

Upper Delaware Council
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
January 27, 2026
ZOOM ONLY

Committee Members Present:	Larry Richardson (6:50pm), Jeff Dexter, Al Henry, Aaron Robinson, Harold Roeder, Ginny Dudko, Christine Martin, Cathleen Breen
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff:	Laurie Ramie, Kerry Engelhardt, Stephanie Driscoll
NPS Partners:	Carly Marshall
Guests:	Bill Dudko

The UDC's Project Review Committee held its monthly meeting on Tuesday, January 27, 2026. Vice-chairperson Dexter called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. There was no public comment on the agenda.

Election of Committee Chair and Vice-chair: Dexter nominated Larry Richardson as Project Review Committee Chairperson, seconded by Martin, with the motion carried. G. Dudko nominated Aaron Robinson as Project Review Committee Vice-chair, seconded by Dexter, carried.

Approval of December 16, 2025 Meeting Minutes: A motion by Robinson seconded by Roeder to approve the 12/16 meeting minutes, carried.

Resources and Land Use Specialist Update:

New York State Projects

DRBC Dockets – There were no projects in the State of New York listed on the DRBC's Notice of Applications Received in January.

Town of Delaware

Callicoon Riverside Park – The UDC received checklists and a project plan set for this project on January 21. We will review at our February meeting.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Projects

DRBC Dockets – There were no projects in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania listed on the DRBC's Notice of Applications Received in January.

Damascus Township

Callicoon Bridge – Engelhardt said she made inquiries to Michael Ford at the NYDOT about the status of the condition of the pedestrian crossing. He responded that he has “moved it up the chain.” She heard subsequently from Ford that NYDOT has asked their contractor to install a sandpaper-like material to provide traction along with other safety-enhancing features. A DOT employee walks the pedestrian crossing twice a day to look for any abnormalities. They also met with residents on site and have offered their direct contact information to report any future issues.

Lackawaxen Township

Masthope Wastewater Treatment Plant – Engelhardt has made inquiries to Lackawaxen Township about the Masthope WWTP remediation plan and will keep the PR committee informed when she hears back.

Open Substantial Conformance Reviews

Project ID	Project Name	Municipality	Action	Status
2025-04	Golden Horde Farm and Campground	Cochecton, NY	Class II – Site Plan	NPS concurs with finding of substantial conformance.
2025-07	Sorochynskj Dog Kennel	Damascus, PA	Class II – Conditional Use Permit	Recommendation of substantial conformance sent to NPS on 1/12.
2026-01	Open Space & Recreation Plan, and Natural Resources Inventory	Tusten, NY	Local Plan Review	To be discussed tonight.
2026-02	Rutman Conditional Use	Lackawaxen, PA	Class II – Conditional Use and Variance	To be discussed tonight.
2026-03	Callicoon Riverside Park	Delaware, NY	Class II – Governmental Applicant	To be discussed at February PR meeting.

Additional Comments:

Golden Horde Farm and Campground – The project will be heard at the January 2026 meeting which will be held this Thursday, January 29th. The UDC received a letter from a property neighbor included in tonight’s packet. That person is concerned about changes happening from the campground’s development. Ramie said we should respond to the individual to acknowledge the letter and Engelhardt agreed.

Tusten Open Space and Recreation Plan – To be reviewed for Substantial Conformance in order to release the TAG funds. A public hearing was held December 9, 2025 and no comments from the public were received that would require revision. The Town Board was expected to adopt the plan at the January 13, 2026 meeting, however Engelhardt said she has not received confirmation of that from the Town of Tusten. Breen indicated that the adoption had taken place.

FY 2025 Technical Assistance Grants

Applicant	Project Description	Award	Project Status
2025-01 Town of Tusten	Pt II of Open Space and Recreation Plan Development	\$9,740	Contract extended until plan is adopted by town.

Additional Comments:

Town of Tusten – See above.

FY 2026 Technical Assistance Grants

Applicant	Project Description	Award	Project Status
2026-01 Town of Tusten	Zoning Revisions	\$3,000	Signed contract returned
2026-02 Town of Delaware	Callicoon Crosswalk Study	\$3,000	Project Completion form submitted
2026-03 Damascus Township	ADA Website	\$3,000	Signed contract returned

We have received the completion documents and a copy of the Crosswalk Study from the Town of Delaware for TAG26-02. The mid-term progress reports for TAG26-01 and TAG26-03 are due by February 20, 2026.

