

curriculum of all elementary and secondary schools, as developmentally appropriate, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:35-28[.]; and

7. Ensuring that all curricular requirements pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:8 and the NJSLs are taught, including any curriculum developed concerning any of the protected categories listed at N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1(a) or curriculum developed by any commissions constituted for the development of curriculum concerning any of the protected categories listed at N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1(a).

(c) The district board of education shall ensure all students have access to adequate and appropriate counseling services.

1. When informing students about possible careers or professional or vocational opportunities, the district board of education shall not restrict or limit the options presented to students on the basis of [race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status] **the protected categories listed at N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1(a).**

2. The district board of education shall not use tests or guidance or counseling materials that are biased or stereotyped on the basis of [race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status] **the protected categories listed at N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1(a).**

(d) The district board of education shall ensure the school district's physical education [and athletic programs are equitable and] **is in a co-educational setting that is developmentally appropriate and does not discriminate on the basis of [race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status] the protected categories listed at N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1(a),** as follows:

1. (No change.)

2. A school **district** may choose to operate separate teams [for the two sexes] **based on sex** in one or more sports or single teams open competitively to members of [both] **all** sexes, as long as the athletic program as a whole provides equal opportunities for students of [both] **all** sexes to participate in sports at comparable levels of difficulty and competency; and

3. (No change.)

[6A:7-1.8 Equality in employment and contract practices

(a) Each district board of education shall ensure all persons, regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status, have equal and bias-free access to all categories of employment in the State's public educational system, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1.

(b) A district board of education shall not enter into any contract with a person, agency, or organization that discriminates on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status, either in employment practices or in the provision of benefits or services to students or employees, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1.

(c) A district board of education shall not assign, transfer, promote, or retain staff, or fail to assign, transfer, promote, or retain staff, on the sole basis of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1.

(d) The district board of education shall ensure equal pay for equal work among members of the school district's staff, regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, affectional or sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, or socioeconomic status, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1.1.]

6A:7-[1.9]1.8 Accountability

(a) The district board of education's obligation to be accountable for the chapter's requirements is not precluded or alleviated by any rule or regulation of any **recreational** organization, club, athletic association, or other league or **organizing** group.

(b) Each school district shall complete a comprehensive equity plan that includes a cohesive set of policies, programs, and practices that ensure high expectations, positive achievement patterns, and [equal] **equitable** access to [education opportunity] **educational opportunities** for all learners, including students and teachers.

(c) [A] **The** comprehensive equity plan shall include the following:

1. An assessment of the school district's needs for achieving equity in educational **activities and** programs. The assessment shall include staffing practices, quality-of-program data, stakeholder-satisfaction data, and student assessment [and behavioral] data disaggregated by gender, race, ethnicity, [limited English proficiency] **multilingual learner status, homeless status,** special education, migrant, date of enrollment, student suspension, expulsion, child study team referrals, preschool-through-grade-12 promotion/retention data, preschool-through-grade-12 completion rates, **attendance data,** and re-examination and re-evaluation of classification and placement **process** of students in special education programs if there is [overrepresentation] **disproportionality** within certain groups;

2. (No change.)

3. Progress targets for closing the achievement **and opportunity** gaps;

4. Professional development targets regarding the knowledge and skills needed to provide a thorough and efficient education as defined by the New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLs), differentiated instruction, and formative assessments aligned to the NJSLs and [high expectations for teaching and learning] **professional standards for teachers and school leaders;** and

5. (No change.)

[(d) The comprehensive equity plan shall be written every three years.]

[(e)] **(d)** The district board of education shall [initiate] **implement** the comprehensive equity plan within 60 days of [its approval, and shall implement the plan in accordance with the timelines approved by the Department] **the executive county superintendent's certification of completion.**

[(f)] **(e)** If the district board of education does not implement the comprehensive equity plan within [180] **60** days of the [plan's approval] **executive county superintendent's certification of completion** date, or fails to report its progress annually, sanctions deemed to be appropriate by the Commissioner or [his or her] **the Commissioner's** designee shall be imposed. Sanctions may include action to suspend, terminate, or refuse to award continued Federal or State financial assistance, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:55-2.

[6A:7-1.10 Appeals

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-9, any individual may petition the Commissioner in writing to resolve a dispute arising under the chapter, pursuant to procedures set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:3, Controversies and Disputes.]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

(a)

PINELANDS COMMISSION

Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan Fees; Definitions; Development Review; Water Quality

Proposed Substantial Changes: N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11, 4.2, and 6.86

Notice of Proposed Substantial Changes Upon Adoption to Proposed Amendments

Proposed: September 6, 2022, at 54 N.J.R. 1668(a).

