

Delaware Riverkeeper Network

Please find attached a PDF of a comment letter submitted by and signed by 23 organizations and 294 individuals.

To: Delaware River Basin Commission

Re: Comment: Proposed Rulemaking: 18 CFR Part 401, Rules of Practice and Procedure

Date: November 29, 2023

We, the undersigned organizations and individuals, submit this comment to the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) in opposition to the rulemaking for the proposed amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, codified at 18 C.F.R. Part 401.

We object to the codification of a process that does not offer the opportunity for public participation in important decisions made by the DRBC. Public participation is a process that engages the public, provides opportunity for meaningful contribution from the public, and fully considers the public's input in the decisions that are made. This is the hallmark of participatory democracy and gives legitimacy to the government agencies that make decisions on projects, particularly an agency dedicated to the Delaware River, its Watershed and communities, the water supply for up to 17 million people, and home to diverse and irreplaceable species and ecosystems.

The DRBC states its mission as: "Managing, protecting and improving the water resources of the Delaware River Basin".[1] The DRBC describes inclusion of the public and public input, and public education and outreach, as key in carrying out its mission.[2] DRBC describes its "core values" as: "Service: to the public, the regulated community and our DRBC colleagues; Respect: for each other, the public and the Basin's water resources; Professionalism: defined by high ethical standards, integrity, continuous improvement and accountability; and Diversity and inclusion: promoted both as an employer and as a public agency." [3] The removal of the public from the decisionmaking does not uphold or affirm these values.

Proposed Rulemaking – Extension of Permits

The proposed rulemaking, among other provisions, codifies DRBC's practices regarding the extension of some permits that have substantial impacts on the public and the Delaware River's water resources and watershed. For projects with an "approval not assigned an expiration date" [Subpart C. Section 401.41(a)], the proposed rules prevent the public from being notified prior to an approval being granted and close out public participation in the decision process that leads to that approval. The decision about the extension of that approval is made solely by the DRBC's Executive Director based on criteria in the proposed rules. There is no requirement that the Executive Director disclose to the public that the extension is being considered, there is no opportunity for the public to review or comment on the extension, no public hearing required, and no vote is required by the DRBC Commissioners.

Additionally, the current rules allow an extension of three years and the proposed rules allow a five-year extension. This expansion of the approval length is even worse than the current regulations because over a longer period there is more opportunity for changes to occur that are central to the criteria that must be met in order for a project approval to be extended. These include: no material change has occurred [Section 401.41(a) ii]; that "The condition of the

project site has not changed in a manner important to determining whether the project would substantially impair or conflict with the Commission's Comprehensive Plan" [Section 401.41(a) iii]; or that the Comprehensive Plan has not changed [Section 401.41(a) iv].

The rules state that public notice of the Executive Director's decision is to be made "no later than the Commission's next regularly scheduled public hearing or business meeting following the determination." In other words, the extension of such an approval is done behind closed doors, without any public involvement or knowledge, unilaterally by the Executive Director, without public disclosure. The only public notice is after the fact and, depending on when the decision was made, it could be long after the fact since the DRBC only meets quarterly. We strenuously object to the lack of public participation and transparency in this proposed decisionmaking process. The rules propose that the Executive Director's decision is "appealable" but that is a long and expensive process that assumes people and/or organizations have the substantial resources required to do so. That assumption is not valid; unless the costs of an appeal are absorbed by others or waived, most members of the public will be without recourse, even if a project will directly adversely impact them.

Additionally, according to the DRBC's governing Compact, the DRBC Commissioners, "Serve as the governing body of the commission and exercise and discharge its powers and duties except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to this Compact" and administer the Commission.[4] Yet the proposed rules do not require a vote or public discussion of the determination made by the Executive Director on such approvals. The proposed rules remove the Commissioners from this key process that is part of their charge. The Commissioners are the Governors of the four watershed states (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware) and the Army Corps of Engineers, representing the federal government (President Biden) and are the elected officials that are accessible and accountable to their constituencies, providing public confidence. This is crucial to the trust people have that their representatives are serving the public good and shared resources first, not project applicants or special interests.

The Executive Director is invested with far too much authority in the determination of the extension of the referenced approvals. Regarding an extension, not only does the Executive Director make the final decision on the extension of an approval but also exercises personal judgment about whether the criteria cited above are met [Section 401.41(a)]. The criteria also include a finding as to whether the written application for an extension that the applicant is required to submit illustrates that they have "...expended, at a minimum, the sum of one million dollars (\$1,000,000) or an amount representing substantial funds in relation to the cost of the project in reliance upon the Commission's approval" [Section 401.41(a)i(A)] or "In the alternative, circumstances beyond the project sponsor's control (including but not limited to, pending legal challenges to local, State or Federal permits) have prevented the sponsor..." from expending the required sums [Section 401.41(a)i(B)]. Terms such as "substantial funds" and "beyond the sponsor's control" are value-laden and are prone to subjectivity by the Executive Director. This subjectivity will not be open to public scrutiny nor DRBC Commissioner Assessment prior to a final determination. This process lacks guardrails that are needed to prevent erroneous decisions and/or the appearance or incidence of bias.