Land Use Complaints

UDC Tusten representative Breen noted that the street lights on the PA side of the Darbytown/Narrowsburg Bridge are not lit at night. Engelhardt reached out to PennDOT to let them know, and Gary Borgacci, Civil Engineer Manager, responded that he had passed the concern along to the folks that oversee the signing and lighting contractor

New Business:

Substantial Conformance Review 2026-01: Tusten Open Space and Recreation Plan: Engelhardt said she has reviewed the plan in detail and hoped that committee members had at an opportunity to look through the narrative sections and maps. The plan is a very comprehensive and well-planned document developed over the course of 2024 and 2025 with a great deal of thought and effort.

Engelhardt said the plan seeks to balance protection of the town's water quality, open spaces, and plant and animal habitats with economic activities that help conserve Tusten's scenic and rural character. The plan also aims to create new opportunities for public access to land and water in order to expand recreational and educational opportunities for both residents and visitors. The introduction includes discussion of the Delaware River and the role of the UDC, and she felt that this was done very well. She suggested that throughout the plan it would be helpful to mention the UDC more consistently where appropriate, particularly since many of the proposed projects are located along the river. When the plan discusses implementation of projects, it would be useful to explicitly note that projects within the river corridor would require substantial conformance review by both the UDC and the NPS.

Regarding proposed public enhancements to Fireman's Field, Engelhardt said any work undertaken there would be considered a Class II significant project, as it would involve a facility constructed or operated by a governmental entity. The plan also mentions the possibility of expanded fishing access at Fireman's Field, which she said she would return to later in her comments.

Another project discussed was the Narrowsburg Riverwalk, envisioned as a walkway below the Narrowsburg–Darbytown Bridge that would wrap around below the Tusten Cup. This area is very close to the river and clearly within the river corridor, making it subject to substantial conformance review. The project is within the floodplain, which would further limit what could be done at that site and would require careful review by the UDC and the NPS.

Turning to the former Boy Scout lands, Engelhardt said that the plan discusses access improvements to the Ten Mile River access. TMR has been discussed many times in the past, particularly regarding whether it should remain primarily a river rest stop, as it functions now, or whether it should be improved to accommodate full trailer and boat access. The UDC would definitely need to be involved in any discussions related to changes at that site. The plan also references additional fishing access points in several locations.

Engelhardt then addressed other priorities outlined in the plan, including new swimming opportunities in the Delaware River for youth. Swimming in the Upper Delaware River can be dangerous. She read language from the National Park Service website noting that there are no designated or lifeguarded swimming areas within the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River, and that the river includes swift currents, rapids, eddies, sudden drop-offs, slippery rocks, and floating or submerged debris. Most drownings along the Upper Delaware River are swimming-related. She acknowledged that people do swim in the river and suggested that if swimming is already occurring and likely to continue, there may be opportunities for signage, programming, or other measures to improve safety. The NPS and the UDC would need to be involved in any such efforts.

The UDC is listed first among ongoing and potential partners. She suggested that this would be an appropriate place to include a more explicit description of the UDC's role in making recommendations on substantial conformance to the NPS for projects located within the river corridor. While the NPS is mentioned later in the partnerships section, Engelhardt expressed that she would like to see a more robust description of its role as well.

With regard to programming, the plan states an intention to work with the UDC, referencing the Upper Delaware BioBlitz. She clarified that while one UDC representative serves on the BioBlitz steering committee, the event itself is a broader collaborative effort, and suggested that the plan could be revised to reflect that distinction more accurately.

Engelhardt then turned to Section 5.3 of the plan, which addresses open space and natural resource protection and proposes development of a GIS mapping tool. She suggested that tool could also show the boundaries of the Upper

Delaware River Corridor, though that can be tricky, as using green shading on maps can sometimes give the impression that land is publicly accessible, which is not always the case. Even so, she felt that delineating the river corridor on the map would be useful.

