy.

ANNUAL REPORT

The Executive Committee approved the office statement relative to the preparation, printing and distribution of the Annual Report of the Commission for the year ending June 30, 1948. It instructed the office to proceed with the preparation of material for the report and to have five thousand (5,000) copies of the finished document printed.

FINANCES

Upon motion sponsored by Messrs. Foy and Lichtenwalter, the following increases in annual salaries, retroactive to July 1, 1948,

were approved:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| James H. Allen | $7500. | to $7800. |
| John Boardman | 4600. | to 4900. |
| Ruth L. Sampson | 2400. | to 2700. |
| Norma Moore Rementer | 2040. | to 2300. |

Statements contained in the general item on "Finances," showing the status of the Commission as of August 31, 1948, and bills current and payable for the months of July and August, in the amounts of $9,222.99 and $3,026.06, were approved upon motion sponsored by Senator Anderson and Congressman Lichtenwalter and agreed to.

* * * * * * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER II: Executive Secretary's Report.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

This meeting has been called because a considerable number of Incodel members are attending the General Assembly of the Council of State Governments. It was felt that advantage should be taken of this circumstance, in view of the fact that the Legislatures of the four States in which the Basin is located are scheduled to convene January 1949 and it is unlikely that another opportunity to hold an Incodel Executive session probably would be conveniently available because of the approaching holiday season.

Progress being currently made on the items to which the office is devoting most of its attention is covered in the various agenda items for the meeting. In several instances questions arise relative to legislative proposals which it may be desirable for Incodel to sponsor.

It is pleasing to report that Mr. Harvey R. Frantz began employment with the Commission on November 15th. He has been placed in responsible charge of the Commission's programs on soil and forest conservation. Mr. Frantz is presently headquartered in the offices of the Lehigh Valley Flood Control Council, Dodson Building, Bethlehem. The decision to have Mr. Frantz operate from this point was made because of its central location to those areas in which soil and forest conservation problems are most acute. Mr. Frantz' starting salary is $4,500 per year. He has taken over the tasks of former staff members Custer and Powell. It is believed that Mr. Frantz will make a very valuable addition to the Incodel operating personnel.

* * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER III: Stream Pollution Abatement.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Incodel's overall program for the abatement of stream pollution continues to go forward at an encouraging rate.

The Philadelphia project is proceeding according to schedule. Work at the Northeast treatment plant is well advanced and contracts for construction at the Southwest and Southeast works are to be awarded in the near future.

Across the river, the City of Camden has awarded contracts for preliminary construction activities and, despite the fact that the proposed project will cost much more than the original estimate, the City is committed to keep pace with Philadelphia. It expects to finance the works with revenue bonds secured by sewer rental charges.

The City of Gloucester has created a municipal authority to handle its sewage collection and treatment project, and city officials advise that the City will go ahead with its program. Gloucester has stalled considerably in the past, and the New Jersey Attorney General's office is prepared to cite that City, should it continue such tactics.

Chairman Irving V. A. Huie, of the New York City Board of Water Supply, has recently announced that contracts will be awarded for the Port Jervis project early in 1949.

The City of Wilmington is now preparing to go before the Delaware Legislature to secure its approval of the financing of the sewage treatment project for that city. Incodel should be in readiness

to assist the City in this endeavor.

Municipal Use of Non-Debt Revenue Bonds

Because of the approaching legislative session, the office has begun to renew its efforts to validate the use of non-debt revenue bonds by municipalities. It will be recalled that advantage is not being taken of the laws on the statute books for this purpose because of an unfavorable ruling concerning a bond indenture provision for a program proposed by the Abington Township some years ago. The office has written a letter to George F. Baer Appel, requesting the advice of his office in this matter. A copy of the letter to Mr. Appel is appended. Specifically, he has been asked if his firm will assist Incodel in making an appraisal of the situation with particular reference to the following points:

1. Whether it is advisable that municipalities should have the privilege, the same as authorities, of financing sewerage projects with non-debt revenue bonds;

2. Whether a bond indenture can be prepared which will overcome the objections which caused the unfavorable decision in the Abington Township case and would probably receive the "blessing" of the court in a new test case;

3. Whether amendments to existing laws concerning the financing of sewerage projects or additional laws are required in order to make the provisions of Items 1 and 2 effective.

Your Executive Secretary discussed this matter with Mr. H. E. Moses, chief engineer of the Pennsylvania State Department of Health, on

November 23. Mr. Moses is of the opinion that it may be possible for the Sanitary Water Board to make a financial contribution for such activities as would be necessary to clarify the issue.

The entire problem has been discussed with Attorney General Chidsey, but apparently has not been brought to the attention of Governor Duff. It is believed that, if the Governor were apprised of the situation, he would be in full accord with the program. It may be desirable to give consideration to asking the Legislature to appropriate a small sum to carry the activity forward.

## Federal Pollution Control Act

A meeting was held in the Incodel offices on November 15, for a full and frank discussion concerning arrangements of the administration of the Federal Stream Pollution Control Act, passed by the 80th Congress.

It will be recalled that no funds whatever were appropriated for the administration of this statute. It was disclosed at the Incodel meeting that the agencies responsible for the administration of the law propose to make a request for a contingent appropriation of the full amount of the annual allotments for the current fiscal period ending July 1, 1949.

The following persons were present at the meeting held in the Incodel offices on November 15, 1948:

H. E. Moses, Consulting Chief Engineer
Pennsylvania Department of Health

Earl Devendorf, Director
Division of Environmental Sanitation,
New York State Department of Health

R. C. Beckett, Vice Chairman - Incodel;
State Sanitary Engineer, Dover, Delaware

H. P. Croft, Chief Engineer, Sanitation
New Jersey State Department of Health

Harry C. Greenfield, Principal Engineer, Sanitation
New Jersey State Department of Health

Robert S. Shaw, Principal Engineer, Sanitation
New Jersey State Department of Health

A. H. Wieters, Sr. Sanitary Engineer
United States Public Health Service

Arthur D. Morrell, Deputy Commissioner
BCF - Federal Works Agency

William D. Jones, Division Engineer
Division No. 1, N.Y.C. Federal Works Agency

L. M. Connally, District Engineer
New Jersey Federal Works Agency

William J. Finley, District Engineer
Federal Works Agency
P. O. Box 899, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

James H. Allen, Executive Secretary - Incodel

John Boardman, Engineer - Incodel

Stated briefly, the results of the conference clearly indicated that the United States Public Health Service and the Federal Works Agency, the two agencies responsible for the administration of the Federal law, are anxious to embark upon the program. They are working together, apparently cooperatively, in devising working procedures. Bulletins setting forth proposals being considered for this purpose have been recently distributed from the office of the Public Health Service and a series of meetings throughout the United States, to be held during December and

January, has been arranged. A meeting covering the Northeastern North Atlantic Region will be held in New York City on December 20-21. Representatives of Incodel have been invited, and Messrs. Allen and Boardman plan to be present. It is expected that the meeting will be well attended by representatives of agencies in charge of pollution abatement programs in the area.

* * * * *

November 22, 1948

George F. Baer Appel, Esq.
Provident Trust Building
17th and Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Mr. Appel:

This Commission is firmly convinced that it should do everything reasonably within its power to help secure a definite answer to the question which has arisen regarding the use of non-debt revenue bonds for the construction of sewerage systems by municipalities without the necessity of establishing a special authority for the purpose.

As you know, we have discussed this matter with you on several occasions. But, thus far, we have made no progress in resolving the problem. You will remember that we have interested associations representing boroughs and the third class cities of Pennsylvania in the subject. Some months ago, each of these organizations indicated a willingness to make a modest financial contribution toward the cost of working out a satisfactory solution. You will also remember for a time we felt that we might find a municipality in the Pennsylvania section of the Delaware Basin that would be willing to be a party to another test case. However, for various reasons, the one or two prospects contacted have since balked.

We are now approaching another legislative session and, because of this fact, it seems to me that if there should be a need of any amendments to existing laws permitting municipalities to use non-debt revenue bonds, we should soon be giving consideration to that factor.

The Commission desires to be advised whether your firm will assist it in making a general appraisal of the situation. Among other things, we would specifically like to know:

1. Whether it is advisable that municipalities should have the privilege, the same as authorities, of financing sewerage projects with non-debt revenue bonds;

2. Whether a bond indenture can be prepared which will overcome the objections which

caused the unfavorable decision in the Abington Township case and would probably receive the "blessing" of the court in a new test case;

3. Whether amendments to existing laws concerning the financing of sewerage projects or additional laws are required in order to make the provisions of items 1 and 2 effective.

The Commission will hold an Executive Committee meeting on December 2 or 3. It will be greatly appreciated if you would make your reply to this inquiry in order that the subject under consideration can be thoroughly discussed at that meeting.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. ALLEN
Executive Secretary

JHA/s

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER IV: Schuylkill River Restoration Project.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

SCHUYLKILL RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

The Schuylkill River restoration project continues to proceed at a rapid rate.

The Commission should be highly gratified with the progress being made and continue to lend its assistance to the expeditious forwarding of the project, both by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Federal Government.