Authorized By: New Jersey Pinelands Commission, Susan R. Grogan, Executive Director.

Authority: N.J.S.A. 13:18A-6.j.

Calendar Reference: See Summary below for explanation of exception to calendar requirement.

A **public hearing** concerning this notice of substantial changes upon adoption will be held on:

Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 9:30 A.M.

Richard J. Sullivan Center

15C Springfield Road
New Lisbon, New Jersey

Submit written comments by regular mail, facsimile, or email by June 2, 2023, to:

Susan R. Grogan, P.P., AICP
Executive Director
Pinelands Commission
PO Box 359
New Lisbon, NJ 08064
Facsimile: (609) 894-7330
Email: planning@pinelands.nj.gov or through the New Jersey Pinelands Commission's website at <http://nj.gov/pinelands/home/contact/planning.shtml>.

The full name and mailing address of the commenter must be submitted with all public comments. Commenters who do not wish their names and affiliations to be published in any notice of adoption subsequently prepared by the New Jersey Pinelands Commission (Commission) should so indicate when they submit their comments.

Take notice that the Commission proposed amendments to the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan at N.J.A.C. 7:50-1.6, 2.11, and 6.86 on September 5, 2022, at 54 N.J.R. 1668(a) to strengthen protections to the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer and the ecology of the Pinelands Area. Public hearings were held on October 12 and November 2, 2022, and the public comment period closed on November 5, 2022. This notice of proposed substantial changes is published pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-4.10.

The Commission is proposing three substantial changes to the amendments in response to comments received. During the public comment period on the original notice of proposal, the Commission received comments expressing concern regarding the impact of the proposed amendments on the resource extraction industry in the Pinelands Area. Resource extraction in the Pinelands Area involves mining sand and gravel, typically by mechanical or hydraulic dredging, a process that uses water directly from water bodies created by excavations below the water table of the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer.

The Commission is also proposing non-substantial changes to the amendments in response to public comments and one very minor agency-initiated change. These changes clarify language in the proposed amendments and correct a citation.

The following individuals and organizations submitted comments that gave rise to the substantial and non-substantial changes being proposed in this notice. The Commission has also responded to comments received from those same individuals, but which did not result in revisions to the original proposal. The Commission will respond to the remaining comments received, as well as any new comments, when it files a final notice of adoption. The numbers in parentheses after each comment summarized below correspond to the following list of commenters.

1. William Layton, Executive Director (written comment) and Kyle England, CLB Partners (public hearing), NJ Concrete & Aggregate Association

2. Ryan Benson, Esq., (public hearing), Kevin Coakley, Esq. (written comment), and Brian Blum, CPG, LSRP (written comment), Clayton Companies

3. Robert S. Baranowski, Jr., Esq. (public hearing and written comment), Whibco, Inc.

4. Joseph Gallagher, Township Administrator, Winslow Township

5. Jeffrey L. Hoffman, State Geologist, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Water Supply and Geoscience

6. Robert Kecskes (public hearing and written comment)

Summary of Public Comments and Agency Responses:

Resource Extraction (N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11; 4.2(b)6xi (new); 6.86(d)2iii)

1. COMMENT: Resource extraction operations use mechanical and hydraulic dredging that typically involves "nonconsumptive" water use. The water is returned to the source with little or no change in the quality or quantity of water. The amendments would impose a disproportionate regulatory burden on such nonconsumptive diversions and would not accomplish the purpose of protecting the aquifer. The proposed amendments are punitive of nonconsumptive uses as they do not account for aquifer replenishment in a closed-loop use. (1, 2, and 3)

2. COMMENT: The proposed regulations will hurt the mining industry. Additional constraints on mining in the Preservation Area District, Forest Area, and Special Agricultural Production Area will hasten the demise of the industry. (1, 2, and 3)

3. COMMENT: The proposed rule will force resource extraction operations to reduce production of mined sand, gravel, and crushed stone, resulting in a shortage of the products, which will threaten vital transportation projects and negatively impact the construction industry. The Commission should identify and protect these resources to ensure an uninterrupted, economical supply. The proposed rule is contrary to the Federal ROCKS act (part of the Infrastructure and Jobs Act of 2021), designed to keep aggregate building materials sustainable. The general mid-Atlantic region is dependent on these already scarce materials used for construction of buildings and roads. (1, 2, and 3)

4. COMMENT: The proposed rules will result in a shortage of sand, gravel, and crushed stone, which could result in the doubling of price for those materials. (2)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 1, 2, 3, AND 4: The Commission thanks the resource extraction industry for its comments and explanations regarding the specific nonconsumptive uses of water for hydraulic dredging operations. Given that there are over 70 existing resource extraction operations in the Pinelands Area, approximately half of which are located in the Preservation Area District and Forest Area where the proposed amendments would prohibit new diversions of 50,000 gallons of water per day or more from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, the industry has raised valid concerns about the impact of the proposed amendments.

