

**Upper Delaware Council**  
**PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2019**

Committee Members Present: Larry Richardson, Jim Greier, Harold Roeder, Jr., Fred Peckham,  
David Dean, Al Henry, Jeff Dexter, Aaron Robinson, Susan  
Sullivan

Committee Members Absent: Debra Conway

Staff : Laurie Ramie, Pete Golod, Ashley Hall-Bagdonas

NPS Partner: Marilou Ehrler, Carla Hauser-Hahn, Jennifer Claster

Guests: Roger Saumure – Shohola alternate, Laine Rubin- NPS

The UDC's Project Review Committee held its monthly meeting on Tuesday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at the Council office in Narrowsburg, NY. Chairperson Richardson called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. There was no public comment on the agenda.

**Approval of May 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes:** A motion by Roeder seconded by Robinson to approve the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes was carried. There was no public comment on the agenda.

Hauser-Hahn announced her retirement to the committee from NPS after 39 years. Her last official day is 8/3 but she will not be working after 7/3 as she has a lot of accrued vacation time to use. She will not officially be at UDC representing NPS in the future. If she is at UDC, she will be representing herself and her area. There are two things Hauser-Hahn wanted to see through before she left. One is the Substantial Conformance and Project Review GIS tool that will be available for all municipalities. The second project is the Project Review Guide and Hauser-Hahn said that is almost ready.

**Resource Specialist's Update:**

New York:

**Town of Delaware:** Golod reported that the Public Service Commission has approved the sale of the Callicoon Water Co. to the Town who entered into a per year agreement with JPK Environmental Services to operate and maintain the Callicoon Water District. Recently the Town Board approved a resolution of support for Sullivan County Industrial Development Agency PILOT projects. The IDA approved \$400,000 in tax breaks for four solar projects in the Town, with each project receiving up to \$100,000, with up to \$70,000 from sales and tax exemptions, and up to \$30,000 from mortgage tax exemptions.

**Town of Tusten:** On 4/23 Golod presented a substantial conformance review of the Town's draft zoning and subdivision law amendments. On 6/14 Golod met with Town Supervisor Wingert and Planning Consultant Manning to go over the Substantial Conformance review which consists of a review of the Land and Water Use Guidelines Principles and Objectives, and a comparison of the Town's Schedule of District Regulations against the LWUG's Schedule of Uses. Both the Supervisor and Planner agreed with many of the issues presented during the review. Changes were made to the draft ordinance amendments and the schedule of uses/ schedule of district regulations. Once the revised amendments are adopted Golod will perform a final substantial conformance review and present it to the Project Review Committee to make a recommendation to the full Council.

**Town of Highland:** On 6/10 per the full Council's request Golod mailed Highland Alternate Representative Boyar a packet including the UDC's final substantial conformance review and all communications (electronic and hard copy) between the Town and the UDC. He is awaiting direction from Boyar regarding the next steps with the Town.

**Town of Lumberland:** On 4/15 UDC received the Town of Lumberland's Proposed Local Law #1, "A Local Law Amending the Zoning Law of the Town of Lumberland, Sullivan County, New York". The proposed law changed the zoning designation of two parcels, SBL 28.-1-28 and SBL 28.-1-30. As of 4/11 the two lots have been zoned and designated River Hamlet District (RH) which had formerly been located in the Hillside District (HD), and the Black Forest District (BFD). Golod asked the committee to refer to the double-sided handout provided in the