Engelhardt said that throughout the plan there are several suggestions for new or expanded river access points for fishing, or kayak and canoe launches. She referenced recent comments by Henry at a previous meeting regarding the River Management Plan (RMP) and its provisions related to facilities. She had quoted an excerpt from the RMP in her report and noted that it is somewhat unclear whether the plan would need to be amended if a township were to purchase land along the river. The RMP specifically addresses facilities owned by federal or state entities, and it would require discussion to determine how township ownership would be treated. Leasing land would likely be permissible without triggering a plan amendment, but projects of this nature would require discussion and review by both the UDC and the NPS.

In conclusion, the Open Space and Recreation Plan clearly reflects a great deal of planning and work and is an impressive and comprehensive document. She recommended that the town make a number of relatively small revisions, specifically adding references to the review processes required by the UDC and the NPS. If those changes were made, she indicated that she believed the plan would substantially conform, but that the revisions should occur first. She asked whether Marshall had identified any additional issues that had not already been discussed.

Marshall responded that she did not see any issues, but noted that one recommendation on page 60 stood out to her. That recommendation called for strengthening partnerships and improving communication channels with Delaware River stakeholders, including the Delaware River Basin Commission, NPS, Delaware Highlands Conservancy, UDC, various New York agencies, the Boy Scouts, The Conservation Fund, the Scenic Byway, and Sullivan County. She was curious about what public comment or concern that recommendation was responding to, and added that she felt the UDC is in a primary position to help the Town of Tusten meet those goals.

Engelhardt agreed, stating that she hoped the town viewed the UDC as a true partner and not simply as a funding source for development of the plan. Working collaboratively throughout implementation, rather than only submitting projects for substantial conformance review after the fact, would be beneficial.

Ramie noted at 6:56pm that Richardson had joined the meeting and explained that the committee was in the midst of the substantial conformance review. Richardson apologized for joining late and took over leading it. Martin asked whether the plan discussed funding sources for the many projects proposed. Engelhardt said that she did not recall specific funding being identified, and Marshall clarified that while the plan does include a section on funding, it only discusses potential funding sources and does not identify earmarked funds. Martin asked whether the plan prioritized projects. Engelhardt responded that she did not believe there was a clearly defined priority list, other than the order in which projects were presented.

Breen said that she serves on the Conservation Advisory Council and was one of the authors of the plan. She described the document as a visionary plan intended to guide how the town does and does not want to develop in the future, emphasizing conservation of open space and protection of water quality. The plan is intended to help advise the Planning Board as it reviews future projects.

Engelhardt said that she would send the comments back to the Town of Tusten. Ramie asked whether the document should go to the NPS first, given the usual substantial conformance process, noting that this situation was somewhat unusual because the plan was developed as a TAG project. Engelhardt said that she viewed the comments as more in the nature of suggestions and noted that with other zoning-related efforts there is often some back-and-forth with the municipality before proceeding to formal substantial conformance recommendation. Ramie said that the Project Review Committee has the authority to transmit comments directly to the town, which is why the full council relies on the committee for this type of review. Martin made a motion to send the document back to the town with the committee's comments, seconded by Dexter. The motion carried unanimously, with Breen abstaining.

Substantial Conformance Review 2026-02: Summer Recreation for Children Conditional Use (Lackawaxen):

Engelhardt explained that this review involved an existing campground in Lackawaxen Township that has been operating since the 1930s. The facility has been working through renovations over the past year or two. This year, they are looking to reconstruct a staff sleeping cabin. The property is located at 445 Masthope Plank Road with the river to the east and the railroad to the west and low-density residential development on the far side of the railroad. The parcel tapers at the top and bottom, and the staff cabin project is located at the very south end of the property.

The existing staff sleeping cabin is roughly 70 feet by 56 feet. It is not a clean rectangle but an odd shape. That building has been there since the 1930s. Engelhardt attended the conditional use hearing where the applicant explained that part of the existing building is unusable and the remainder is generally in poor condition. The applicant's plan is to demolish the old structure and start fresh, reconstructing a new building in the same location.