In order to avoid unintended negative impacts on the resource extraction industry, the Commission is proposing a new provision at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)2iii, which states that the standards at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)3 through 9 will not apply to proposed diversions for resource extraction operations that constitute a nonconsumptive use, provided that the water returned to the source is not discharged to a stream or waterbody or otherwise results in offsite flow, and the diversion and return are located on the same parcel. A definition of "nonconsumptive use" is being added at N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11 to mean the use of water diverted from surface or ground waters in such a manner that at least 90 percent of the diverted water is returned to the source surface or ground water at or near the point from which it was taken. This new definition focuses on water quantity and does not explicitly reference water quality, because all development in the Pinelands Area, including diversions from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, are required to meet the existing water quality standards of the Comprehensive Management Plan.

A resource extraction operation located in the Pinelands Area will continue to be required to apply to the Commission for any new or increased diversion. If the applicant for such a diversion can demonstrate as part of the application process that the proposed diversion meets the definition of nonconsumptive use at N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11 and the conditions in new N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)2iii (described in the paragraph above), the water management standards at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)3 through 9 will not apply, even if the proposed diversion involves the withdrawal of 50,000 gallons of water per day or more from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer. To clarify the application process, the Commission is also proposing a new provision at its application requirement section, N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.2(b)6xi, to specify the information a resource extraction operation must provide to the Commission. This application would most likely be submitted as part of an application for renewal of a resource extraction permit or as a separate application for development that would necessitate a modification of a New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Water Allocation Permit. The new provision requires submission of a hydrogeologic report that identifies the volume of the diversion, the volume of water to be returned to the source, a description of the route of return to the source, the methodology used to quantify the volume of water returned to the source, and a description of any other existing or proposed water diversions or discharges on or from the parcel. A "parcel" will be considered as all tax lots that are a part of a resource extraction operation for which a municipal approval has been reviewed by the Commission, determined to be consistent with all CMP standards and allowed to take effect pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.37 and 4.40. The report shall also include a map that depicts the location of the diversion, the location of the

return to source, the location of all existing or proposed resource extraction operations, and the location of all wetlands on or within 300 feet of the parcel on which the diversion is proposed.

5. COMMENT: Holders of current water allocation permits issued by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) should be “grandfathered” pursuant to the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments will prohibit new diversions or increases in diversions even though a resource extraction operation may have had a DEP-issued water allocation permit for many years. (1 and 2)

RESPONSE: There is no need for a grandfathering provision because, pursuant to the proposed amendments, a holder of a current water allocation permit is not required to apply to the Commission for an existing diversion. The holder is required to complete an application only for a new diversion or an increase in allocation from either a single existing diversion source or from combined existing and new diversion sources in the same HUC-11 watershed in the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, that results in a total diversion of 50,000 gallons of water per day or more.

6. COMMENT: Disparate treatment of different Pinelands Management Areas is arbitrary, and nothing in the Pinelands studies supports a prohibition on diversions in the Forest Area and Preservation Area District. Most mines are located in the Forest Area or Preservation Area District; therefore, the proposed standard at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)3 is a problem. (2 and 3)

RESPONSE: The Commission disagrees, as the Pinelands Protection Act, N.J.S.A. 13:8A-1 et seq., authorizes greater protections for the Forest Area and Preservation Area District based on the ecology of these management areas. The Commission recognizes, however, that certain nonconsumptive uses of water can be consistent with those necessary protections and, as discussed above, is proposing revisions to recognize that such uses can maintain the ecological values of the most ecologically valuable management areas.

7. COMMENT: The proposed amendments rely upon flawed studies that model “excessive” drawdown of up to 30 percent of streamflow, six inches of water table lowering, or pumping at 30 percent of groundwater recharge. (2)

RESPONSE: The Commission disagrees that the model is flawed. The studies provide insight into the level of impact that can occur before those impacts have significant adverse impacts on the Pinelands ecology.