meeting packet which is a Google maps view of the area being discussed with the other side providing the tax maps of the parcels. On page 117 of the Land and Water Use Guidelines under Hamlet Areas it states “Each town, having one or more of the hamlets identified in these guidelines within its borders, shall be given the opportunity to determine the hamlet’s precise boundary. This determination shall be guided by the criterion that areas within the hamlet should have an existing density of at least one dwelling unit (or equivalent dwelling unit) per two acres, unless the area is surrounded or bordered on several sides by land developed at such densities and would constitute a logical infill area taking into account the existing pattern of development. New development proposed should be encouraged in areas capable of accommodating uses without adversely impacting or degrading the values for which the Upper Delaware has been designated as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The boundaries proposed for each hamlet shall be adopted as amendments to the Land and Water Use Guidelines, pursuant to §704(b)(2) of the Upper Delaware Special Provisions.” Golod said NPS feels this zoning requires a Substantial Conformance Review. Golod is requesting guidance from the Project Review Committee regarding this issue as he feels it doesn’t rise to the level of Substantial Conformance Review. He stated again, the boundaries proposed for each hamlet shall be adopted as amendments to the Guidelines.

Hauser-Hahn said for the committee’s consideration this is a change to zoning via an ordinance amendment and it would rise to the level of a Substantial Conformance Review. Greier asked how many acres were in lot 28? Golod said it totals 18.74 acres all together. One parcel is 15.64 and the other is 3.1. Golod said it is owned by the individuals that own Jerry’s Three Rivers. Golod did a site check a few weeks back and if you specifically look at sub lot 28 it is pretty much all steep slope and fairly undevelopable. Robinson said he believes the camping area includes a good part of that because it goes along the old Towpath. Claster said the question isn’t whether it substantially conforms but whether there should be a Substantial Conformance Review done of the Zoning Map. Hauser-Hahn said in accordance with the River Management Plan (RMP), Ordinance Amendments are supposed to be reviewed for substantial conformance. Saumure said when you change the zoning to Hamlet a lot more uses are allowed. Golod said the question that he has is how do you perform the substantial conformance review for a zoning designation change? Saumure said if you had Hamlet Zoning in a Zoning Ordinance then UDC would not call that into question in a Substantial Conformance Review. It’s the use that’s going to trigger any review, said Saumure. Claster said you might tell them you can’t do it because the Hamlets are supposed to be denser. There’s a description of what characteristics the Hamlets have. Henry asked if all of the lots upstream of the red in the map provided are in the Hamlet? Golod said yes, that’s why they want to join those two parcels. Henry asked if everything meets the definition and zoning and Substantial Conformance to be a Hamlet? Golod said yes. Claster said again, this is not about if the change conforms. This is about whether the change requires a review by the UDC. Hauser-Hahn said she thinks the first question is, should it be reviewed? Henry said if it bounds a Hamlet and the Hamlet meets the criteria of the RMP that would aid the committee in a decision. Hauser-Hahn said she hears what he’s saying but it hasn’t been reviewed for Substantial Conformance yet. The committee is talking about whether it needs to be or not. She and Claster are saying it does and Golod is saying he doesn’t know. Richardson said his opinion is it does require a review because it’s a change in their existing zoning. That’s the way you need to look at it, not if there’s any proposed or imaginary project that might be in there. Peckham asked if UDC has ever challenged anything to do with Hamlets? Hauser-Hahn said the guidelines say Hamlets are supposed to be designated by the Town or Township and recorded. That hasn’t been done by UDC or NPS. Hauser-Hahn quoted page 117 of the RMP: “The boundaries proposed for each hamlet shall be adopted as amendments to the Land and Water Use Guidelines, pursuant to §704(b)(2) of the Upper Delaware Special Provisions.” Discussion ensued. She said the question is whether the committee is going to review what they’ve done for Substantial Conformance. A Motion by Henry to perform a Substantial Conformance review on Town of Lumberland’s Proposed Local Law #1 seconded by Greier carried with one abstention by Peckham. Golod said he will have that for the Committee next month.