The DRBC's proposed changes are largely carving in stone several of the practices the DRBC already uses when they make permitting and policy decisions. Many of these practices we have protested in the past because it has led to bad decisions by the DRBC. Most notably, the DRBC Executive Director unilaterally approved the extension of the approval for the Gibbstown LNG Export Terminal Project "Dock 2" last year without any public input and even without a vote or public discussion by the DRBC Commissioners. The secret decision to extend the permit was only discussed at a public meeting and voted on by the Commissioners because the community demanded. The proposed rules remove the Commissioners even further than they were regarding the extension of the "Dock 2" approval, making a bad process even worse. We object to DRBC memorializing such an opaque and non-public process into codified rules.

Proposed Rulemaking – Other Sections

We object to other sections of the proposed rules. Under Subpart C. Section 401.39, the Executive Director is given sole power to decide what forms and documentation are needed for an application for a project and when an application is complete. These details should be covered by express requirements that prescribe what is required in an application in order to provide a level field of review and clear understanding by the public of exactly what is required "for the administration of the provisions of the Compact" [Section 401.39(a)]. This is a substantial responsibility where often the "devil is in the details" and should not be left to individual decisionmaking by the Executive Director on a case by case basis. Granting authority to the Executive Director and doing so one application at a time can lead to consequential inconsistencies, it could lead to subjectively influenced decisions, it doesn't afford any public notice and lacks objective reliability. This is entirely too much discretion invested in the spot judgment of the Executive Director.

Under Subpart A. Section 401.8, "substantially changed" is being changed to "materially changed." Under Subpart I. Section 401.121 a definition is provided for "material change." The proposed rules state "Any project which is materially changed [substantially] from the project as described in the Comprehensive Plan will be deemed to be a new and different project for the purposes of Article 11 of the Compact. Whenever a change is made the sponsor shall advise the Executive Director, who will determine whether the change is deemed [substantial] a material change within the meaning of this part" [Section 401.8].

There are other places in the proposal where the word "material" is being substituted for "substantial." Both of these words are value-laden and open to subjective interpretation. The definition provided in the proposed rule is also not clear, focusing primarily on how the evaluation will be used rather than what the term actually means. The ambiguity of "material" and "materially changed" does not improve the understanding of what value is being attached. The definition of the adverb "materially" is "substantially" or "considerably", according to the Oxford Dictionary. These are words that seem to be interchangeable, with little difference. Why is the DRBC changing the term? The secondary dictionary definition of "materially" is described "in terms of wealth or material possessions." If DRBC intends to attach a financial or economic value to the term, then it must define what constitutes "material" so that the public understands under what circumstances a project would be considered a new project, requiring new reviews and approvals. A clear definition and certainty is needed for these terms.

As proposed, this is left, once again, to the sole discretion of the Executive Director, which places this decisionmaking process behind closed doors. Whether or not a change to a project will trigger a fresh review that would open the process up to public review and Commissioner action is of great importance and requires public transparency and Commissioner-level decision making.

Proposed Rulemaking – Public Records Access

Under Subpart H. in the proposed rules, access to public records is addressed. The removal of references to the federal Freedom of Information Act removes provisions in that law without replacing them fairly. It is not clear what the fees that are charged to a requester will be based on because “processing requests for records” is a general term [Section 401.110]. For instance, in many other state and federal regulations, including FOIA, there is a waiver provision that the agency will consider for the administrative costs of pulling records that are requested. By the requester showing a request is in the public interest, the federal FOIA and many agencies will waive the often high fees associated with the time spent by the agency responding to the request. This is because one of the duties of public agencies is to serve the public and provide transparency and access to records that will inform the public. This is a duty of the DRBC and, as stated at the top of this letter, DRBC recognizes this duty. A waiver provision must be provided in the rules to impart fairness and prevent access to information from being too expensive for people. Not allowing this provision discriminates against those who cannot afford the expense.