In preparation for a request for an additional appropriation for the next biennium, probably to the extent of $25,000,000, several inspection trips have been held during the past month or two under the sponsorship of the Department of Forests and Waters. For some reason, difficult to understand, no general invitation has been extended to members of Incodel and its staff to participate in these tours of inspection.

* * * * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER V: Water Supply Diversion Problem.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

WATER SUPPLY DIVERSION LEGISLATION

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Although each of the three Attorneys General of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania has prepared his version of a petition asking the Supreme Court to clarify the question of the scope of its retention of jurisdiction of water supply diversion projects in the Delaware Basin, a conference of the legal officials has not been held. Undoubtedly, one of the main reasons has been the tremendous pressure placed upon Attorneys General Van Riper and Chidsey with other pressing problems. The Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol bridge deal has occupied much attention of both of these officials. Time and services of Attorney General Chidsey also have been taken up, to an unusual degree, by investigations concerning the operation of Philadelphia's municipal government.

Prospects for an early meeting of the Attorneys General do not appear to be bright in view of the approaching legislative sessions of 1949. But, offsetting these events is the fact that a ruling by the Supreme Court in the matter of retention of jurisdiction, while still desirable, is not as essential at the present time as in the past because of the present and prospective investigations relative to the advisability of a regional water supply project to meet the combined needs of municipal areas in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

* * * * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER VI: Soil and Forest Conservation.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

## SOIL AND FOREST CONSERVATION

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Due to the retirement of Messrs. Custer and Powell from the Incodel staff, no continuous concentrated attention has been devoted to soil and forest conservation program items during the past two months.

This does not mean that such programs have been neglected, however. In the interim, three meetings of the Berks County Soil Conservation District have been held, two of which were attended by Mr. Boardman, and the last, on November 24, by Incodel's new addition to the staff, Mr. Harvey R. Frantz. During the same period, Lehigh County District held one meeting, but, unfortunately, because of other commitments, no one from the office was able to be present.

Now that the Commission has, in Mr. Frantz, a full time replacement for Messrs. Custer and Powell, it is expected that considerable progress will be made in the field of soil and forest conservation in the future. As was pointed out in the Executive Secretary's report, Mr. Frantz is stationed in Bethlehem and his services already are being called upon.

In the opinion of your Executive Secretary, Mr. Frantz is a "live wire" and within a short time will stimulate much interest and activity in the Commission's programs.

### Delaware-Lehigh Experimental Forest

Work is progressing at an excellent rate at the Delaware-Lehigh Experimental Forest, established last June in the Lehigh Valley. Headquarters for this operation are at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, and the

United States Forest Service man in charge, Herbert Storey, is reported to be doing an excellent job.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has more than met its part in this joint federal-state undertaking. It has installed a recording stream gauging station, several rainfall gauges, and has provided the full time services of a man on the site. Mr. Frantz has been directed to devote a considerable portion of his time to this work.

## General

Among other programs, arrangements are being developed by Mr. Frantz for the following activities:

(1) Holding of the 1949 annual meeting of the American Society of Foresters in the upper Delaware basin;

(2) Scheduling of several Tree Farm dedications in the upper region next Spring;

(3) Staging of several (four or five) soil conservation demonstrations in Districts established in the upper basin area next Fall.

It is proposed to have at least one such demonstration in the New York and New Jersey sections of the region, and two or three in Pennsylvania. It may also be desirable to have a similar project carried out in Delaware.

Mr. Frantz also proposes to continue and extend the Commission's services in the field of forest conservation on sizeable woodland areas, such as those which are controlled by the Philadelphia Suburban Water

Company, Chester Municipal Water Authority, Split Rock Lodge, Pocono Manor, and the Gifford Pinchot estate in Pike County.

Brandywine Valley Association

Your Chairman, Mr. Beckett, your Executive Secretary and Mr. Frantz attended the third annual meeting of the Brandywine Valley Association. This session followed an extremely successful two-day soil conservation demonstration project on the farm of Mr. John Gregory, World War II veteran, on the outskirts of Coatesville, Pennsylvania. The principal speaker at the Brandywine Valley Association meeting was Louis A. Bromfield, who gave an inspiring address before an audience of about a thousand persons.

* * * * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER VII: Multiple Purpose Development of Delaware River.

(Jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission)

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

MULTIPLE PURPOSE RESERVOIRS ON THE DELAWARE RIVER

(Jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission)

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Complying with the schedule and order issued by the Federal Power Commission, the Electric Power Company of New Jersey, Inc., Mr. H. A. Spalinsky, President, filed additional data in support of his application for a permit to construct a series of dams and reservoirs on the Delaware River for the production of hydroelectric power two or three days before the September 12 deadline set by the Power Commission.

In a telephone conversation with Mr. J. H. Gutride, Acting Secretary of the Federal Power Commission, your Executive Secretary was informed that, in Mr. Gutride's opinion, Mr. Spalinsky had not fully met the request of the Power Commission for additional information. He explained, however, that the Commission was studying the filings and, if found to be appropriate, it would hold public hearings on the Spalinsky project, for which ample advance notice would be given to interested parties.

One of the purposes of the survey being proposed by Incodel to evaluate the merits of a tri-state water supply project in the Delaware River Basin is to develop sound grounds to prevent the possible intrusion of interfering developments, such as the Spalinsky project, in the case it is determined that a regional water supply project is advisable.

* * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER VIII: Delaware Basin Tri-State Water Supply Project.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

DELAWARE BASIN TRI-STATE WATER SUPPLY PROJECT

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Pursuant to instructions given by the Commission at its last Executive Committee meeting at Inlet, New York, September 12, 1948, your Executive Secretary notified the following members of Incodel of their appointment by Chairman Pitkin to the Commission's "Regional Water Supply Committee":

Senator Floyd E. Anderson - New York

Senator Alfred B. Littell - New Jersey

Representative Charles C. Smith - Pennsylvania

Mr. Richard C. Beckett - Delaware

Notices also were given to the following persons of their appointment to the Regional Water Supply Committee's Technical Subcommittee:

John C. Thompson
New York State Department of Conservation

H. T. Critchlow
New Jersey Water Supply Council

R. J. Gillis
Pennsylvania Water and Power Resources Board

Roger W. Armstrong
New York City Board of Water Supply

Charles H. Capen
North Jersey District Water Supply Commission

Elbert J. Taylor
Philadelphia Bureau of Water

Your Executive Secretary is serving as chairman of the Technical Subcommittee.

A meeting of the Technical Committee was held in the Commission's offices in Philadelphia on October 21, 1948. The Committee agreed that it had neither the facilities, services nor funds to make an exhaustive survey of the problem; that this undertaking required the services of a firm (or firms) of consulting engineers and would take at least a year, probably two, to complete. The Committee agreed that it should concentrate its attention upon the preparation of a draft of a reciprocal bill for the authorization of such a survey and for the protection of the states' interests against the encroachment of undesirable developments during the interim the survey would be in progress. A summary of minutes covering the deliberations of the Committee in more detail is appended.

Pursuant to the Technical Committee's recommendation, your Executive Secretary has drafted a bill for the authorization of the necessary survey and submitted it for comment and criticism to all members of the Technical Committee and of its parent Regional Water Supply Committee. A copy of this proposal is appended. Concurrently, the office is working upon a draft of report from the Technical Committee to the Commission's Committee on Water Supply. It is being assisted in this work by other members of the Committee, particularly Mr. Armstrong, of the New York City Board of Water Supply.

Comments regarding the proposed reciprocal legislation have been received from all of the members of the Technical Committee except Messrs. Critchlow and Gillis.

It may be difficult to secure approval of the program for the investigation of the regional water supply problem. Nevertheless, it is a very

important matter that fully justifies the cost involved. If the investigation is not made, the States could easily find themselves in a "mess" that would be much more costly. This could arise in much the same manner as the highly publicized bridge deal which, to say the least, has confused the general program for the development of port and transportation facilities in the Philadelphia-South Jersey-Camden area.

* * *

# SUMMARY OF MINUTES

Meeting of Incodel's Technical Committee on Regional Water Supply

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
October 21, 1948

A meeting of Incodel's Technical Committee on Regional Water Supply was held in the Commission's offices in Philadelphia on October 21, 1948, beginning at 11:00 A.M. The following members of the Committee were present:

James H. Allen
Incodel - Chairman

John C. Thompson
New York State Department of Conservation

H. T. Critchlow
New Jersey Water Supply Council

R. J. Gillis
Pennsylvania Water and Power Resources Board

Roger W. Armstrong
New York City Board of Water Supply

Charles H. Capen
North Jersey District Water Supply Commission

Mr. Elbert J. Taylor, Chief Engineer of the Philadelphia Bureau of Water, was unable to be in attendance because of a conflicting engagement.

Messrs. John Boardman and Henry A. Rowan, of the Incodel staff, attended the meeting.

Mr. Allen gave a résumé of the discussions concerning the matter of evaluating the merits of a tri-state water supply project at a meeting in Wanaque on August 11, 1948, and at the Incodel Executive Committee at Inlet, New York, September 12, 1948. He explained that the Commission had given its

full support of the recommendations calling upon the Technical Committee to pursue the investigation.