### Pennsylvania

**Damascus Township:** On 11/28 Golod received the final DRAFT copy of the East Central Wayne County Comprehensive Plan Update Township Review. A Substantial Conformance review was conducted and completed for the Township’s Comprehensive Plan Update. On 1/22 Golod presented the Substantial Conformance review for the Project Review Committee also done in conjunction with Oregon Township and Manchester Township. Upon Golod’s review, the Committee found the draft Plan Update adhered to the principles and objectives of the River Management Plan’s Land and Water Use Guidelines, and voted for an initial recommendation of Substantial Conformance to be made by the full Council pending no changes are made once it is adopted by the Township. On 2/7 the UDC met and approved the recommendation of Substantial Conformance for Damascus Township’s draft

East Central Wayne County Comprehensive Plan Update to the NPS. On 6/19 Golod attended the Township's monthly Supervisor's meeting where a Public Hearing was held followed by the adoption of the ECWC. Upon the Project Review Committee's approval of the UDC's letter to Township, Golod will then submit the entire Substantial Conformance Review Packet to NPS Superintendent Heister. A draft copy of this letter was provided in the meeting packet. Hauser-Hahn asked if Golod did a follow-up review to see if there were changes or amendments from what he reviewed until now? Golod said he spoke with the Township Supervisor and the Planning Consultant. Hauser-Hahn asked if he read the document; the committee hasn't seen anything. She said she was confused about that and asked how it was approved in February when they didn't have a hearing until June? Golod said when he attended the Supervisors meeting on 6/19 what they adopted was the Amended Draft Plan for which the UDC had done a Substantial Conformance Review and that is the final. The changes regarding Substantial Conformance were made and Golod was told by the Township Supervisor and the Planning Consultant that other than those changes, no other changes had been made. He does not have a copy of the Final Adopted Plan. It has not been printed until Oregon Township adopts their part of the plan, which will be next month. Saumure asked Golod to verify that they made the changes they said they were going to do and Golod agreed to do so. The letter will be deferred.

**NYDOT Rt.97 Work:** Starting around 7/8 NYDOT will begin recycling Rt. 97 from Narrowsburg to Minisink. The work is expected to take two work weeks at which point asphalt overlay will be placed down.

**Project Review Guide:** UDC & NPS would like to conduct a small workshop with interested Project Review Committee members to discuss one aspect of the Guide which the RMP and LWUG do not provide detailed guidance on regarding the timeframe for substantial conformance reviews. Claster, Ehrler, Ramie and Golod will be attending. Claster and Golod have discussed this extensively about when does the clock start; he believes upon receipt of application. In a recent conversation with Claster he said that puts the municipalities at a disadvantage. He's not saying they don't do the groundwork as they've done with Damascus, as they are doing with Tusten. They work to try to get them in conformance as much as possible, but the clock doesn't officially start until they adopt. Hauser-Hahn started asking the question about the timeline because she's thinking there's a possibility when the original handbook says 45 days, that doesn't apply anymore and we are putting everyone under really tight constraints that might not be necessary. Originally, UDC had 45 days to review and NPS had 45 days to review. If that's not necessary that takes a lot of pressure off of everybody. Hauser-Hahn said in some cases they didn't submit to the Regional Director because they would need to review it, send it, and get it back from the Regional Director within that timeframe. Claster said they're talking about Substantial Conformance of the laws, plans and ordinances. It's become apparent today, many of the reviews that are done are amendments of existing ordinances and there is no timeframe in any of the documents that Golod and Claster use going back to the RMP for that case. Saumure said if there is no timeframe, things just drag on forever. Sullivan said when a Town Planning Board is reviewing in New York they have to send it to the County, do a 239 form and meet a deadline and they need to know when things are due and when they can expect an answer. Hauser-Hahn talked about the importance of having a relationship with the Towns and Townships. When they are preparing to redo their zoning they should let UDC know or UDC should find out and be a partner with them as they rewrite their zoning to help assure what they come up with conforms with the Land and Water Use Guidelines. Then when it is submitted for review the committee can say with confidence say "they've done their best". Frequently what happens now is Golod and Claster review and tell them what is wrong. Robinson said leaving out time constraints would be foolish because it doesn't give any party any guidance. From a Township standpoint, the Town would be aware that there's an element of time for the UDC to review as well as NPS. Whether you think 45 days it too short or not, it should be known in the guide and there should be a drop-dead date. Golod and Ramie are willing to work with everyone's schedule. This workshop would be during the day. Golod will check with Claster for the best date for NPS and send an email out to the committee. If you would like to attend please respond to Golod. If not Golod will have an update next month.