We also object to the Executive Director being empowered to decide whether or not to disclose a record. The proposal states that the Executive Director may exercise discretion in deciding that “...disclosure is in the public interest, will promote the objectives of the Commission, and is consistent with the rights of individuals to privacy, the property rights of persons in trade secrets, and the need for the Commission to promote frank internal policy deliberations and to pursue its regulatory activities without disruption” [Section 401.115]. These are decisions that many agencies entrust to attorneys who administer the law. There is no requirement in the proposed rules that the Executive Director must have the qualifications to implement the law and there is a danger that when exercising discretion there will be subjective influences. Regardless of whether FOIA applies, DRBC needs to create a public records request system that aligns with the laws in its member states and the federal FOIA so that the public has similar access to DRBC records and so that records requested for public interest purposes are not subject to a fee. One simple and straight-forward solution is to state that even though DRBC is not a federal agency, it will follow the federal FOIA law as it has for decades.

The public has fought long and hard for greater transparency and fair opportunities to provide meaningful and informed public participation on the approvals and policies that the DRBC makes. These critical decisions directly affect the quality of our environment, our drinking water, our air quality, the diversity and health of the Delaware River, its species, habitats, ecosystems, tributaries and communities throughout the entire magnificent Delaware River Watershed. We cannot effectively take part and influence outcomes if the decisionmaking process is not open and interactive, with all important decisions and the underlying information about them fully

disclosed and available for public review and comment. We object to the proposed inadequate process for public access to records.

We request that the DRBC not approve the rules as proposed. We request that the DRBC revise the sections of the proposed rules to which we object in this comment and replace those sections to provide greater transparency, public participation, and public access and that the decisionmaking process engage and require these important decisions to be made by the Commissioners rather than administrative and/or executive staff.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this critical proposed rulemaking.

[1] <https://www.nj.gov/drbc/library/documents/DRBCvision-mission-values.pdf>

Downloaded at: <https://www.nj.gov/drbc/about/60th-Anniversary.html>

[2] *Id.*

[3] *Id.*

[4] <https://www.nj.gov/drbc/library/documents/compact.pdf> P. 29

Organizations (23 total)

Berks Gas Truth

Catskill Mountainkeeper

Clean Water Action

Coralie Pryde, Wilmington, DE

Damascus Citizens for Sustainability

Delaware Riverkeeper Network

Environment New Jersey

Food and Water Watch

NJ Sierra Club

Don't Gas The Meadowlands Coalition

Choices Mental Health Counseling PLLC

New Jersey Forest Watch

Environmental Commission of Harrison Twp.

Bergen County Green Party

Tusten Heritage Community Garden

NJ State NAACP, Metuchen-Edison-Piscataway Branch

North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE)

Central Jersey Coalition Against Endless War

POWER Interfaith Climate Justice and Jobs, Philadelphia PA

Tikkun Olam Chavurah

Occupy Bergen County

Sourland Conservancy

Maryland Ornithological Society

Individuals (294 total)