8. COMMENT: The Pinelands Commission does not have the regulatory authority to require or issue permits or regulate water use. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has exclusive authority to regulate water diversions and evaluate alternative source requirements where critical water areas are established. The Pinelands Protection Act does not authorize the Pinelands Commission to help implement the Water Supply Management Act. (2 and 3)

RESPONSE: The Commission respectfully disagrees with these statements. The Pinelands Protection Act, N.J.S.A. 13:8A-1 et seq., directs the Commission to regulate development and establish standards to allow development without a significant adverse impact to the resources of the Pinelands Area. The Act specifically authorizes the Commission to regulate land and water management. N.J.S.A. 13:18A-8d. This statutory authority to regulate water management is independent of the DEP’s authority pursuant to the Water Supply Management Act. The Commission also notes that it does not issue permits; rather, it evaluates development applications and municipal approvals to ensure compliance with the standards established in the Comprehensive Management Plan, adopted to implement the Pinelands Protection Act.

9. COMMENT: The proposed rule is duplicative of DEP rules. (3)

RESPONSE: The Commission respectfully disagrees, as it is not issuing water allocation permits. The proposed amendments establish standards and criteria for diversions in the Pinelands Area, some of which are more stringent than those administered by the DEP. The Commission’s evaluation of a diversion application does rely upon a modeling process similar to the DEP’s in an effort to avoid the need for duplicative modeling by applicants in those situations where there is regulatory overlap.

10. COMMENT: One of the commenters noted that its resource extraction site is bisected by watershed management area boundaries and

by the nature of the extraction operation, it cannot avoid interbasin transfers. (3)

RESPONSE: If a resource extraction company can demonstrate that its operation constitutes a nonconsumptive use of water, then, by definition, there will be no interbasin transfer of water. Nonconsumptive use is being defined to mean that at least 90 percent of the diverted water is returned to the source surface or ground water at or near the point from which it was taken. No interbasin transfer of water will occur if 90 percent of the diverted water is returned in this manner.

11. COMMENT: The Pinelands Protection Act already prohibits the export of water greater than 10 miles, so there is no need for interbasin transfer prohibition. (2)

RESPONSE: The Commission disagrees. The prohibition against interbasin transfer of water is not necessarily the same as the prohibition in the Pinelands Protection Act against exporting water greater than 10 miles (N.J.S.A. 58:1A-7.1) as there could be instances where an interbasin transfer of water occurs within a 10-mile area. In addition, the proposed amendments merely strengthen the existing restriction against interbasin transfer at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(a) and clarify that restriction by defining the basins.

12. COMMENT: Along with recognizing mining as a nonconsumptive use, the definition of “divert” or “diversion” should be modified to exclude “mining of sand or similar materials, as long as the mining is conducted by mechanical or hydraulic dredging” and state that such mining shall not be considered development. (3)

RESPONSE: The Commission believes that its proposed changes, described in the Response to Comments 1, 2, 3, and 4, above, sufficiently address the resource extraction industry’s concerns regarding compliance with the proposed new water management standards when an operation involves nonconsumptive use of water. In addition, the suggested revision would conflict with the definition of “divert” and “diversion” in the DEP’s water supply allocation rules at N.J.A.C. 7:19-1.3.

13. COMMENT: The definition of “allocation” at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(b), and the standards at proposed paragraphs (d)3 through 9, should also exclude the taking or discharge of water for mining of sand or other earthen materials, even if permitted pursuant to a Water Allocation Permit, Water Use Registration, Number, NPDES, or NJPDES permit, as long as such mining is conducted by mechanical or hydraulic dredging. (3)

RESPONSE: The Commission believes that its proposed changes, described in the Response to Comments 1, 2, 3, and 4, sufficiently address the resource extraction industry’s concerns regarding compliance with the proposed new water management standards when an operation involves nonconsumptive use of water.

14. COMMENT: The Commission’s existing 100,000 gallon per day threshold pumping volume at which a diversion would need to meet the existing standards at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86 adequately prevents excessive or nonessential diversions from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer and does not need to be modified. (3)

RESPONSE: The Commission respectfully disagrees. The 12 studies on the impacts of diversions on the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, described in the original notice of proposal and at <https://www.nj.gov/pinelands/science/complete/kc/>, revealed a need to update the Comprehensive Management Plan to better protect the aquifer.

15. COMMENT: The Commission should identify and protect sand, gravel, and crushed stone resources to ensure an uninterrupted, economical supply. (1)

RESPONSE: The Commission does not have the statutory authority to directly protect sand, gravel, or crushed stone resources, but the proposed revisions, described in the response to prior comments, recognize the industry’s nonconsumptive use of water and should help to ensure the continued production and supply of the resources.

Stream Low Flow Margin (N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11)

16. COMMENT: The definition of “stream low flow margin” should be the same as the one in the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan. (5)

RESPONSE: The Commission is proposing to change the definition of stream low flow margin at N.J.A.C. 7:50-2.11 to make it consistent with the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan. Specifically, the definition

will clarify “September Median Flow” to mean a stream’s normal dry-season flow and will replace the term and definition of “statistical flow” with “drought flow” and remove the explanation of statistical flow.