**Resource Specialist's Update:** On 6/6 and 6/20 Golod met with NPS Land Use Planner Jennifer Claster to continue work on project review issues. On 6/24 Golod registered and attended session 1 of Pace University's Local Land Use Law Training. Session 2 will be held on 6/26. Golod is finalizing preparations for a UDC/NPS River Management Plan/Land and Water Use Guidelines training session with Sullivan County Planning scheduled for 7/2.

#### **Old Business:**

**Outline of a River Management Plan Supplement:** Ramie provided a handout of a conceptual outline of a River

Management Plan Supplement. UDC talked about methodologies to make changes to the RMP and the Guidelines, when needed, in a way that is consistent. It never says the words “major amendment” in the plan. It says “regular plan revision”. That is the long process that involves going through the same steps it took for designation and authorization in the first place. A secondary option is a minor amendment. The requirements for that are a unanimous vote. A third option is Letters of Interpretation. That isn’t spelled out in the RMP well. It only has two references. That is for any existing policies or provisions in the RMP that you are seeking to know what it means. To Ramie’s knowledge UDC hasn’t done any of those in her 22 years at UDC and yet, there have been changes made to the plan in significant and more subtle ways. Ramie provided background that UDC is assigned the management responsibility to oversee any of these amendments. Therefore she believes it’s UDC’s responsibility to come up with a way to address them in the future if these options seem onerous or not applicable to the situation. On page two Ramie included some observations UDC has had about the changes that have occurred to either the RMP or Guidelines and how that has happened. A big change was the Errata document that is part and parcel with the RMP. That occurred in Sept. 1987, which was before the UDC existed and before Bill Douglass was hired as executive director. Ramie doesn’t know what approval process that went through. As you know, as soon as you finish a document, it’s out of date so it’s not surprising there were certain aspects of the plan that needed to be addressed after it was in print in 1986. The most significant change was about the membership of NPS in saying they are not a member of the UDC. If you look in the content of the plan it says that they are. It also says that the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) is a voting member and that change was done simply by a letter from the DRBC to the Secretary of the Interior at the time. If anyone was reading the plan they wouldn’t know that because that letter isn’t in the appendix or anywhere in the plan to Ramie’s knowledge. It’s in UDC’s bylaws so it is corroborated in other documents. A third example is a vote on a Resolution; this happened in 2015 when an error was discovered in the map of the boundary of Lackawaxen Township. It turned out it involved about 425 acres of property that was shown as being within the corridor that should not have been. The UDC as well as Lackawaxen Township passed resolutions with simple majority votes to say that we were recognizing a different boundary and that too is stuck loose inside the RMP. Ramie referenced the Superintendent’s Compendium. That has happened at least two or three times during Ramie’s time at UDC. Various changes have been made; like no glass on the river, which can be done under the authority of the Superintendent. Do any of those changes involve a deviation from the plan in what was originally there and if so, do they get transmitted for history’s sake? There are also some parts of the plan that have either evolved or changed over time, one being the funding that NPS provides for the law enforcement and trash contracts. It still states in the plan that the money will be provided but clearly we know with the trash in particular that it no longer is. There have been facility changes. The RMP provided that the NPS would construct and operate a major visitor contact facility near the southern terminus of the river at the mouth of the Mongaup River where the majority of visitors enter the river valley. That not only didn’t happen, Superintendent McGuinness said it was not going to happen. Ramie’s sure he had the authority to do that but it contradicts what’s in the plan. None of these decisions were necessarily bad or inappropriate. It’s just showing that over the years the plan has changed.