Jeanne Jordan

Allister Layne

Stuart Rubinow

Patricia Watkinson

mari Mennel-Bell

judith dimitrur

Rose Marie Wilson

Vikram Sikand

JL Angell

Susan Castelli-Hill

Adrienne Naumann

Sharon Gillespie

Linda Myers

Delores Stachura

John Friestad

Ted Neumann

Rebekah Creshkoff

Ellen Phillips

Catherine Lewis

Carrie VanEtten

Vicki Fox

Lenore Sivulich

Mary Bissell

Maria Nazzaro

John Marro

Jacqueline Birnbaum

Stephen Garofalini

Charles Trowbridge

Shirin Wertime

Christina Vjoen

Richard Cole

gordon clemson

Philip A. Englert

Darlene Jakusz

Jane Clevenger

Marie Wakefield

Aloysius Wald

Carole Havelka

Rosalie Riegle

Karen Spradlin

Tem Narvios

Carol May

Laurie Gates

Christine Chaplik

Beth Darlington

Sherrill Futrell

Leo Kucewicz

Paula Shafransky

Harold Watson

Jonathan Hartman

Kirsten MacLeod Martin

Kevin Walsh

Joann Eckstut

nora coyle

Maureen Porcelli

Lee Van Put

Harriet McCleary

Felicity Hohenshelt

Nicole Punday

Liana Lang

Sharon Lieberman

Ann Dorsey

Laura Neiman

Susan von Schmacht

Lori Erbs

Elizabeth Percy

dogan Ozkan

Jacqueline Colyer

Julia Wittich

Heather Greene

Mari Mennel-Bell

George Bourlotos

Summer Downing

Shirley McCarthy Gallalee

Sheryl Iversen

Karin Hemmingsen

Jacqueline & Thomas Callas

Seth Feinberg

karen stabenow

C Kasey

Judith Prigal

John Mark

Michelle Levy

Rebecca Berlant

Erich Winkler

Cynthia Simon

Mindy Kruckenberg

Martin A. Horwitz

Suzy Clarkson Holstein

Maria DeLeonardis

Daniel Tainow

Joseph Quirk

William Snow

Dogan Ozkan

Jared Howe

Patricia Harlow

Ina Claire Gabler

Jeff Toste

John Friestad

Carole Shurtz

Wayne Harris
JL Angell
Ed Fiedler
A.L. Steiner
Roy Strauss
Gertrude Battaly
Connie Allison
Janet schulman
Shawn Troxell
Catherine Williams
Walter Kross
Dogan Ozkan
Pam Naprstek
Tracy S Troth
Catherine Raymond
d carr
Pamela S Overholtzer
Andrew Wadsworth
Carol Carmon
Cheryl Speer
Jesse Kessler
Matthew Glassman
Ray Cage
Susan MacGregor
Kayleigh Hausmann
Elena knox
David Mazariegos
Marianna Mejia

Bri Marino
Harriet McCleary
Marcel Liberge
Marc Silverman
Lynn Baron
JoAnne Kriskowski
Clare Lipinski
E.M. Fetch
James Wesley
Jane Moad
Delores Stachura
Rep. Chris Rabb
Paul Reddy
Michelle Ramauro
Sharon Gillespie
Shirlene Harris
Michael Rosenberg
Denise Sprague
Gary Thaler
John W. Renfrew
Nadine Godwin
Ian Kerner
Paul Kaufman
Susan Hathaway
Nancy Currah
Jarrett Cloud
Mary Bissell
Elizabeth Seltzer

Karl Hildenbrand

David Hinkes

John Felton

Susan Mellen

JUDITH DAVIDSEN

Roberta Camp

Martin Horwitz

Jackie Pomies

Sandra Gardiner

Steve Oder

Neil Hoffmann

Brie Gyncild

Adelheid Koepfer

Katherine Poole

Margaret Yelenik

Catherine Sims

Mary Cato

Kim Smith

Elizabeth Enright

Erich Winkler

Lydia Johns

Gregg Taylor

Barbara Sorgeler

MARIE CURTIS

Kathy Riese

Karl Hamann

Judith Poxon

Todd Southworth

Sonja Rebarber

Keith Voos
Johan Andrade
Robin Spiegelman
mark williams
Jennifer Latzgo
Mo swa
Henry Steinberg
James Keenan
J. Beverly
Iris Antman
Kathy Slawinski
Valerie Rounds Atkinson
Carlie Muessig
Norman Starr
roger keller
Brad Snyder
Darlene Jakusz
Katharine Walsh
Bernard Greenberg
Nick Viggiano
Virginia Davis
Henry Berkowitz
Beth Darlington
Bretton Little
Carol A May
Haylee Herrick
Sid Madison
K Schultz

Beth Darlington

Sidney Sisk

Carol Weiler

Kevin Walsh

Barbara Benson

Arthur Satter

Laura Neiman

Gerritt and Elizabeth Baker-Smith

CARL PRELLWITZ

geoffrey saign

Charles Favorite

Chris Spear

Marie Wakefield

Jan Emerson

Rosie Starr

Ronit Corry

Diane DiFante

Melissa Carlson

Herb Caesar

Linda Rossin

Ruth Swenson

Janet Hermann Dougherty

Alexa Manning

Mary McKenna

Scott sheaffer

Jonathan Hartman

Christine Cameron

Lisa Ruffman-Weiss

Mark Bloomberg
Rochelle Gravance
Michael Votta
Doreen Votta
Teri Bowers
Lucia Pollock
Paula Morgan
H. Rosenberg
N. Dumser
Susan Balaban
Susan Clark
Michele Swenson
Kathy Flocco-McMaster
J. Barry Gurdin
Elizabeth Percy
Susan von Schmacht
Mary Sullivan
George Bourlotos
Joseph Quirk
Borja Rodriguez
Edward Priem
Shawna Raymond
Brent Groce
Heather Nelson
Kenneth Baumert
Charlie Collins
Mary Goodkind
Sally Jane Gellert

Peggy Hartzell

Fred Fall

Sharon Lieberman

Jason Miller

Elizabeth Enright

Tom Hougham

Sandra Wheeler

Joann Eckstut

Judith Ackerman

Rebecca Jean Emigh

Barbara Atkinson

Brian Scanlan (former mayor, Wyckoff, NJ)

Mike Souza

Jim Derzon

sally marks

Cara Worcester

Deana Weaver

Perry Kendall

Nat Lownes

Barbara Ballenger

Susan DeWitt

Dyan Campbell

John Klima

Sarah Peters

Maya Kurtz