It was explained that, since those meetings, members of the staff of the New York City Board of Water Supply and of Incodel had made studies of possible reservoir sites; that the Board of Water Supply had confined its attention to the New York section of the basin, while Incodel had concentrated on the Pennsylvania section.

Mr. Armstrong submitted a map on which were shown, in addition to reservoirs now under construction at Downsville, on the East branch of the Delaware, and at Neversink, on the Neversink River, as authorized by the United States Supreme Court, a series of additional reservoir sites involving the development of approximately 1200 square miles of watershed area. Based upon preliminary figures, it was estimated that the probable yield from such developments would amount to about one billion gallons per day (for all purposes). Mr. Armstrong promised to submit more reliable figures to the members of the Committee after further study.

Similarly, a map prepared by Incodel indicated that it might be possible to build a series of reservoirs in the Pennsylvania section of the Basin, controlling a drainage area of 442 square miles. The probable yield from such a development would amount to approximately 333 million gallons of water daily (for all purposes). As envisioned, provision would be made for sufficient reservoir capacity for flood control on the Lackawaxen and Dyberry Rivers.

Approving the work to date, the Committee unanimously agreed that

the merits of a tri-state water supply project should be thoroughly investigated. It concluded that this was a task which would require a year or more to complete, involve a substantial expense and probably could be best done by consulting engineers serving Incodel. It was also agreed that the Committee should be prepared with definite recommendations on these matters by early December, in order that they could be discussed with legislative leaders before the General Assembly sessions which convene in January, 1949.

The Committee felt that each of the States involved--New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania--should enact legislation which would properly protect their individual and joint rights in the matter of construction of reservoirs to meet the future water supply requirements of their respective metropolitan subdivisions. There was a difference of opinion as to whether such legislation should be broad and all-encompassing or should be confined to the reservoir locations deemed to be most suitable for the purpose. It was understood that Incodel would attempt to resolve this question and to draft a bill to accomplish the desired ends.

It was also decided that, to do a thorough job, the States would have to make substantial appropriations, amounting probably to as much as $50,000 each for the first year.

In order further to advance the problem, the Committee concluded that it would be advisable to prepare a map of a size which would appropriately show the general plan; also to prepare a statement or brochure, concisely setting forth the importance a nd urgency of the problem. It was the opinion of the group that such a report should be in simple terms and designed primarily to point out the complexities and ramifications of the

problem and the pertinent reasons for securing an early conclusive solution.

Mr. Armstrong agreed to be responsible for the making of the map. Mr. Allen offered the services of the Incodel staff in preparing copy for the brochure.

* * * * * * *

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

NOVEMBER 9, 1948

Preliminary Draft of a Proposed Act Authorizing an Investigation to Determine the Advisability of a Tri-State Water Supply Project in the Delaware River Basin.

AN ACT

To promote interstate cooperation for the conservation and protection of the water resources of the Upper Delaware River Basin for an integrated project designed, among other incidental purposes, to meet prospective municipal water supply requirements of municipal subdivisions and metropolitan areas within the Commonwealth, both within and outside of the Delaware Basin; authorizing The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin to be responsible for the conduct of investigations necessary to determine the advisability of such a project, and making an appropriation therefor

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby enacts as follows:

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, municipal subdivisions and metropolitan areas in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in common with similar units in the States of New Jersey and New York, are constantly confronted with the problem of providing an adequate and satisfactory supply of municipal water, both for domestic and industrial purposes, to meet existing and prospective requirements of the people which they serve; and

WHEREAS, the waters of the Upper Delaware River Basin, above Easton, Pennsylvania, and Phillipsburg, New Jersey, are the common

property of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and New York, and a logical and attractive future source of municipal water for certain municipal subdivisions and metropolitan areas in each of such States; and

WHEREAS, the United States Supreme Court in its decree in the Delaware River Case (U.S. 283 U.S. 336) confirmed the principle enunciated by the Master that the use of the waters of the Upper Delaware River Basin for municipal water supply has precedence over all other purposes; and

WHEREAS, agencies other than the said States and their political subdivisions have recently advanced, or sought to secure approval of, projects involving the construction of dams and reservoirs for the development of the waters of the Upper Delaware River Basin for purposes other than municipal water supply which, if effectuated, would interfere with and probably seriously jeopardize the rights and interests of the States and their municipal subdivisions and metropolitan areas in the matter of providing adequate and suitable sources of municipal water supply; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and New York have each created and now maintain a Commission (or Committee) on Interstate Cooperation for the purpose of promoting cooperation among said States, respectively, and among other States of the Union, in various fields of governmental operations, including the utilization, control and conservation of the water resources of interstate river systems; and

WHEREAS, said Commissions (or Committees) on Interstate Cooperation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and New York--and also Delaware--have organized and established

and are now maintaining as an instrument of governmental machinery a joint advisory board known as "The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin" for the purpose, among other things, of formulating integrated policies and programs for the mutual and beneficial protection of the water resources of the Delaware River Basin for municipal water supply and other incidental purposes.

Section 1 - SCOPE OF ACT - It is hereby declared to be the intent and purpose of this Act to authorize and direct The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin to be responsible for the conduct of investigations necessary to determine the advisability of the future construction of an integrated water supply project within the Upper Delaware River Basin, comprised of a series of dams and reservoirs on both the tributaries and the main channel of the Delaware River, to meet the combined prospective water supply requirements of municipal subdivisions and metropolitan areas in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and New York, both within and outside of the said Basin; and to authorize and direct said Commission to submit a report to the Governors and Legislatures of each of said States prior to January 1, 1951, setting forth its findings, conclusions and recommendations concerning said investigation.

Section 2 - PROTECTION OF STATE'S INTERESTS - In order to carry out the purpose of the Act and policy of the Legislature to protect the Commonwealth's interest in the development of the waters of the Delaware River Basin for municipal water supply and other incidental purposes, it is hereby declared to be contrary to public policy and unlawful for any agency of government, federal or state or local,

operating within the Commonwealth, to issue a permit for the construction of a dam for any purpose in the Upper Delaware Basin above Easton, Pennsylvania, and Phillipsburg, New Jersey, until such time as The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin has completed its investigation and submitted its report on the municipal water supply investigation in accordance with the requirements and schedule set forth in the preceding section of this Act, unless said Commission, upon review after public hearing, certifies to the agency responsible for the issuance of a permit for the proposed dam that the proposed project will not adversely interfere with the water supply program which it has under investigation.

Section 3 - APPROPRIATION - For the purpose of carrying out the investigation provided for in this Act, a sum of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) is hereby appropriated for the use of The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin. This sum only shall become available and be used for the purpose for which it is made in the case that the States of New Jersey and New York both have made an appropriation of the same amount to the said Commission for the same purpose.

Section 4 - DEFINITIONS -

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER IX: Underground Water Resources.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

UNDERGROUND WATER RESOURCES

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

It is pleasing to report that steps have been taken to secure appropriations in the amount of $15,000 per year each from the states of New Jersey and Pennsylvania to match an appropriation of $30,000 per year by the United States Geological Survey for an intensive investigation of the occurrence, quantity, quality and dependability of the ground water resources in the formation underlying the Philadelphia-Camden area.

In New Jersey, this request has been made by the New Jersey Water Supply Council, and in Pennsylvania, by the Department of Internal Affairs.

There would appear to be some distinct advantages in having these monies specifically earmarked for the purpose for which they are intended. This has not been done. In both the case of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, they are part of a total appropriation for ground water surveys in the respective states. Earmarking the funds would assure their being expended for the Philadelphia-South Jersey survey and eliminate the possibility of their being used somewhere else. Earmarking also would lend weight to any statement Governor Duff or Governor Driscoll might wish to make in their annual message to the Legislatures concerning their interest in the project. Earmarking also would afford Incodel a better opportunity to keep posted on developments and participate in the general program.

* * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER X: Port and Transportation -

Philadelphia Metropolitan Region.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

PORT AND TRANSPORTATION - PHILADELPHIA METROPOLITAN AREA

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

The Knappen Engineering Company has completed its survey of the port and transportation problems in the Philadelphia-South Jersey metropolitan area, and, on November 24, submitted its final report to the Delaware River Joint Commission. A copy for each of the members of Incodel has been furnished. These have been mailed from the office.

A copy of letter of transmittal, which constitutes a general summary of the report, is appended hereto.

Although there has been no opportunity to study the report, it is believed many of the recommendations will require some legislative action on the part of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Incodel probably will be called upon to give its opinion of the merit of the proposed program and of the proposed legislation to carry it out. Without much question, Governor Duff will depend upon Secretary Matthews to handle these problems in behalf of Pennsylvania.

In view of the publicity which has been given to it, you are all probably aware of the deal under which the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol bridges were acquired by the freeholders of Burlington County. Negotiations were carried out very quietly and the sale came as a complete surprise to almost everyone. Its consummation was made possible by the passage of certain legislation in the 1948 session of the New Jersey

Legislature, the consequences of which were apparently overlooked by top officials of that State. The law was never called to Incodel's attention.