UDC is now trying to incorporate the conclusions of the renewable energy position paper. One consistent way UDC thought it could be addressed is through a Supplement. This is a brand new concept UDC could look at and work in conjunction with NPS to develop. It’s been since 2016 that UDC has been developing the position paper. The first attempt with the position paper was by Resolution. They had the Resolution drawn up and presented it 9/7/17 and it was kicked back to committee for further discussion. They then discussed the Letter of Interpretation approach and sent a formal letter to NPS 10/25/17. There was a mixed response back from Superintendent Heister who consulted the Solicitor’s Office. Heister stated the conclusions with Hydropower were not necessary to mention because it’s already in the plan, Geothermal and Wind Energy could be addressed through a Letter of Interpretation and regarding Utility-scale Solar, that is where UDC and NPS differed because she opined that is a brand new land use so the Letter of Interpretation is not appropriate in that situation. UDC has yet to finalize that position paper. Ramie said we had conceptually adopted it back in 2017 and reopened it when we got additional information. A revised position paper from August 2018 remains under discussion. Ramie copied the applicable pages from the Land and Water Use Guidelines. It would be a matter of adding certain definitions, revising definitions that exist, such as Power Generating Stations, and on the Schedule of Uses, putting where the Renewable Energy Systems fall. Discussion followed.

Robinson said since it’s almost inevitable that a minor amendment process will fail if the intent is to provide guidance to Towns and Townships on this Renewable Energy. He doesn’t see a downside with the UDC preparing a Supplement with technical information, as it pertains to zoning. Although it doesn’t have the full force of being in the RMP it does accomplish providing member Towns and Townships information as they are still not required to

include that type of zoning in their ordinances. He believes it's a good interim path to take. Shohola Township discussed it because Pennsylvania is changing rapidly with the Governor putting new regulations in effect to facilitate Wind and Solar and the Townships don't know where this will lead. For a township to adopt an ordinance concerning renewables at this point would be premature.

Robinson said he sincerely thinks NPS needs to reevaluate how it perceives the UDC and the Towns and Townships and include some sensitivity to the fact that these are small Towns and Townships. They work closely with their constituency. The elected officials are highly accountable. The mood and the lack of interest changes fast based on irregular actions. Robinson feels NPS is putting itself in a really bad position with the Towns and Townships with its position on Technical Assistance Grants because you are talking about a minimal amount of money for something that was funded in the past which the Towns and Townships felt had merit. UDC isn't talking about high level projects. He knows Shohola needs economic activity. It's disappointing that NPS lacks the sensitivity and he welcomes NPS to come to a Shohola Supervisors meeting so there can be an open discussion about how they view NPS.

Greier feels the committee has talked about this topic for two and a half years and they aren't any further along. The only solution he feels will work is to hire a consultant to guide the committee. Discussion ensued. Ehrler said from a NPS perspective, she thinks it's great that the committee is grappling with the whole issue because it will impact everybody and it will eventually impact the river. The question is how do you do that and it is very clearly in the document that Ramie put together the three methods for revising the plan. Either way you may have to open up the plan. Currently a Supplement is not an option. Henry said nor is an errata sheet, nor is a resolution or any of the things Ramie listed earlier but they have all been done. If you read 36CFR, the Code of Federal Regulations, NPS will not have Federal Jurisdiction (law enforcement) on private property. That has changed by regulation. Henry was working there as Chief Ranger when some of those changes were made. Henry said we all have to be aware that a law or regulation trumps a plan. NPS recommended going to UDC to let them know it changed and they never wanted to do it out of fear. He cited the outlaw of glass on the river which extends to the ordinary high-water mark, which is on private property. When this change was made it was never put in the plan, amended or was there an attempt made to let people know. That would have been a great time for a Letter of Interpretation or Supplement. In the 2004 NPS Foundation Document, page 16, Sean McGuinness abdicated an addendum for the RMP dealing with the kind of concerns we are having right now. Ehrler said the current position of NPS is there are ways to change it, there are ways to adopt it and it's outlined here and it's very clear. Henry said a Supplement would make it easier on all the Towns and Townships. Hauser-Hahn said the RMP was written by the Valley and the NPS to accomplish what the law requires. Another issue that must be addressed is revising the RMP every five years. UDC did two reviews that she can remember and UDC deemed changes unnecessary. Hauser-Hahn said maybe it's time for the committee or UDC to take a look at the changes that have been made and decide whether it's time to revisit the plan itself. This wasn't a NPS plan. This was a Conference of Upper Delaware Townships (COUP) plan that UDC took over responsibility for implementing. Robinson said the role of the UDC does usurp the decision making of NPS in terms of interpretation. In his reading of the RMP he would think that the order of subordination is that if the UDC feels that this is a legitimate method, that position should be upheld. This is a bottom-up governing system, not a top-down governing system and you're dealing with private property and Towns and Townships. Richardson suggests everyone reviews Ramie's document and come back next month with a firm opinion. The committee may vote. Henry made a Motion that the Council approve Letters of Interpretation and Supplements for any of the issues coming up seconded by Robinson. Discussion followed. Henry said he will postpone his motion until next month. Robinson agreed with the amendment and Motion carried.