Engelhardt said the proposed new staff cabin would be 70 feet by 70 feet—slightly larger than what is there now, but still in the same spot. The proposal also includes construction of a new septic system. The necessary testing has already been conducted and the results looked good, but emphasized that the septic system design would still need to be formally approved.

In terms of proximity and why the review was before the committee, Engelhardt said the staff building is located approximately 329 feet from the Upper Delaware River. The new building would be about five to six feet higher than the existing building, and she believed that was the primary reason it had come up for review. She reminded the committee that Lackawaxen Township's ordinance requires a Conditional Use Permit if new construction can be seen from the river. The township had amended its zoning a year or two ago so that single-family homes no longer need conditional use approval, but because this project is commercial, a Conditional Use Permit is required.

Engelhardt said the building location is on a small "peninsula" of land that is just barely outside the flood hazard zone. The building would be constructed a foot and a half above the base flood elevation. They had obtained a flood certificate demonstrating compliance. The flood certificate was included in the submission documents she had distributed via email a couple weeks earlier. She has not received architectural drawings as part of the submission to the committee, but the applicant did bring them to the hearing and she reviewed them there. The application materials describe the exterior as using earth tone, low-intensity colors consistent with other cabins at the facility. She expects the color to be far less visually harsh than the existing building, which is orange. The structure would be a single-story building, though it would be raised somewhat, which would contribute to the overall increase in height. The project is located within a scenic segment rather than a recreational segment, but the campground has existed for nearly 100 years and is a long-established use at the site.

Engelhardt said the camp typically has about 500 children at a time, and that from aerial imagery you can see recreational amenities such as a baseball field and basketball courts. At one time the camp accommodated 700 children and reported having 108 staff. There are four synagogues on site. Campers are in study most of the day and afternoons are devoted to other activities.

Henry asked if water had encroached upon the old structure during the floods of 2004 and 2006 and whether anyone involved in the approvals had looked into that. Engelhardt said she did not know and that it had not been raised at the hearing. The proposal calls for the structure to be raised a foot and a half above base flood elevation, and that is essentially what can be required. Henry said he was asking because if there had been significant flooding then a foot and a half of elevation change would not necessarily address the bigger exposure, and he observed that the camp area is quite flat. If the water got up onto that section, the height would be similar throughout.

Martin asked whether the new septic was a system they did not have before. Engelhardt confirmed that they would be installing a whole new system for this building. Martin asked where exactly it would be placed, and whether it would be directly beside the river or otherwise too close. Engelhardt explained that it would be located just south of the building, at approximately the same distance from the river as the building itself—over 300 feet. She pulled up the site plan to show and clarify.

Richardson asked whether the building was clearly visible from the river, and Engelhardt said she was not entirely sure. Based on the aerial imagery, she did not think it would be clearly visible, and she noted that her report included the aerial view. She said there appeared to be significant trees between the river and the building. When she spoke with Marshall, she noted that the NPS recommends landscaping/plantings if visibility becomes an issue.

Henry described the site as being on a "single bank" and that if someone drives down Route 97 and looks across the river, the location is on the Pennsylvania side north of Lackawaxen. He estimated there is roughly 40 to 50 feet of elevation from normal summer flows up to the top of that bank. Based on that, he said you likely would not see the building in normal summer flows. He added that in a flood year like 2006, water levels might be right up near the building, but under normal summer conditions it would not be visible from the water. He said you might be able to see it from Route 97 because the vantage point is comparable in height.

Martin circled back because she still wanted clarification on the sewage system. Henry commented that sewage review should be handled by the state and the sewage enforcement officer. Engelhardt agreed, and showed Martin

via screenshare the site plan. Martin asked about the camp's capacity, noting Engelhardt's earlier comment that there are roughly 500 children every summer and asking whether that represented normal capacity or whether capacity was increasing. She wondered whether reconstructing the staff cabin suggested an increase in staff and, if so, whether that meant capacity would increase and whether other developments were planned alongside that.