Interbasin Transfer (N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(b))

17. COMMENT: There are unavoidable interbasin transfers because some diversions that are located near the border of the Atlantic and Delaware River Basins are pulling water from both basins. This is difficult for municipalities whose land areas straddle both basins and can be problematic for municipalities that currently depend on interbasin transfer for a potable water source and wastewater treatment. Winslow Township purchases 1.5 million gallons per day (MGD) from New Jersey American Water that is sourced from the Delaware River Basin and is mostly transferred to the Atlantic Basin. (4)

RESPONSE: The Commission thanks the commenter for raising this concern. The Commission is aware that for Winslow Township and other municipalities, water procurement involves the transfer of water between the Atlantic and Delaware River Basins and that these transfers are from diversions located outside the Pinelands Area. Therefore, the Commission is proposing to amend N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(b) to clarify that the prohibition against interbasin transfers applies only to transfers of water “from sources within” the Pinelands Area. It should be noted that water sourced from outside the Pinelands Area that is distributed to development within the Pinelands Area through a public or community water system will not result in an interbasin transfer, as the water will be conveyed back out of the Pinelands Area through the public sanitary sewer system or completely consumed.

Water Management Standards/50,000 gpd Threshold (N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d))

18. COMMENT: The proposed rule does not clearly state that any proposed increase in diversion over 50,000 gpd triggers review. (4)

RESPONSE: In its initial notice of proposal, the Commission expanded the scope of wells that will be subject to the water management standards by lowering the water volume threshold from 100,000 gallons of water or more per day to 50,000 gallons of water or more a day. The proposed amendments at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d) specify that the 50,000 gallon per day threshold includes all of an applicant’s existing diversions in the same HUC-11 watershed, in addition to the new or increased diversion. In response to the commenter’s request for greater clarification, however, the Commission is proposing to add “and new” at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d) pertaining to diversions in the same HUC-11 watershed and in the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer. Examples and additional explanations of how this threshold will be calculated and applied can be found in the initial notice of proposal.

Water Management Standards (N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)2i)

19. COMMENT: The cross-reference at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)2i is incorrect. N.J.A.C. 7:9-9 was repealed and replaced with N.J.A.C. 7:9D-3. (5)

RESPONSE: The Commission has corrected the cross-reference in this notice.

Adverse Regional Impact (N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)6)

20. COMMENT: It is unclear which datasets in the Water Supply Plan the Commission will rely upon to determine whether a proposed diversion exceeds 20 percent of the stream low flow margin. It is unclear if the proposed amendment is referring to allocations or peak reported use, which are estimated differently in the Water Supply Plan. Additionally, the information referred to is in Appendix A of the Water Supply Plan, which is not the referenced document. The correct reference is <https://www.state.nj.us/dep/watersupply/pdf/wsp-appendix-a.pdf>. (6)

RESPONSE: The Commission has revised proposed N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)6 to make the language consistent with the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan and to specify that applicants should use Appendix A of that Plan. The revisions also include correcting the link to Appendix A, and specifying the exact datasets/tables applicants should use at Appendix A.

Summary of Agency-Initiated Changes:

The Commission is clarifying N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d)2ii by adding the word “proposed” before “diversion.”

Effect of Proposed Changes on Impact Statements Included in Original Proposal

None of these changes affect the Social, Agriculture Industry, or Racial and Ethnic Community Criminal Justice and Public Safety Impacts, the Federal Standards Statement, or the Housing Affordability and Smart Growth Development Impact Analyses, as published in the original notice of proposal. The following is a discussion on how the revisions change the Economic, Environmental, and Jobs Impact, as well as the Regulatory Flexibility Analysis.

Economic Impact

When the Commission initially proposed the amendments, it was not aware of the potential impacts on the resource extraction industry in the Pinelands Area or the construction industry in general. If the rule changes remained unchanged, there would be a negative economic impact on both of those industries -- but with the proposed changes, it is anticipated that these impacts will be avoided.

There will, however, continue to be some costs for a resource extraction operation proposing a new or expanded diversion from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer that meets the volume threshold specified at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d). Pursuant to the revisions, an operation will still have to apply for a diversion, but it will not have to conduct the hydrogeologic modeling required at N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.86(d) if it can demonstrate that the diversion constitutes a nonconsumptive use, the water returned to the source is not discharged to a stream or waterbody or otherwise results in offsite flow, and the diversion and return are located on the same parcel that is the subject of the application to the Commission. To demonstrate that the application meets these three standards, a resource extraction operation will have to provide a hydrogeologic report that identifies the volume of the diversion, the volume of water to be returned to the source, a description of the route of return to the source, the methodology used to quantify the volume of water returned to the source, and a description of any other existing or proposed water diversions or discharges on or from the parcel. The report shall also include a map that depicts the location of the diversion, the location of the return to source, the location of all existing or proposed resource extraction operations, and the location of all wetlands on or within 300 feet of the parcel on which the diversion is proposed.