The whole situation is a serious matter for several reasons, uppermost of which is the fact that the Knappen survey calls for the acquisition of the two bridges as a part of the port development program. The cost involved under a formula established by legislation enacted in the 1920s would have been approximately $5,000,000.

* * * * *

FOR STUDY ONLY

October 27, 1948

The Delaware River Joint Commission
of Pennsylvania and New Jersey
Administration Building
Bridge Plaza
Camden, New Jersey.

Gentlemen:

We submit herewith our report on the "Delaware River Port Development Plan", the preparation of which was authorized by the Delaware River Joint Commission in a resolution adopted April 7, 1948. The analysis and preliminary recommendations contained in our report on the Preliminary Survey of the Delaware River Port dated February, 1948 formed the basis for the present study. The object of this report is to present to the Commission an integrated plan for developing the port facilities for the purpose of stimulating commerce through the Port and improving transportation in the Port area and a systematic procedure for its accomplishment.

The Development Plan for the Delaware River Port contemplates the expansion of the powers of the Delaware River Joint Commission to permit it to function as an effective central administrative agency for the Port and suggests the legislative action necessary to accomplish this purpose. Methods and activities to attract commerce are suggested. Plans are presented for port facilities projects which appear to be economically jusitifiable and which are desirable in order to modernize and increase the efficiency of the Delaware River Port. Designs, cost estimates, and estimates of benefits and revenues are presented for each of the recommended improvements. Detailed schedules are presented for financing the entire Development Plan.

A number of port improvements in addition to those recommended were investigated and were found to be impracticable from an economic viewpoint at the present time. Some of these would be of definite benefit to the Port and should be considered in the future when their need is more clearly evident. The remainder appear to have no economic justification in the forseeable future.

The report consists of fifteen chapters describing the engineering and economic investigations and the designs for the recommended facilities, and appendices containing additional data, plates and tabulations. Supporting data and details of a technical nature are included in a supplemental volume submitted under separate cover. In addition , exhibits are submitted relative to port administration at other ports in the United States.

The cost estimates in the report are based on the general price level of 1948 but contain a reasonable margin of safety to cover forseeable price increases. The assumption is made that costs will stabilize within 10% of the mid-1948 level. Any major cycle of inflation or depression which might affect these cost estimates would probably have a parallel effect upon the estimates of earnings and benefits and would not necessarily modify the economic balance of the projects. The findings and recommendations of this report are outlined in the following summary.

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Port District. It is recommended that a Delaware River Port District be created comprising the counties of Bucks, Philadelphia, Montgomery, Delaware and Chester in Pennsylvania and Mercer, Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Salem, Cumberland and Cape May in New Jersey. These are the counties adjoining the River in Pennsylvania and New Jersey between Trenton and the sea, the limits established by the two States.

Administrative Organization of the Port. It is recommended that the powers of the Delaware River Joint Commission be enlarged and strengthened to make it an effective central administrative body for the Delaware River Port District and to permit it to carry out the Port Development Plan. Because of its established credit and its prestige as an efficient business organization it is desirable that the present indentity of the Commission be continued.

The successful operation of the various activities in which the Commission will be engaged will require an efficient organization. The recommended organization chart (see Chapter Two, Plate II-2) suggests a departmental organization for the operating forces for each of the major activities of the Commission. The operation of each activity such as marine terminals, toll bridges and the like would be under the direction of a department head who would be given the necessary authority and then be held fully responsible for the success of his department. The department head would have under his direction the necessary operating forces and the groups handling engineering, maintenance and business promotion in his department. The overhead functions such as accounting, personnel and procurement would be centralized to serve all of the operating departments.

Executive Management of all departments would be headed by a General Manager who would report directly to the Commission. The Department Heads would be directly responsible to the General Manager.

Promotion of Business. Vigorous activity in the development of commerce through the Port is an essential part of the Port Development Plan. This includes not only efforts for the development of business for the various facilities to be operated by the Commission, but also a coordinated effort to promote the growth of business in the Port as a whole. Toward this end the following measures are recommended:

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

(a) As an immediate interim measure, until the reorganization of the Delaware River Joint Commission into a central administrative agency for the Port has been authorized and is fully functioning, the establishment of a temporary business development organization within the Commission to operate on an annual budget of $25,000.

(b) The immediate development of a strong independent promotional agency with the existing World Trade Bureau of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce as a nucleus and with a board of directors representing the various business interests in the Port area. The base of representation and financial support of this Bureau should be broadened so that it could serve as the chief promotional agency of the Delaware River Port under the name of "Delaware River Port and Traffic Bureau". This Bureau should be financed by contributions from the business organizations of the Port, with the Delaware River Joint Commission contributing about half of the total. During the interim period the annual contribution of the Commission should be limited to about $65,000. This contribution should be increased to $150,000 when the new port administrative agency is fully in operation. The voting power in the Board of Directors of the Port and Traffic Bureau should be approximately proportional to the financial support afforded by the various groups.

(c) The work of the Foreign Trade Bureau of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum should be strengthened by an annual contribution of $50,000 from the Commission and proportionate representation in the management of this bureau should be obtained for the Commission. All appropriate influence should be exerted towards the ultimate consolidation of this bureau with the Delaware River Port and Traffic Bureau.

(d) When the new Port Department of the Commission is fully organized and operating, a Business Development Division should be provided in it with an annual budget of about $200,000 to promote business for the Commission's own port facilities.

Marine Terminal Facilities. In order to attract general cargo commerce to the Delaware River Port modern efficient marine terminal facilities open to all shipping interests are absolutely essential. The recommendation that the Commission lease, modernize and operate a group of general cargo piers as described in Chapter Four is probably the most important feature of the Port Development Plan. It would create a central terminal service and pier control organization for the Port and provide the basis of an ever available efficient and modern wharf service which is a necessary condition for the success of the increased promotional effort. The welfare of the entire Port is dependent on proper and progressive port management sufficiently flexible to adjust its operations to meet every legitimate need and to provide facilities for all potentially valuable commerce.

Of the available locations for a new marine terminal, Greenwich Point in South Philadelphia appears to be the most suitable and plans are presented for a modern terminal at that site, which would be planned to permit the fastest possible turn-around time for ships. The cost of this installation would be about $35,000,000. Alternative locations considered include Hog Island, Tinicum and Reed Street but none of these proved to be as economical as the Greenwich Point site. The estimated growth of traffic indicates that the Marine Terminal project as Greenwich Point could expect ultimate financial success but that it would incur substantial deficits during the earlier years of operation.

An alternative plan for providing the Port with modern terminals consists of the leasing, modernization and improvement of existing municipal

general cargo piers in Philadelphia and Camden. This would provide an equal number of modern berths capable of efficient service while requiring a capital investment of only about $7,500,000. Earnings estimates indicate that this plan could be accomplished on a self-sustaining basis. Therefore, it is concluded that the pier modernization program is the preferable first step in the improvement of the Port's terminal facilities if the existing municipal facilities can be leased. In this case the construction of a new marine terminal should be deferred until it is needed to supplement the business of the modernized municipal pier system. The obvious advantage of this plan is that it would cause many piers that are now being used as warehouses to be converted back to use as piers for the promotion of commerce on the river, the purpose for which they were built by the cities. It is not contemplated that existing leases of piers for legitimate use as marine terminals should be terminated but that the Commission would take over these piers subject to current leases and would permit legitimate pier operators to continue in the occupancy of their present facilities.

As a result of these studies it is recommended:

(a) That the Commission lease the Camden Marine Terminal and twelve Municipal General Cargo Piers in Philadelphia and put them in operation as marine terminals. Municipal Piers numbers 84-S, 82-S, 80-S, 78-S, 40-S, 38-S, 30-S, 16-S, 3-N, 5-N, 9-N, and 19-N are recommended for operation by the Commission beginning as soon as practicable. The suggested terms for the leases as outlined in Chapter Four include an annual rental of $300,000 for the twelve Philadelphia piers and $100,000 for the Camden Marine Terminal, with further payment of one-third of the net surplus earned by the installations under the management of the Commission. Alternate proposals are suggested for the lease

of pier 80-S, depending on whether or not the City of Philadelphia completes the contemplated construction program at this pier prior to the date of the new lease.

(b) That the Commission undertake a program of modernizing and improving these piers. This program should be carried on progressively as justified by the growth of commerce. Recommended plans for the improvement of Piers 38-S, 40-S, 5-N and the expansion of the Camden Marine Terminal are presented in Chapter Four. The estimated cost of this work, including the cost of the superstructure for Pier 80-S is about $7,500,000.

(c) That, when the future growth of traffic requires facilities in excess of those provided by the pier modernization program, or immediately if the satisfactory arrangements for the leasing of the municipal piers are not consummated, the Commission proceed to contruct the first stage of the Greenwich Point Marine Terminal, as described in Chapter Five.

(d) That the Commission proceed at once to obtain a ten year option, with renewal privileges, on, or title to, the land for the future construction of the Greenwich Point Marine Terminal in order to forestall developments which might interfere with these plans.