Engelhardt said that she did not believe the number of staff was increasing. The applicant described their current typical camper count as around 500 at a time and the figure of 700 campers reflected a peak from years ago, not necessarily recent numbers. Engelhardt referred to the existing building as a dark area on the site plan and the proposed new building as a larger square, and she identified the proposed septic bed on the plan. Martin asked how many feet the septic bed would be from the river. Engelhardt said that if the new building is 329 feet from the river, then the septic bed would be even farther than that. Martin acknowledged she was not a septic expert and asked where the septic had been previously and whether it was in a new location. Engelhardt said she was not sure where the existing septic was located, but over 300 feet is a sufficient buffer and she did not believe it would have an impact on the river, particularly given the elevation difference that Henry had described. Engelhardt said the septic bed would likely be in a slightly different location because you generally would not put it in the exact same spot, but she did not see the placement as problematic.

Martin also asked where 500 children actually stay—whether tents were involved or if they are housed in cabins. Engelhardt said that the campers stay in cabins. The site plan being viewed did not show the entire camp layout, but she described the camp as having many group cabins. The cabin numbering—cabin 27, cabin 28, cabin 29—gives a sense of how many cabins exist. Some staff sleep in the camper cabins to supervise, while the staff cabin being replaced is intended for staff who are not counselors, giving them their own separate space.

Robinson noted that coincidentally Shohola has been looking at zoning modifications related to summer camps, and he said that children's camps in Pennsylvania are highly regulated. Camps must meet strict standards, operate under a permit, and are subject to significant accountability regarding their operation.

Henry said that when the plan was enlarged, he saw references to "future replacement cabins," and he asked if there had been any discussion about those. Engelhardt said she did not think those would trigger review by the UDC because they appear to be replacement of existing cabins, just potentially in a slightly different spot.

Robinson recalled that around 2009, under another name, there had been work to replace deteriorated cabins. He remembered reading about it in the *River Reporter* and suggested it might have been a predecessor to the current operator. The buildings are old and it makes sense that the facility would need to continue upgrading.

Engelhardt recommends a finding of substantial conformance to the NPS. A motion by Roeder to send Summer Recreation for Children (conditional use) to the full council for approval, seconded by G. Dudko carried.

Other: Ramie said that she had received an email earlier in the day from Eric Gebhart, the Legislative Director for Congressman Rob Bresnahan in Pennsylvania. Gebhart had obtained her contact information through New York Congressman Pat Ryan's office and reached out to her about the Bresnahan office's idea of extending the Section 566 program to include the Upper Delaware River Basin. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) includes a Section 566 program that provides federal assistance to communities through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The program supports projects involving environmental infrastructure, resource protection, and development. Under the program, non-federal interests can receive design and construction assistance from the Army Corps, but only if their region is included under the act's authorized coverage. Eligibility is tied to being part of the program's defined geographic area.

The WRDA originally authorized the program for southeastern Pennsylvania, and it included five counties. In 1999 the program's authority was expanded to include environmental restoration. In 2022 the authority was expanded again to add the lower Delaware River Basin by including the Schuylkill Valley Watershed, Upper Estuary, Lower Estuary, and the Delaware Bay. The current proposal would be to amend Section 566 to expand the program's coverage to include the Upper Delaware River region and would specifically include the Upper Delaware subwatershed, the Lackawaxen subwatershed, the Lehigh subwatershed, and the Middle Delaware subwatershed. This proposal as described would only involve Pennsylvania townships, since Congressman Bresnahan is a Pennsylvania congressman and the effort is coming from his office. What Gebhart was asking from the UDC was whether they were aware of the program and what their reaction to the proposal would be. He had provided a fact sheet and examples of projects that have benefited from Army Corps involvement through this program. He also

asked whether the idea had ever been floated in the region before, and Ramie told him not to her knowledge but that it sounded like an interesting opportunity.

Because the UDC takes direction from its municipal members, she did not want to respond unilaterally. She told Gebhart she would poll the municipal members for their reaction and to determine whether they would want to be involved. However, the request would need feedback by Friday when submissions are due. Despite the short turnaround, she told Gebhart she would bring it to the committee that evening, and her proposal would be to do a straw poll of the five Pennsylvania member townships to see whether they were supportive of legislation being drafted to add the Upper Delaware watershed to the program. Her personal opinion after reviewing the fact sheet was that it appears entirely positive. It would simply offer the opportunity for communities to take advantage of the program if they chose to, and it would not obligate or mandate any participation.