Although there could be engineering and other professional costs associated with the preparation of the application and hydrogeologic report, the DEP requires similar information from a resource extraction operation that is applying for a modification to a water allocation permit (WAP). Thus, if the operation is simultaneously applying for a WAP modification, there should not be any significant additional costs associated with the application to the Commission.

Ultimately, the revisions will result in greater economic protection to the resource extraction industry and the associated construction industries.

Environmental Impact

The revisions should not have a negative impact on the environment. The revisions are being proposed to recognize that the nonconsumptive use of water by a resource extraction operation need not be subject to the new Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer water management standards, provided the specified conditions are met to ensure the protection of the aquifer and ecology. Specifically, a resource extraction operation will have to demonstrate that it meets the new definition of nonconsumptive use, that the water returned to the source is not discharged to a stream or waterbody or otherwise results in offsite flow, and that the diversion and return are located on the same parcel. All other CMP environmental standards will continue to apply to such proposed diversions, including those related to water quality.

Jobs Impact

The Commission does not anticipate that the revisions will have any significant impact on job creation and retention in New Jersey. Engineering and other professional work will be needed for the hydrogeologic report required at new N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.2(b)6xi, but the requirements for the report align closely with those currently imposed by the DEP on the resource extraction industry. Pursuant to the proposed amendments, however, the report requirements will apply to a slightly larger group of proposed diversions in the Pinelands Area (those that will

pump 50,000 gallons per day or more from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer).

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The revisions do not alter the Commission’s initial evaluation of whether the proposed amendments will impose any reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements on small businesses pursuant to the New Jersey Regulatory Flexibility Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-16 et seq. As discussed above, resource extraction operations that are deemed small businesses may incur costs from hiring professional consultants, such as engineers, when proposing new or increased diversions in the Kirkwood-Cohansey reservoir.

The Commission has balanced the costs imposed by the proposed revisions on small resource extraction businesses against the environmental benefits to be achieved by ensuring that a diversion for resource extraction purposes should not have to comply with the proposed water management standards and determined that it would be inappropriate to exempt small businesses from these new application requirements.

Full text of the proposed changes to the proposed amendments follows (additions to proposal indicated in italicized boldface *thus*; deletions from proposal indicated in italicized cursive brackets {thus}):

SUBCHAPTER 2. INTERPRETATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

7:50-2.11 Definitions

When used in this Plan, the following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them.

...

“Nonconsumptive use” means the use of water diverted from surface or ground waters in such a manner that at least 90 percent of the diverted water is returned to the source surface or ground water at or near the point from which it was taken.

...

“Stream low flow margin” means the difference between a stream’s {September median flow and its statistical flow, which is the seven-day flow average in the 10-year period for the stream} normal dry-season flow (September Median Flow) and drought flow (7Q10) as reported in the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 2017, New Jersey Water Supply Plan 2017-2022: 484p, <http://www.nj.gov/dep/watersupply/wsp.html>, as amended and supplemented.

...

SUBCHAPTER 4. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

7:50-4.2 Pre-application conference; application requirements

- (a) (No change.)
- (b) Application requirements.
 - 1.-5. (No change.)
 - 6. Application for resource extraction: Unless the submission requirements are modified or waived pursuant to (b)3 above, an application filed pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.13 or 4.33 for resource extraction shall include at least the following information:
 - i.-ix. (No change.)

x. A financial surety, guaranteeing performance of the requirements of N.J.A.C. 7:50-6.68 and 7:50-6.69 in the form of a letter of credit, certified check, surety bond or other recognized form of financial surety acceptable to the Commission. The financial surety shall be equal to the cost of restoration of the area to be excavated during the duration of any approval which is granted. The financial surety, which shall name the Commission and the certified municipality, if applicable, as the obligee, shall be posted by the property owner or his agent with the municipality if the municipality has had its master plan and ordinances certified pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-3 or with the Pinelands Commission if the municipality has not had its master plan and ordinances so certified{,}; and

xi. If the application includes a proposed diversion from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, a hydrogeologic report that identifies the volume of the diversion, the volume of water to be returned to the source, a description of the route of return to the source, the methodology used to quantify the volume of water returned to the source, and a description

of any other existing or proposed water diversions or discharges on or from the parcel. The report shall also include a map that depicts the location of the diversion, the location of the return to source, the location of all existing or proposed resource extraction operations, and the location of all wetlands on or within 300 feet of the parcel on which the diversion is proposed.