(e) That the Commission appoint the head of the Port Department as soon as possible so that the negotiations for and development of this vital part of the plan may proceed without delay.

Plans for the future development of additional piers by new construction and by modernization of existing installations are presented in Chapter Six. These projects might be undertaken by the Commission or by other interests in the Port when needed.

An administrative organization chart for the operation of the terminal

facilities is shown on Plate B-4 in Appendix B. It is contemplated that the applicable parts of the organizations of the City of Philadelphia and the Camden Marine Terminal now operating these piers would form the nucleus of the Commission's Port Organization.

Delaware Port Railroad. In an efficient port it is essential that all trunk line railroads have access to wharves and piers on equal terms. This is only partially achieved by the existing Philadelphia Belt Line Railroad. The operation and maintenance of facilities to furnish equal access to the waterfront can be most efficiently and economically accomplished by a single belt line railroad operating as an independent unit, not obligated to any railroad except by contract or tariffs. This railroad would perform impartially all switching on an equal basis for all railroads, shipping interests and industries located on the waterfront area. All of the various agencies conducting business in the port territory would deal with one railroad only for switching operations. Duplication of services and the resulting traffic congestion would be eliminated.

It is recommended that a new Delaware Port Railroad be established to consolidate the existing facilities on the Philadelphia waterfront area. This railroad would acquire parts of the waterfront physical assets of the three trunk line railroads, and all of the assets of the Philadelphia Belt Line Railroad. A cash investment of $2,500,000 would be made by the Commission. The trunk line railroads and the Commission would receive stock in the new railroad in proportion to their respective investments either by contribution of physical assets or by cash. The total assets of the Delaware Port Railroad would be about $12,500,000. The Commission would own all of the common stock and 25 per cent of the Class A, one per cent maximum dividend, non-voting stock.

A revenue estimate indicates that the Delaware Port Railroad could be operated on a sound financial basis and would earn for the Commission a substantial annual surplus after meeting all expenses and debt services. The trunk line railroads would profit by the reduced cost of switching service and by

their share of the earned surplus. The Port would receive more economical and faster service and shippers would benefit by the more efficient handling of freight.

The Delaware Port Railroad would connect with the major terminals of the trunk lines and would perform switching operations only, with the trunk line railroads performing all classification operations. This would not eliminate the beneficial competition among the trunk line railroads and no major changes are contemplated in the existing tariff structures.

A master-plan has been developed for belt line service for the water-front area. It is recommended that this plan be undertaken in successive stages. Stage One, recommended for immediate adoption, provides for the operation of the Delaware Port Railroad on the Philadelphia waterfront between Port Richmond and the South Philadelphia Terminal. This area carries the heaviest concentration of traffic on the waterfront.

It is recommended that the Commission proceed with the work necessary to accomplish Stage One of the Delaware Port Railroad. It is further recommended that the Commission place on its staff an executive with experience in railroad operation to be in charge of the negotiations with the railroads and other interested parties, and to represent the Commission in the group selected to organize the Delaware River Railroad.

Extension of the system should be undertaken when the need is clearly established by increased commerce and when experience in the operation of the initial stage has confirmed the estimates of earnings to be derived.

Pollution. Chapter Eight describes the actual pollution of the Delaware River and its detrimental effect on the growth of the Port. The program now in progress for abating this pollution is discussed and it is concluded that substantial improvement in conditions will result within a few years. It is recommended that the Commission not undertake any specific activities relative to pollution at this time other than to encourage and aid all efforts to expedite

of completion.

It is recommended that under present economic conditions the base toll on the two acquired bridges and on the Delaware River Bridge be established by the Commission at the uniform rate of 25 cents.

In view of the expenditures to be incurred by the Commission for immediate promotion of the Port and those involved in converting it into a central port administrative agency, it is recommended that the new rate on the Delaware River Bridge be made effective as soon as practicable.

Proposed South-Philadelphia-Gloucester Bridge. The estimated growth of motor vehicle traffic in the Philadelphia-Camden area during the next thirty years will be of such volume that the capacity of the Delaware River Bridge, even with improved approaches, will be exceeded. The Tacony-Palmyra Bridge and the Burlington-Bristol Bridge will assume a part of this estimated growth but because of their locations, the relief they can afford to traffic congestion in the metropolitan areas is limited. A study of the traffic conditions in Philadelphia and Camden and of existing river crossings, their approaches, and their traffic capacities, indicates that a new river crossing will be needed by about 1954.

The traffic study indicates that a river crossing south of the Delaware River Bridge and north of the Philadelphia Navy Yard would best fit the pattern of origin and destination of cross-river traffic, and that a sufficient volume of traffic would be directed to this new crossing to justify its construction. It would remove traffic from the congested areas and would add to the efficiency of the existing crossings.

Consideration of a number of alternate sites with comparative investigations of foundation conditions, estimated future traffic, and approach highways leads to the conclusion that a site in the vicinity of Packer Avenue in South Philadelphia and Hudson Street in Gloucester City would be most suitable from the viewpoint of engineering, economics and traffic. From a comparison of

bridge designs with tunnel designs, it was concluded that a bridge would be more economical and generally more satisfactory.

Designs have been prepared for a six-lane high level suspension bridge at the Packer Avenue-Hudson Street Location and the principal details are illustrated in Chapter Ten. The bridge, including approaches, plazas and all other features and appurtenances, is estimated to cost about $43,000,000. It is estimated that the bridge will carry approximately 9.9 million vehicles in its opening year which was taken to be 1954, and approximately 13.5 million vehicles in the year 1980.

With a base toll of 25 cents, the bridge would meet operation and interest charges from the beginning and could commence bond retirement in the second year. It is therefore recommended that the Commission:

(a) Request the Legislatures of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to authorize the construction of the bridge.

(b) Acquire or place under option the necessary lands by purchase or condemnation.

(c) Request the enactment of Congressional legislation approving construction of the bridge.

(d) Retain an engineering firm to prepare the application to the Department of the Army for a permit for the construction of the bridge, and to make detailed surveys, additional foundation investigations, construction drawings and specifications.

(e) Arrange for the financing of the project through the sale of revenue bonds and call for bids for construction in 1951.

Union Motor Truck Terminal. There is considerable duplication of services in the local collection and distribution of much of the long haul motor truck freight entering and leaving the Philadelphia-Camden area. There are approximately 100 private motor-truck terminals in this area. Partially loaded pickup and delivery trucks travel over the streets of the city to many of the same consignees on the same day. Thus a needless duplication of truck mileage occurs, which increases the traffic congestion in the crowded city streets.

To alleviate a similar condition in other major cities the Union Motor Truck Terminal has been developed. This type of terminal provides facilities at a central location for over-the-road carriers, at which their "less than truckload" loads can be unloaded at a platform, sorted and then consolidated according to destination. The city is divided into operating zones, and pickup and delivery in each zone is handled by one or more local carriers. This results in full loads on pickup and delivery trucks and reduction in mileage, since each truck confines itself to the relatively small area of its zone.

The construction of a Union Motor Truck Terminal in the Port area with a capacity of 1,000 tons daily would be beneficial to the Delaware River Port and revenue estimates indicate that it could be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

It is recommended that such a terminal be constructed, as described in Chapter Eleven, at an estimated cost of $2,125,000, and that the necessary authority for this purpose be requested from the legislatures of the two States.

South Jersey Rapid Transit. At the request of the Commission three earlier engineering reports on a proposed South Jersey Rapid Transit System were reviewed. The proposed system consists of the present Bridge Rail Line over the Delaware River Bridge, extended westward to Locust and 16th Streets in Philadelphia and eastward in New Jersey from Broadway, Camden to Glassboro, Clementon, Haddonfield and Moorestown, utilizing the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines.

We are of the opinion, and in this we concur with the previous reports, that the construction and the operation of the proposed Rapid Transit System in New Jersey is feasible from an engineering viewpoint, but that financially it appears to be a marginal enterprise at best.

The area which would be served by this system is urgently in need of improved public transportation, but the costs of ownership and operation are such that the system could be made self-sustaining only after a considerable period of time when increased earnings, it is believed, would result from the estimated growth of population and traffic. From the analysis in the former reports and from independent estimates prepared for the present report, it is concluded that the proposed Rapid Transit System does not qualify as a business venture which would attract private capital for investment. Further, it is believed that even financing based on the sale of revenue bonds by the Commission would be unsuccessful unless revenues from other properties of the Commission were sufficient and were made available to cover the financial deficits during the early years of operation.

The system can be developed entirely in one stage or by constructing the four-branch line in successive stages. The construction of the entire system at one time would require an initial expenditure of

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

about $23,500,000 exclusive of grade crossing elimination, and would result in a cumulative deficit after meeting operating and capital charges of approximately $6,000,000 in the first ten years. Our estimates indicate that after this initial period the system may be expected to become self-supporting. The deficit accumulated during this period may be offset by the surplus earnings accumulated during the next ten to twelve years.

If the project is undertaken in successive stages an initial outlay of approximately $11,600,000 will be required and the operations would result in a cumulative deficit of approximately $3,000,000 after ten years. The system may then be expected to become self-supporting. The deficit accumulated during the first ten years may be offset by the surplus earnings accumulated during the next seven or eight years.