Claster said both the amendment process and the minor amendment process have provisions in them for public input. She heard someone mention running a grassroots procedure and she didn't hear anything regarding public input for the Supplement. Ramie said unfortunately they don't provide any guidance about Letters of Interpretation in the plan so we have to make it up ourselves. The UDC always welcomes public input. Henry said it does say in the plan you can send Letters of Interpretation to the Secretary of the Interior for clarification purposes. Richardson said he would like to see a public hearing. Hauser-Hahn said the plan describes circumstances for amendments. It says an amendment to a plan would essentially deal with a single issue that can be addressed without requiring a revision from parts of the plan. She said she thinks it's one thing UDC should consider. Hauser-Hahn referenced page 26 of the RMP as it describes the whole process for doing amendments.

**Other:** None.

**New Business:**

**Draft Letter to Damascus Township: Joint Comprehensive Plan:** Golod provided a copy of the draft letter in the meeting packet discussed during the Discussion Items Report. With the committee's approval and Roeder's signature he would like to send this out. Richardson asked Golod to look at the final adopted version and after that's done he can seek approval to send to full Council. An issue Golod mentioned to Cluster regarding the Comprehensive Update is that Damascus Township did this in conjunction with two other municipalities, Oregon and Manchester Townships. Manchester had already adopted their version of the comprehensive plan update in April. Damascus Township adopted theirs 6/19. Oregon is to-be-determined on their adoption. Golod confirmed that he is going off their word without seeing the final document that no changes were made aside from the changes that were in the Substantial Conformance review. He said he understands that to send this letter out now would be premature.

**FY 2020 TAG Program Project Scope:** Ramie submitted a letter to NPS on 6/6 requesting to expand the scope of the projects that are covered under UDC's Technical Assistance Grants (TAG) Program for the round we hope to open imminently because August is when we ask for applications. Kris Heister did respond on 6/24. Ramie's points to Heister's letter are she doesn't think it's the UDC's responsibility to come up with projects since UDC is the grantor. We ask applicants to provide us with project ideas that we then evaluate in conjunction with NPS. Whether or not UDC feels there are any cultural resources that need to be addressed, that's not up for UDC to say. We are just trying to open up more expansively the types of projects that we would look at. Heister had mentioned in her email she believed that UDC had only asked for cultural resource projects to be included and not such things as informational pamphlets, etc. while Ramie said that she was quoting directly from UDC's letter in the email so she's not sure how that interpretation wasn't made. The letter asks for projects that address education, interpretation, documentation, resource protection, stewardship and economic needs as identified by our member communities. To Ramie it extends beyond cultural or historic projects to open it up to allow the Towns and Townships to be creative. Rather than UDC be micromanaged and being told what the money that is allocated to the UDC can be used for specifically in advance of receiving applications, we would make that decision on a case-by-case basis together. Staff was hoping by tomorrow to put out the solicitation so we can give the communities enough time to get something back to us. Ramie expects with the current limited project parameters it will be the same tepid response UDC has received in the last two years.