- 7.-9. (No change.)
- (c) (No change.)

SUBCHAPTER 6. MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND MINIMUM STANDARDS

7:50-6.86 Water management

[(a) Interbasin transfer of water between watersheds in the Pinelands should be avoided to the maximum extent practical. In areas served by central sewers, water-saving devices such as water saving toilets, showers and sink faucets shall be installed in all new development.]

[(b)] (a) Water shall not be exported from the Pinelands except as otherwise provided [in] at N.J.S.A. 58:1A-7.1.

[(c) All wells and all increases in diversion from existing wells which require water allocation permits from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection shall be designed and located so as to minimize impacts on wetlands and surface waters. Hydrologic analyses shall be conducted in accordance with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Guidelines for Water Allocation Permits, with an Appendix on Aquifer-Test Analysis Procedures, New Jersey Geological Survey Report GSR 29, 1992, incorporated herein by reference, as contained in pages 53 through 91 of the Technical Manual for Water Supply Element, Bureau of Water Allocation, Water Allocation Permits dated May 19, 1993, as amended.

(d) All applications for the development of water supply wells or the expansion of existing water distribution systems shall address measures in place or to be taken to increase water conservation in all areas to be served by the proposed well or system. This shall include efforts by water purveyors and local governments to reduce water demands by users and to reduce losses in the supply and distribution system.

(e) Except for agricultural uses, all new potable and non-potable water supply diversions of more than 100,000 gallons per day that utilize the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer as a source of water supply and new increases in existing potable and non-potable water supply diversions of over 100,000 gallons per day that utilize the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer may be permitted only if it is demonstrated that:

- 1. No viable alternative water supply sources are available; or
- 2. The proposed use of the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer will not result in any adverse ecological impact on the Pinelands Area.]

(b) A diversion that involves the interbasin transfer of water {in/ from sources within the Pinelands Area between the Atlantic Basin and the Delaware Basin, as defined at (b)1 and 2 below, or outside of either basin, shall be prohibited.

1. The Atlantic Basin is comprised of Watershed Management Areas 13, 14, 15, and 16, as identified by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection at <https://www.state.nj.us/dep/seeds/docs/watersheds.pdf>.

2. The Delaware Basin is comprised of Watershed Management Areas 17, 18, 19, and 20 as identified by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection at <https://www.state.nj.us/dep/seeds/docs/watersheds.pdf>.

(c) A diversion involving the intrabasin transfer of water between HUC-11 watersheds in the same basin, Atlantic Basin or Delaware Basin as defined at (b) above, shall be permitted. If such an intrabasin transfer involves water sourced from the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, the diversion shall meet the criteria and standards set forth at (d) below.

(d) A new diversion or an increase in allocation from either a single existing diversion source or from combined existing and new diversion sources in the same HUC-11 watershed and in the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, that results in a total diversion of 50,000 gallons of water per day or more (hereafter referred to as “proposed diversion”) shall meet the criteria and standards set forth at (d)3 through 9 below. “Allocation” shall mean a diversion permitted

pursuant to a Water Allocation Permit or Water Use Registration Number issued by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:19.

1. When evaluating whether the proposed diversion meets the criteria set forth at (d)3 through 9 below, all of the applicant's allocations in an HUC-11 watershed, in addition to the proposed diversion, shall be included in the evaluation.

2. The standards set forth at (d)3 through 9 below shall not apply to:

i. A new well that is to replace an existing well, provided the existing well is sealed in accordance with N.J.A.C. {7:9-9} 7:9D-3 and the new replacement well will:

- (1) Be approximately the same depth as the existing well;
- (2) Divert from the same aquifer as the existing well;
- (3) Have the same or lesser pump capacity as the existing well; and
- (4) Be located within 100 feet of, and in the same HUC-11 watershed as, the existing well; {or}

ii. Any *proposed* diversion that is exclusively for agricultural or horticultural use{.}; or

iii. Any *proposed diversion for a resource extraction operation that constitutes a nonconsumptive use, provided the water returned to the source is not discharged to a stream or waterbody or otherwise results in offsite flow, and the diversion and return are located on the same parcel.*

3. A proposed diversion shall be permitted only in the following Pinelands Management Areas:

- i. Regional Growth Area;
- ii. Pinelands Towns;
- iii. Rural Development Area;
- iv. Agricultural Production Area;
- v. Military and Federal Installation Area; and
- vi. The following Pinelands Villages: Milmay; Newtonville; Richland; Folsom; Cologne-Germania; Pomona; Mizpah; Nesco-Westcoatville; Port Republic; New Gretna; New Lisbon; Indian Mills; Tabernacle; Blue Anchor; Elm; Tansboro; Waterford Works; Winslow; Dennisville; Petersburg; Tuckahoe; Delmont; Dorchester; and Port Elizabeth-Bricksboro.