Under either plan the eventual expenditure will be close to $32,000,000 exclusive of the cost of grade separations.

It should be noted that the elimination of grade crossings will cost approximately 15 to 20 million dollars in addition to the cost of installation of the Rapid Transit System. It is understood that the New Jersey Public Utility Commission has contributed 85% of the cost of similar improvements in the past and might participate in the grade separation program in connection with the Rapid Transit System. Before proceeding with the project this possibility should be explored by the Commission.

In view of the magnitude of this project and the probability of deficits in the first ten years of its operation there appear to be considerable advantages in undertaking the work one stage at a time and proceeding to successive stages only as funds become available for the extension of the system. Construction in four stages has the advantage of permitting the further extension of the system to be delayed, curtailed or suspended at any time after the first stage has been placed into operation,

should the results not come up to expectation. On the other hand, it would be possible to accelerate the construction of subsequent stages, should the traffic grow beyond the estimated volume.

It is believed that the Commission should operate the rapid transit system by contract with an operating agency.

Should the Commission contemplate undertaking this project it is recommended that prior to a definite decision an engineering firm be engaged to prepare an engineering, operating, revenue and financing report on the system, inasmuch as the existing engineering reports are of a preliminary nature. The work required could be completed in about a year, at an estimated cost of about $104,000 for the entire system, plus the cost of field surveys which might amount to $10,000 additional. It is further recommended that the Commission place on its staff an executive with public utility experience to represent the Commission in the necessary negotiations with the railroads, rapid transit companies and labor unions.

While this report was being completed, a law pertaining to the establishment of a South Jersey Rapid Transit System was adopted by the State of New Jersey. This law calls for a State referendum on a 15 million dollar bond issue to provide funds for an "authority" to finance the Rapid Transit System. If the proposed 15 million dollar bond issue is ratified by the voters and made available to the Commission it would then be feasible for the Commission to start the entire project at once. If the bond issue should be rejected, the entire project could still be undertaken at one time if the State of New Jersey would advance the necessary funds or guarantee an issue of bonds in contemplation of ultimate repayment from net operating revenue. In either event the entire question of the construction and operation of the project by the Commission should be reviewed.

Port Administration Building. There would be some advantages in the Commission's owning an office building to serve its own needs and also to provide space which might be rented to tenants interested in shipping, transportation and other activities related to the Port. Estimates of the cost of an administration building and the earnings that might be derived from rentals indicate that the project is not economically feasible at the present time, largely because of the present high level of building costs. However, this project is worthy of reconsideration at some future time when economic conditions may be more favorable or when the best interests of the Port indicate the desirability of a Commission-owned headquarters in one suitably located building even at some financial sacrifice as compared with the cost of office rental.

Projects Not Recommended. Other projects have been suggested as being suitable for the Commission to undertake to improve the facilities of the Port. Engineering and economic studies lead to the conclusion that some of these projects would be beneficial to the Port but would not produce enough revenue to justify their cost, under present conditions. Included in this group are the following:

(a) A small boat harbor at the mouth of Pennypack Creek.

(b) A central Produce Market in Philadelphia.

(c) A General Merchandise Warehouse for use in connection with port operations.

None of the foregoing projects are recommended to the Commission for construction at the present time. However, they all have considerable merit and may properly be undertaken when the Commission's operations have accumulated surplus funds to finance such projects. A description and analysis of these projects will be found in Chapter Fourteen and in Supplements 3, 4 and 6.

Another group of projects, described in Supplements 5 and 7, were investigated to determine benefits which would result to the Port, economic justification and engineering feasibility. It was concluded that none in this group is urgently needed at present and that the projects are not economically justified. Therefore, they are not recommended to the Commission for construction in the foreseeable future. Included in this group are the following:

(1) Union Bus Terminal

(2) Supplying ships with water

(3) Bunkering ships with oil and coal

(4) Owning and operating dredging equipment

(5) Lighterage

(6) Ship repair facilities

(7) Marine Radio Station

(8) Coal Terminals

(9) Grain Terminals

(10) Lumber Terminals

(11) Union Freight Depot

(12) Real Estate Development for Port purposes.

(13) Foreign Trade Zone.

Financing Recommended Projects. The Port Development Plan proposed herein, if fully carried out, will require a capital expenditure of about $91,000,000, over a period of 30 years. Further, it is believed that all of the projects as recommended will eventually pay out. On the other hand, many of them are not sufficiently attractive financially to make possible their financing on an independent revenue basis. However, our studies show that the group of projects combined with the Delaware River Bridge as outlined herein will present a favorable financing picture.

It is therefore concluded that the use of revenue bonds backed by surplus earnings from the operation of the Delaware River Bridge offers the most practicable method for financing the Delaware River Port Development Plan. Any city, state, or port district subsidies which might be provided in the future for individual projects will aid and accelerate the Port Development Plan.

Chapter Fifteen contains a suggested construction schedule and a plan for financing the proposed group of improvements. In view of the low interest rate of the outstanding Delaware River Bridge bonds, it is recommended that these bonds not be refinanced at the present time and that they be retired only at maturity. It is further recommended that the funds designated in the Annual Report of the Commission as "Net Income Over Bond Maturity and Sinking Fund Requirements" be used to back the financing of the contemplated projects.

In the financing schedule presented for each recommended project in Chapter Fifteen, it is assumed that 30-year sinking fund bonds will be sold bearing a coupon rate of 3½ per cent. For each new project a Reserve Fund should be established at the earliest possible date after issuance of the bonds and maintained until final maturity of the bonds at an amount not less than the maximum of any subsequent one-year's debt service requirement of that Project. All funds beyond debt service and project reserve requirements will flow into a General Reserve Fund which should be maintained in an amount not less than the largest subsequent one-year's combined debt service requirements on all bonds then outstanding for all projects other than the Delaware River Bridge. Any deficiency in individual Project Reserves or the General Reserve should be made up from the first funds available after payment of current debt service.

It is recommended that any other project to be undertaken by the Commission be self-liquidating. A new project, that is, a project in addition to those recommended herein, should be financed by the issuance of bonds which will be supported first by the net revenues of that project and then if so required by the General Reserve Fund. After the new project has been in operation a sufficient period of time to indicate its earning ability, and if at that time the net revenues available for debt service from all projects are sufficient to cover their combined debt service and reserve requirements at least one and one-half times, then the bonds issued for the new project may be refunded or exchanged for bonds on a parity with all other bonds of the Commission.

The financial analysis of the recommended projects indicates that a substantial surplus will be earned above the cost of maintenance and operation, and the required debt service. While there is considerable variation among the several projects in the ratio of net revenues to debt service, each is estimated to be self-supporting over the life of its bond issue.

The financing of the various projects is based on certain recommended tolls, tariffs and rates. If experience should show that the income of the Commission proved to be too low to meet sinking fund and other requirements then the tolls and other charges should be adjusted upward; on the other hand, should the income prove greater than needed appropriate downward adjustment should be made.

To recapitulate, our recommendations are summarized as follows:

(1) That the Commission be reorganized into a Port District central administrative body.

(2) That an immediate promotion program authorizing a $90,000 annual budget be authorized and that this be expanded to

an annual budget of $400,000 with the development of the Port project.

(3) That the Philadelphia municipal piers and the Camden Marine Terminal be taken over, operated and modernized at a capital cost of about $7,500,000 and a rental of $400,000 plus a year.

(4) That the Delaware Port Railroad be organized as an operating belt line at an initial cost to the Commission of about $2,500,000.

(5) That the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol Bridges be taken over by the Commission, if possible, at a cost of about $5,000,000.

(6) That a new bridge be constructed by the Commission between Packer Avenue in South Philadelphia and Hudson Street in Gloucester City at a cost of about $43,000,000.

(7) That a uniform base toll of 25 cents be established immediately for all Commission bridges.

(8) That a Union Motor Truck Terminal with a capacity of 1,000 tons daily be established at a cost of about $2,125,000.

(9) That a rapid transit system between Philadelphia nnd South Jersey be adopted as a Commission project and that plans and negotiations be initiated with a view to carrying it out at an ultimate cost of about $32,000,000 exclusive of grade separations, as recommended herein.

(10) That the Commission adopt the recommendations of this report and recommend to the legislatures of the two States that it be granted the powers necessary to adopt and carry out the construction and operation of this recommended program.

KNAPPEN TIPPETTS ABBETT ENGINEERING COMPANY

By: Theodore T. Knappen
Partner

11/10/48

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER XI: Route 97 Council.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

ROUTE 97 COUNCIL

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Representatives of Route 97 Council were visited during a recent trip by your Executive Secretary and Mr. Frantz in the upper reaches of the Delaware watershed. It is pleasing to report that the officers of the Council are convinced of the wisdom of Incodel's recommendations for broadening the scope and membership of the group and changing its name to the Upper Delaware Conservation Council, or a comparable designation. The officers are now developing procedures and programs for this purpose.