Richardson said that based on what he was hearing, it sounded positive and he did not see why any communities would want to be excluded from something that could provide access to assistance and resources. Robinson agreed that it should be looked at carefully because it involves the townships and it would be appropriate to apprise elected officials. He acknowledged that it made sense, but they don't have a lot of time to review it. He would be willing to read it over and call one of the Shohola supervisors to get a sense of how they felt about it. Ramie said that she had already sent the information to all of the Pennsylvania township representatives earlier today, so they should have the fact sheet and her correspondence with the legislative director in their email. Because of the time sensitivity, she copied the township supervisors as well.

Henry asked for clarification on the deadline. Ramie said Friday. Henry reacted to the short turnaround, noting that Tuesday to Friday is essentially two days. He expressed concern that it was unrealistic to expect to make a decision that quickly. Townships typically want to bring matters like this up at an official meeting and discuss whether they want to participate. Was there any way to request an extension in light of the late notice? Ramie said that an extension was probably not possible. The last line of Gebhart's message said WRDA submissions were due to the committee by Friday, and even "tomorrow, if possible." Henry asked when Ramie had received the message, and she replied that it came in at 12:37 p.m. today. Henry said that gave them less than three days; they should push back and say that towns and townships cannot responsibly decide something like this in three days, particularly when people have not had time to read the materials.

Richardson asked whether there was any kind of opt-out built into the legislation, meaning, if a region joins now, could a municipality decide later that it is not in their interest. Ramie said she did not get the impression that this is an opt-in/opt-out situation by municipality. It appears to be structured by geographic region, so the program would simply be offered to the Upper Delaware communities within the defined area. Gebhart's email seemed aligned with that concept as well: he was essentially saying that more avenues for Upper Delaware communities to access Army Corps support for water-related projects would be a good thing.

Martin asked whether this is an annual process, wondering whether it could come back next year. Ramie said that it is not an annual thing; it began in 1996 and the only way it changes is if legislation is introduced to expand it—exactly as has been done over time to add more communities. Richardson said it still sounded like a good opportunity, but the committee should defer to the Pennsylvania members and go with whatever their recommendation is. Richardson said to send it out, contact the townships, and see where it goes from there.

Old Business:

Technical Assistance Grant TAG2025-01 (Tusten) Project Completion: Englehardt said that this is tied to completion of Tusten's Open Space and Recreation Plan. The town had submitted the plan and she believed the first version had already been adopted, although Deputy Supervisor Jane Luchsinger had not yet gotten back to her to confirm that detail. A small number of revisions were being requested as part of the Substantial Conformance Review discussion earlier in the meeting. She asked whether the committee wanted to release the TAG funds now, or wait until the revisions were made and a recommendation of substantial conformance was formally issued. Richardson asked whether the board had an overall sense of how they wanted to proceed. Ramie reminded the committee that the \$9,740 check had already been written and is sitting in the UDC safe, pending the committee's approval of the project.

Henry asked whether the town had approved the plan? Engelhardt said that the town had asked her whether there were any major changes needed, and she had told them no, while also making it clear that the Project Review Committee had not yet formally weighed in at that point. Henry said that the plan contained many open-ended ideas, including potential development at Ten Mile River and swimming areas along the river. He referenced earlier discussion about funding and questioned whether those elements were fully thought through. Engelhardt said that this is the nature of an open space and recreation plan—it is not a list of specific projects, but rather a comprehensive, guiding document that outlines ideas and priorities over time. Henry said that he personally found the document confusing, given the wide range of ideas presented, but this is the town's plan and ultimately something they will have to work through themselves.

Ramie reminded the committee that their task in this vote was limited to determining whether the town had fulfilled the terms of the TAG contract. The question before them was not whether they agreed with every element of the plan, but whether the contractual requirements of the grant had been met. Henry agreed and reiterated that one of the conditions the committee had discussed previously was making sure the town itself had formally approved the plan. Ramie asked Breen to confirm whether the town had approved it. Breen indicated that the town had approved the plan.

A motion by Henry, seconded by Martin, to send the payment approval of Tusten's Open Space and Recreation Plan 2025 Technical Assistance Grant to Operations Committee, carried.