Dexter said after the boat NPS bought years ago under Sean McGuinness, the fund for trash pickup along the river was never funded. He doesn't see why UDC can't spend more money to help NPS out with cultural resources, pamphlets, etc. and asked if NPS is still paying for the boat? Sullivan stressed the importance of bottom-up. UDC is saying to Towns you know what you want to do. Almost every one of these projects is going to depend on volunteers. What is the point of NPS or UDC deciding on a project if the Town or Township isn't going to do it? You attend a Town board meeting and four people raise their hands and say "Can we get a UDC grant?" and right away that makes everyone enthusiastic. Everyone gets on board because they know they will have seed money and they will be able to make it happen. If you try to do this from the top down, there is no point.

Robinson said he read the letter from Heister and found it deplorable for many reasons. UDC has a history of funding these projects so it's nothing new we are asking from them or any additional money. The elimination of these projects was at the discretion of the current Superintendent. Prior Superintendents funded them. It's another element in the destruction of this agreement. There's not much left for a Town or Township to be engaged in this agreement. If all NPS wants out of a Town or Township is zoning you're going to see Town and Townships depart because they've had enough. Zoning is part of the deal but so is everything else. Shohola has done a lot of work with a lot of preservation of historical elements in the Township. You eliminate that and it's a reversal of an agreement. NPS has been able to manipulate this agreement through bureaucracy, through regulation and rules. What UDC had available 25 years ago and even 5 years ago is nothing like what's available to us now and it's only through bureaucracy that this is occurring. Ramie has to deal with paperwork after paperwork. You can blame the law and regulations but it doesn't change the fact that the UDC is absorbing and using its resources to address it. What message is Heister sending to UDC, Towns and Townships when she says she's not interested in funding these projects? Robinson said he will take Heister's letter to the Shohola Board of Supervisors and let them review it and he'll come to the next meeting and represent what the Supervisors have to say. Richardson said he's been with UDC

since 1989. In the early years UDC had \$100,000 for which they sought projects. UDC had paid consultants out of Washington and those consultants were making the point that if you want to endear yourself in the local communities, make these grant programs as wide as you can make them as long as it ties back to the RMP in some way, and for UDC to be generous. Richardson said that is what started the whole ball rolling all those years ago. Henry said he thinks about the amount of money Upper Delaware NPS has spent on the Roebling Bridge and Zane Grey Museum. Our tax dollars are funding an amazing amount of cultural and historical projects. The Outstandingly Remarkable Values that NPS touts all the time in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act include Cultural. Richardson said the question for the committee is are you comfortable with the points that Ramie put in this letter. He personally thinks it's a pretty good outline. Claster said historical and cultural resources are very important to NPS and they are not saying that UDC can't use a TAG to protect them but they are saying you can use a TAG Grant to protect them through Zoning which carries more bang for the buck. NPS offered to contact the Townships for model ordinances in Pennsylvania and New York that can be used for communities on both sides of the river which will do more to protect cultural resources. Robinson said Shohola Township drafted a book on the Boarding Houses in the Valley. How does that relate to a Zoning Ordinance? Small towns operate simply and directly and their elected officials are accountable. Greier said not everyone embraces NPS and the UDC. At one time they did embrace UDC but we've lost the faith of our Towns and Townships. If you don't believe it just check how many Town Supervisors and Town board members you saw at the UDC dinner in the past five years. Greier said UDC works with NPS as partners sometimes; when it comes to land issues NPS represents the Department of the Interior and UDC represents the local people and we become adversaries. UDC has to go back to the Towns saying you can't have this and you can't have that, and that makes the situation worse. He said UDC has to fight for every dollar we get from NPS and it shouldn't be that way. We have to find out some way to work together.