The Council is keenly interested at the moment in gaining acceptance of a program for freeing the Lackawaxen-Minisink Bridge across the Delaware of tolls. This is the only remaining toll structure in the section of the Delaware River above Port Jervis. It was designed by John A. Roebling as a model for the Brooklyn Bridge, and is one of the first wire-rope suspension bridges ever built in the country.

It has been learned that the Pennsylvania State Highway Department, which apparently has jurisdiction in respect to this particular structure, cannot use state highway funds for the acquisition of a toll bridge for the purpose of freeing it from tolls. Inasmuch as traffic handled by the bridge is exceedingly light, it is obvious that the expenditure of money necessary for the construction of a new structure would not be justified. In view of these circumstances, Incodel has advanced the idea of seeing whether the John A. Roebling Company might be interested in purchasing the bridge and turning it over to the State as a gift. Thus,

it would be possible to preserve the bridge as an historic monument to the memory of its designer and, at the same time, permit it to be used for the limited volume of traffic which it serves.

* * * * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER XII: Annual Report.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

ANNUAL REPORT

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

You have all received a copy of Incodel's printed annual report for the year ending June 30, 1948. Comments thus far received refer to it as an excellent presentation.

The reports are now being distributed to the Commission's mailing list.

* * *

Incodel Calendar
Business Meeting

NUMBER XIII: Finances.

STATEMENT: See attached copy.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review, discussion, suggestions, and approval.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

By:

ACTION TAKEN:

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

FINANCES

Incodel Executive Committee Meeting
Detroit, Michigan
December 3, 1948

Within the past two months, requests have been made for Incodel's appropriations from the States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In the case of the first two, the appropriations will be for the year July 1, 1949 to June 30, 1950. Pennsylvania's appropriation will be for the biennium ending June 30, 1951.

The requests are the same as for the past year, being, on an annual basis, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | $25,000. |
| New Jersey | 12,000. |
| New York | 10,000. |

No difficulty is anticipated in securing these funds.

It is proposed to ask Delaware for an appropriation of $3,000 per year for the next biennium. This represents an annual increase of $500, previous appropriations being $2,500 a year.

The financial status of the Commission as of November 30, 1948, and statements covering bills current and payable for the months of September, October and November, in the amounts of $4,183.21, $3,214.89 and $4,807.36, respectively, are appended hereto for consideration and action of the Committee.

* * *

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

## FINANCIAL STATUS AS OF

## NOVEMBER 30, 1948

### JULY 1948 to JUNE 1949 BUDGET

| Budget Classification | Allocation | Expenditures | Balance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Salaries | $27,900.00 | $11,085.79 | $16,814.21 |
| Rent | 3,648.00 | 1,350.00 | 2,298.00 |
| Equipment | 800.00 | 29.75 | 770.25 |
| Supplies | 1,000.00 | 291.46 | 708.54 |
| Printing | 2,000.00 | 1,975.05 | 24.95 |
| Telephone & Telegraph | 800.00 | 243.42 | 556.58 |
| Postage & Express | 500.00 | 190.95 | 309.05 |
| Travel | 3,500.00 | 997.75 | 2,502.25 |
| Conferences | 2,800.00 | 2,406.47 | 393.53 |
| Financial Audits | 400.00 | 325.00 | 75.00 |
| Consulting Service | 1,000.00 | 50.00 | 950.00 |
| Retirement Fund | 5,638.00 | 4,822.09 | 815.91 |
| Miscellaneous | 1,000.00 | 469.28 | 530.72 |
| | $50,986.00 | $24,237.01 | $26,748.99 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Interim Operating Reserve . . . . . | 10,662.30 |
| Accounts Payable . . . . . | 176.00 |
| | $37,587.29 |

### 1948-1949 APPROPRIATIONS

| | Total | Received | Balance Due |
|---|---|---|---|
| Delaware | $ 2,500.00 | $ 1,250.00 | $ 1,250.00 |
| New Jersey | 12,000.00 | 0.00 | 12,000.00 |
| New York | 10,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 25,000.00 | 17,000.00 | 8,000.00 |
| | | | $26,250.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| BANK BALANCE: | |
| Account No. 1 . . . . . | 5,150.60 |
| Account No. 2 . . . . . | 3,799.19 |
| ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE . . . . . | 2,387.50* |
| | $37,587.29 |

* State of Delaware unpaid 1946-47 appropriation $200.00 plus State of New York unpaid 1947-48 appropriation $2,187.50.

September 1948

# INCODEL ACCOUNTS

## CURRENT AND PAYABLE
(except where noted)

## Classified in Budget Form

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Personal Services: | |
| | 1. Executive Secretary (includes July & Aug. increase) . . . | $ 700.00* |
| | 2. Engineer. . . . . | 458.33* |
| | 3. Engineer. . . . . | 300.00* |
| | 4. Agronomist. . . . . | 203.60* |
| | 5. Forester (Sept. 1-15, resigned Sept. 16). . . . . | 132.50* |
| | 6. Office Secretary (includes July & Aug. increase). . . . . | 275.00* |
| | 7. Assistant Office Secretary (includes July & Aug. increase) | 235.00* |
| | 8. Stenographer. . . . . | 150.00* |
| | | $2,454.43* |

* These amounts include Income Taxes withheld and Retirement Fund payments totaling $227.50 and $131.44, respectively.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| II. | Other Expenses: | |
| | 1. Rent: | |
| | The Pennsylvania Railroad. . . . . | $ 284.00 |
| | The Pennsylvania Horticultural Society . . . . . | 20.00 |
| | 2. Equipment | |
| | 3. Supplies: | |
| | A. Pomerantz & Company . . . . . | 8.12 |
| | Danzig & Bowers. . . . . | 12.50 |
| | J. R. Howarth Paper Company . . . . . | 20.85 |
| | Fitch Carbon & Ribbon Company. . . . . | 32.40 |
| | 4. Printing: | |
| | W. T. Peck & Company . . . . . | 63.00 |
| | 5. Postage & Express: | |
| | Henry A. Rowan . . . . . | 50.00 |
| | 6. Telephone & Telegraph: | |
| | The Bell Telephone Company of Penna. . . . . | 38.24 |
| | 7. Travel: | |
| | James H. Allen: | |
| | Aug. 9, West Chester, Pa. . . . . | 2.76 |
| | Aug. 11, Wanaque, Ellenville, Neversink, etc. . . . . | 48.35 |
| | Aug. 19, Harrisburg, Pa. . . . . | 12.99 |
| | Aug. 20, Trenton, N. J. . . . . | 4.30 |
| | Aug. 23-27, State College, Pa. . . . . | 47.75 |
| | Sept. 7-15, Cooperstown, & Inlet, N. Y. . . . . | 194.50 |
| | Sept. 21, Trenton, N. J. . . . . | 5.17 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Sept. 2, Carney's Point, N. J. . . . . | 4.96 |
| | Sept. 8, Wilmington, Del. . . . . | 5.10 |
| | Sept. 9-11, Hagerstown, Md., . . . . . | 41.97 |
| | Sept. 24, Reading, Pa. . . . . | 8.77 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | Travel (continued) | |
| | Henry A. Rowan: | |
| | Sept. 14, New York, N. Y. | $ 8.01 |
| | Amos L. Powell: | |
| | Aug. 16-18, Hackettstown, N. J. | 31.34 |
| | Aug. 24, Swabia Creek | 6.66 |
| | Sept. 14, Kempton, Berks Co., Pa. | 8.79 |
| | Sept. 15, Lehigh Co., Pa. | 5.34 |
| | Samuel A. Custer: | |
| | Aug. 12, Norristown, Pa. | 2.79 |
| | Aug. 17, Norristown, Pa. | 2.84 |
| | Aug. 18, Snow Hill Camp, Pa. | 12.64 |
| | Aug. 19, West Chester, Pa. | 5.85 |
| | Aug. 21, Downingtown, Pa. | 6.71 |
| | Sept. 1-3, Alexandria Bay, N.Y. | 76.61 |
| | Sept. 8, Wilmington, Del. | 8.48 |
| | Sept. 10, Bryn Mawr, Pa. | 3.48 |
| | Sept. 14, Maple Shade, N. J. | 5.76 |
| 8. | Conferences: | |
| | F. A. Pitkin: | |
| | Sept. 10-14, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 96.16 |
| | R. C. Beckett: | |
| | Sept. 10-16, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 107.32 |
| | Burton S. Heal: | |
| | Sept. 11-12, Ex. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 23.50 |
| | Franklin H. Lichtenwalter: | |
| | Sept. 11-13, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 50.60 |
| | Floyd E. Anderson: | |
| | Sept. 12, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 24.78 |
| | Raymond B. Phillips: | |
| | Sept. 11-14, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N.Y. | 69.35 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Aug. 25, with F.A. Pitkin | 2.40 |
| | Aug. 26-27, Pa. Sewage Works Association, State College, Pa. | 11.35 |
| 9. | Miscellaneous: | |
| | F. A. Pitkin | 25.85 |
| | James H. Allen | 7.32 |
| | John Boardman. | 5.60 |
| | Amos L. Powell | 7.04 |
| | Samuel A. Custer | 1.86 |
| | Peerless Union Linen Service | 1.40 |
| | Royal Typewriter Co., Inc. | 19.50 |
| | Robert G. Wilder | 26.50 |
| | Forest Farmers Asn. Cooperative | 1.00 |
| | Harper & Brothers | 2.60 |
| | J. L. Smith Co. | 7.80 |
| | Matthew P. Romanski | 25.00 |
| | McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. | 6.10 |
| | Doubleday Book Shops | 16.00 |
| 10. | Retirement Fund: | |
| | State Employes' Retirement Fund | 98.72 |
| | TOTAL: | $4,183.21 |
| | Received from "Automatic" Spr. Corp. of America, Credit - Rent | 35.00 |
| | NET TOTAL: Charged to Budget Items | $4,148.21 |