Technical Assistance Grant TAG2026-02 (Delaware) Project Completion: Engelhardt said that Delaware had completed its pedestrian crossing, or crosswalk, study for the hamlet of Callicoon. She had circulated the completed study to committee members by email. The study identified several potential locations for pedestrian crossings within the hamlet. The consultants evaluated multiple options, ultimately proposing four primary crosswalk locations and identifying one additional alternate location. One potential location had been ruled out due to insufficient sight lines. She said the Town of Delaware had fulfilled the requirements of the TAG contract. They submitted all required vouchers documenting what they paid their consulting engineer for the project, and she described the final report as thorough and comprehensive.

A motion by Henry, seconded by Martin, to send the payment approval of Delaware's Cross Walk Study 2026 Technical Assistance Grant to Operations Committee, carried.

AI Data Centers Information: Richardson suggested adding this topic to next month's agenda, as it will likely be a lengthy discussion. Everyone agreed.

UDC2022-03 Camp FIMFO: Letter From NPS: Comments on Project FEIS: Engelhardt said that this discussion related to the letter submitted by the NPS in December which contained its formal comments on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The Town of Highland is still working through that document.

Marshall said that a significant portion of the NPS comments focused on the emergency and flood evacuation plan. The town had previously indicated it was seeking outside experts to review that plan and had encountered difficulty finding appropriate reviewers. NPS staff met with USGS to discuss concerns related to the evacuation strategy, particularly the reliance on river gauge readings—specifically referencing the gauge located above Barryville—and the implications of using river height as the primary trigger for evacuation decisions. The feedback received from USGS was shared with the town and incorporated into the broader set of comments. Beyond the evacuation and flood-related concerns, the remainder of the comments largely reiterated positions that NPS had previously raised.

Larry asked whether there was anything specific in the Park Service's letter that the committee needed to bring up for further discussion at that time. Ramie said that we were simply sharing this letter that we did not have at the last meeting on 12/16 as a handout. Martin said she found it very enlightening that the discussion around Camp FIMFO was now more open. She said it was helpful to see the NPS perspective and how the issues had evolved as the DEIS continued to be discussed. She was particularly struck by recommendations related to limiting or eliminating concrete pads, which she described as a significant shift from earlier versions of the proposal. She also emphasized the importance of the evacuation plans, saying that in her view there had been substantial gaps in the DEIS regarding how evacuations would actually occur. She expressed appreciation that the NPS had taken a close look at flood risks and had recommended, consistent with the Town of Highland's position, that buildings be evacuated in

advance of storms that meet certain flood-risk thresholds. She acknowledged that these recommendations would likely be very challenging for the applicant to implement, particularly given the number of buildings involved and the time frames that had been discussed. She feels it is important for the committee to continue paying close attention to the issues raised in the letter, not only for the current review but also for future situations when similar issues arise, as they inevitably will.

Summary of 2025 Substantial Conformance Reviews: Engelhardt said there is a handout in tonight's packet of a summary of 2025 Substantial Conformance Reviews. Richardson thanked Engelhardt for putting this together.

NPS Comments on 2023-2024 Code Enforcement Report: Engelhardt said the comments from Marshall's review were largely focused on clarity and consistency. The main issue was determining exactly what should be counted and reported in the enforcement summaries. A very large number of building permits recorded by municipalities, many of which involve minor items such as electrical upgrades. While those permits are valid and properly issued, they do not all need to be captured in the enforcement report for UDC purposes. The review process was primarily about making sure she was applying the same criteria across all municipalities—deciding what types of permits and enforcement actions should be included and reported, and ensuring that those decisions were applied consistently from one municipality to the next. The goal was to improve clarity and comparability in the report rather than to change its overall substance. She said that she would go back through the report and make the necessary revisions and corrections based on the feedback received.

Richardson said sometimes towns say "You want information? I'll give you everything I have, and you can sort it out." While that can be challenging from a reporting standpoint, it is still better to have more information than less. Engelhardt agreed.

Other: None.

Public Comment: None.

Adjournment: A motion moved by G. Dudko, seconded by Henry to adjourn at 7:46 p.m. carried.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Driscoll, 1/30/2026