

## Mary Chieffe

The Executive Director is given far too much authority over many crucial decisions and these are made behind closed doors, without the public and without a vote by the DRBC Commissioners.

Extension of Permits without an expiration date are given favored status, such as the Gibbstown LNG Export terminal docket. The Executive Director is being invested with exclusive authority regarding extension of permits that removes public input completely and relieves the Commissioners of their responsibility to review and approve extensions.

\$1M is set as a "minimum" amount expended to decide if a project has been sufficiently invested in, and even that value can be disregarded under certain circumstances. No foundation is provided for this amount and no substantive explanation of what "substantial funds in relation to a project" really means.

They are allowing the sponsors of a project to claim that litigation by opposing parties is an excuse that can be used to explain why they haven't built or spent sufficient funds on a project that they want extended.

The public needs something concrete to rely on. And it's proposed that the Executive Director determines whether or not to disclose requested information, deciding unilaterally if a disclosure is in the public interest. This invests unfair control over the information in an administrator who may not even be qualified to make such legally important decisions. The public needs to take part in DRBC decisions but without access to information, we can't do that effectively. Information is power and we have a right to it.