October 1948

# INCODEL ACCOUNTS

## CURRENT AND PAYABLE
(except where noted)

## Classified in Budget Form

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Personal Services: | |
| | 1. Executive Secretary | $ 650.00* |
| | 2. Engineer | 408.33* |
| | 3. Engineer | 300.00* |
| | 4. Office Secretary | 225.00* |
| | 5. Assistant Office Secretary | 191.67* |
| | 6. Stenographer | 150.00* |
| | | $1,925.00* |

*These amounts include Income Taxes withheld and Retirement Fund payments totaling $164.80 and $105.38, respectively.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| II. | Other Expenses: | |
| | 1. Rent: | |
| | The Pennsylvania Railroad | 284.00 |
| | The Pa. Horticultural Society | 20.00 |
| | 2. Equipment | |
| | 3. Supplies: | |
| | A. Pomerantz & Company | 3.95 |
| | 4. Printing: | |
| | Rapid Reproduction Service | 1.80 |
| | Photo-Illustrators | 3.00 |
| | 5. Postage and Express: | |
| | Henry A. Rowan | .95 |
| | 6. Telephone & Telegraph: | |
| | Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania | 44.97 |
| | Western Union Telegraph Company | 3.34 |
| | 7. Travel: | |
| | James H. Allen: | |
| | Sept. 28, New York, N. Y. | 9.45 |
| | Oct. 1, Harrisburg, Pa. | 12.97 |
| | Oct. 3, Phoenixville, Pa. | 2.52 |
| | Oct. 4, Washington Crossing, Pa. | 2.50 |
| | Oct. 12, Phila. Public Works Project | 4.95 |
| | Oct. 13, Wagontown, Pa. | 5.64 |
| | Oct. 21, Chester, Pa. | 2.16 |
| | Oct. 22, Local. | 1.00 |
| | Oct. 24, Hancock, N.Y | 33.93 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Oct. 6, Trenton, N.J. | 4.50 |
| | Oct. 12, Wagontown, Pa. | 7.09 |
| | 8. Conferences: | |
| | Charles C. Smith: | |
| | Sept. 13-14, Exec. Com. Meeting, Inlet, N. Y. | 69.75 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. | Conferences (continued) | |
| | J. C. Thompson: | |
| | Oct. 20-21, Technical Sub-Com. Meeting, Phila. . . . | $ 15.54 |
| | James H. Allen: | |
| | Sept. 22, Luncheon with S. A. Custer . . . . . | 2.35 |
| | Sept. 29, " " Messrs. Pitkin, Boardman. . . | 5.65 |
| | Oct. 8, " " Mr. Pitkin . . . . . | 4.70 |
| | Oct. 14, Brandywine Valley Assoc. Annual Meeting . . | 5.50 |
| | Oct. 15, Luncheon with F. A. Pitkin . . . . . | 3.45 |
| | Oct. 21, A.W.W.A. Meeting, Philadelphia . . . . . | 2.00 |
| | Oct. 21, Technical Sub-Com. Meeting, Philadelphia . . | 4.20 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Oct. 14, Brandywine Valley Assoc. Annual Meeting . . | 8.10 |
| | Oct. 21, A.W.W.A. Meeting, Philadelphia . . . . . | 6.00 |
| | Oct. 21, Technical Sub-Com. Meeting, Phila. . . . . | 9.60 |
| 9. | Financial Audits: | |
| | Ellwood B. Revell & Company. . . . . | 325.00 |
| 10. | Consulting Service: | |
| | Robert G. Wilder & Company . . . . . | 50.00 |
| 11. | Retirement Fund: | |
| | State Employes' Retirement Fund. . . . . | 160.26 |
| 12. | Miscellaneous: | |
| | James H. Allen . . . . . | 2.74 |
| | John Boardman. . . . . | 3.56 |
| | Peerless Union Linen Service . . . . . | 1.40 |
| | Photo-Illustrators . . . . . | 5.50 |
| | Photo Art Studio . . . . . | 15.00 |
| | J. L. Smith Company. . . . . | 1.20 |
| | Don Corvelli . . . . . | 21.00 |
| | Latcham Studio . . . . . | 5.00 |
| | Doubleday Book Shops . . . . . | 5.00 |
| | American Forestry Association (1 year dues). . . . . | 5.00 |
| | The Empire Statesman (1year subscription) . . . . . | 4.00 |
| | E. W. Rising . . . . . | 36.67 |
| | Harper's Magazine (3 year subscription). . . . . | 10.00 |
| | Robert G. Struble, Treasurer, Chester Co. Soil Conservation District. . . . . | 25.00 |
| | A. B. Dick Company . . . . . | 19.50 |
| | American Forestry Association . . . . . | 1.50 |
| | Soil Conservation Society of America . . . . . | 3.00 |
| | Pennsylvania Municipal Publications Service . . . . . | 4.00 |
| | TOTAL. . . . . | $3,214.89 |
| | Received from "Automatic" Sprinkler Corp. of America, (credit Rent) . . . . . | 35.00 |
| | NET TOTAL: Charged to "Budget Items" . . . . . | $3,179.89 |

November 1948

# INCODEL ACCOUNTS

## CURRENT AND PAYABLE
(except where noted)

## Classified in Budget Form

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Personal Services: | |
| | 1. Executive Secretary | $ 650.00* |
| | 2. Engineer | 408.33* |
| | 3. Engineer | 300.00* |
| | 4. Conservationist (15th to 30th) | 187.50* |
| | 5. Office Secretary | 225.00* |
| | 6. Assistant Office Secretary | 191.67* |
| | 7. Stenographer | 150.00* |
| | | $2,112.50* |

* These amounts include Income Taxes withheld and Retirement Fund payments totaling $176.00 and $105.30, respectively.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| II. | Other Expenses: | |
| | 1. Rent: | |
| | The Pennsylvania Railroad | 284.00 |
| | The Pennsylvania Horticultural Society | 25.00 |
| | 2. Equipment | |
| | 3. Supplies: | |
| | A. Pomerantz & Company | 8.50 |
| | Danzig & Bowers | 1.80 |
| | J. R. Howarth Paper Company | 38.58 |
| | 4. Printing: | |
| | The Drake Press | 1,855.00 |
| | Renninger & Graves, Inc. | 1.50 |
| | Photo-Illustrators | 3.60 |
| | 5. Postage & Express: | |
| | Henry A. Rowan | 100.00 |
| | 6. Telephone & Telegraph: | |
| | The Bell Telephone Co. of Pa. | 55.68 |
| | The Western Union Telegraph Co. | 7.72 |
| | 7. Travel: | |
| | James H. Allen: | |
| | Oct. 29, Trenton, N.J. | 4.38 |
| | Nov. 4-7, Atlantic City, N.J. | 45.23 |
| | Nov. 12, Trenton, N. J. | 9.85 |
| | Nov. 15-18, Bethlehem & Hawley, Pa., and Downsville, N. Y. | 54.79 |
| | Nov. 23, Harrisburg, Pa. | 14.31 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Oct. 28, Reading, Pa. | 8.23 |
| | Nov. 18, Yardley, Pa. | 9.23 |
| | Henry A. Rowan: | |
| | Nov. 23, New York, N.Y. | 7.86 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. | Conferences: | |
| | James H. Allen: | |
| | Oct. 27, Luncheon Conference. . . . . | 3.10 |
| | Nov. 1, Luncheon Conf. re Phila. Public Works . . . . . | 3.95 |
| | Nov. 9, Luncheon Conf. with Critchlow, Hartwell and Graham. . . . . | 3.65 |
| | Nov. 22, Wm Penn Chapter, Soil Conservation Soc. of Am. | 2.97 |
| | John Boardman: | |
| | Nov. 15, Quality Committee Meeting, Philadelphia . . . | 27.30 |
| 9. | Miscellaneous and Contingent: | |
| | James H. Allen . . . . . | 1.88 |
| | John Boardman . . . . . | 4.21 |
| | William A. Walker. . . . . | 13.00 |
| | Peerless Union Linen Service . . . . . | 1.40 |
| 10. | Retirement Fund: | |
| | State Employes' Retirement Fund . . . . . | 98.14 |
| | TOTAL . . . . . | $4,807.36 |
| | Received from "Automatic" Sprinkler Corp. of America credit Rent. . . . . | 35.00 |
| | NET TOTAL: Charged to "Budget Items" . . . . . | $4,772.36 |

DEC 16 9 14 AM '48