Ehrler went on to describe how cultural structures are protected. If something is on the National or State Register the only way that it's protected is if there is Federal or State money involved. That does not impact any private homeowner. Ehrler said a brochure is great, it tells people what you have, but the only way to protect your resources on a local level is to put them on a local ordinance and to include them in a local district because otherwise you could have nothing. It doesn't matter if it's on the State or National Register. As a private individual, you can do whatever you want on your property if it's on the National or State Register as long as you are using your own money. Richardson said UDC evaluated these projects based on priority and that's how they split up the monies. UDC got away from that somewhat. If a Town wants to come in with a project to strengthen their zoning or historical district, to Richardson that would have a priority over printing a brochure of interesting barns in the Town but that's not to say that brochure is not important. UDC funded it, it was popular and people loved it because Lumberland inventoried every single barn in the Town and took pictures. A lot of those barns are gone now and it was a way of preserving history. The way it's been the last two years, NPS wouldn't give money towards a project like that. Sullivan said in the spirit of being cooperative, if NPS wanted to do a workshop on the topics discussed, she feels there would be people from historical societies and beautification committees interested in attending. This information Ehrler, Claster and Hauser-Hahn are providing would be great for them to have. That information has nothing to do with what UDC is talking about because that information is top-down, NPS directs the process, NPS gives the information and says what the rules are. UDC is saying we would like the impetus to come from the bottom, the Town itself, the folks that volunteer. UDC rates projects on criteria of: is it relevant, is it important, does it protect values of the river, is it going to enhance our economy, will it help tourism. All of those parameters are taken into consideration. A lot of projects did enhance tourism. Almost every single Town or Township is aware that UDC wants to have something to offer when people come here. Ehrler said she thinks that a roundtable would be a great idea because you can also bring in State Historic Preservation Offices. Brochures are fabulous but to the Chairman's point, you did the brochure and now a lot of those barns are gone; that doesn't preserve what you had. A history book is also important but it doesn't actually physically preserve what you had. Part of what you're trying to do is project that and move it to the next level. Ehrler doesn't disagree it comes from grassroots. She said it has to come from bottom-up and there has to be interest in preserving your Cultural resources. The one way to do it on a local level, the best way across the country, is a Local Preservation Ordinance. Peckham said Equinunk Historical Society has a water sawmill that they own. They also have a Native American collection. Many people have donated to those and the society has also bought some of these items. They have gotten their name because they go out and they obtain these items and show them. Peckham talked about the importance of advertising things like that via brochures.

Hauser-Hahn said there is no requirement that UDC only operate with funds that they get from NPS and UDC can get funding from other sources to do some of the things you would like to do for whatever reason the agreement

isn't allowing. Roeder said you come into this corridor now and you're starting to see signs that say Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational Area. Years ago, Shohola had signs through a TAG grant for Shohola Falls. Roeder asked what is the difference between Shohola putting up signs about Shohola Falls and NPS putting up signs about the Scenic & Recreational Area? It's hypocritical. Roeder said this could be such a PR coup for NPS. You don't put everything in an ordinance. He's not saying you can't put things in an ordinance for preservation but you can help laud this beautiful area. That is what has happened historically and NPS is cutting it out. Roeder asked how many years has UDC been giving TAG grants for people in the Towns and Townships to take advantage and show the people that come and visit what we have here. NPS is making it very difficult for the municipalities. Hauser-Hahn responded by saying NPS did not put up the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational Area signs. That was the State DOT. Saumure said it's not just about the river; it's about the people that live near the river. Sullivan said the Town of Tusten wanted to cosign Ramie's letter and felt strongly about this issue at the Town meeting to the point when Sullivan said UDC is seeking to return to the former TAG grants and the letter is in process, they requested if they could sign on to it. A Motion by Dexter seconded by Henry to approve an amendment of the project description to include additional types of projects as identified in the FY 2020 TAG Program Project Scope letter, with an explanation that applicants must define how their projects would address the RMP and they will be reviewed for the use of federal funds, was approved.

**Other:** None

**Public Comment:** None

**Adjournment:** A motion by Robinson, seconded by Greier, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. was carried.

*Minutes prepared by Ashley Hall-Bagdonas, 7/9/19*