4. A proposed diversion shall only be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that no alternative water supply source is available or viable. Alternative water supply sources include, but are not limited to, groundwater and surface water sources that are not part of the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, and public water purveyors and suppliers, as defined at N.J.A.C. 7:19-1.3. A list of alternative water supply sources is available at the offices of the Pinelands Commission and at <https://www.nj.gov/pinelands/>.

5. A proposed diversion shall not have an adverse ecological impact on the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer. Adverse ecological impact means an adverse regional impact and/or an adverse local impact, as described at (d)6 and 7 below.

6. A proposed diversion shall be deemed to have an adverse regional impact if it, combined with all {existing permitted allocations} *current depletive-consumptive net use* in the same HUC-11 watershed, exceeds 20 percent of the stream low flow margin for the year of peak use {established in}. *For this analysis, applicants shall use Appendix A of the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan at /https://www.nj.gov/dep/watersupply/pdf/wsp.pdf for/ https://www.state.nj.us/dep/watersupply/pdf/wsp-appendix-a.pdf, as amended and supplemented, and refer to the HUC-11 watershed where the proposed diversion will be located (hereafter referred to as "the affected HUC-11 watershed"). Applicants shall use the tables in Appendix A entitled "Summary of HUC-11 area, Low Flow Margin and Remaining Water" and specifically, the values for the HUC-11 Low Flow Margin in the column labeled LFM(mgd) and the values for current depletive-consumptive net use in the column labeled "Current Net Dep-Con (mgd)."*

i. If a proposed diversion is deemed to have an adverse regional impact, it shall be permitted only if an applicant permanently offsets the diversion on a gallon-for-gallon basis in accordance with the following:

(1) Offsets shall be implemented in the affected HUC-11 watershed and include, but are not limited to:

(A) The recharge of previously non-infiltrated stormwater runoff in the Pinelands Area;

(B) The recharge of treated wastewater that is currently discharged through a regional sewage treatment plant that discharges treated wastewater into the Delaware River or Atlantic Ocean;

(C) Development of a desalinization facility; and

(D) Sewerage system inflow and infiltration abatement and/or water distribution infrastructure leak auditing and correction.

ii. A proposed diversion in an HUC-11 watershed where water withdrawals already exceed 20 percent of the stream low flow margin established in the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan shall be deemed to have an adverse regional impact unless an applicant can permanently offset the entire diversion in accordance with (d)6i(1) above.

iii. Unless the submission requirements are modified or waived pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.2(b)3, all applications shall include the information required at N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.2(b)4 or 5, as well as the following:

(1) Using data on low flow margins in the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan in effect at the time of application, the applicant shall calculate the sum of the proposed diversion and all existing permitted allocations in the affected HUC-11 watershed, and show whether that sum exceeds 20 percent of the stream low flow margin for the year of peak use established in the New Jersey Statewide Water Supply Plan. The applicant shall submit a report that includes all required calculations and a summary of the impact of the proposed diversion on the available portion of the 20 percent stream low flow margin in the affected HUC-11.

(2) The applicant shall identify all offset measures and provide to the Commission a detailed description of the measures, including the volume of water that will be offset, timeframes for implementing the offsets, a description of the entity that will be implementing the offset measures, and an explanation of the entity's authority to implement the measures.

7. A proposed diversion shall be deemed to have an adverse local impact in the Pinelands Area if it results in the drawdown of the water table as defined at N.J.A.C. 7:19-6.2 of any portion of the Preservation Area District, Forest Area, or Special Agricultural Production Area in the affected HUC-11 watershed, or of more than four inches of the wetlands nearest to the estimated zone of influence in the affected HUC-11 watershed.

i. Application requirements:

(1) The applicant shall submit an analysis of potential drawdown impacts using the Thiem method in accordance with the New Jersey Geological & Water Survey Technical Memorandum 12-2, Hydrogeologic Testing and Reporting Procedures in Support of New Jersey Water Allocation Permit in effect at the time of application (hereafter referred to as "TM 12-2").

(2) Upon completion of the Thiem analysis, the applicant shall submit a proposed hydrogeologic test procedure, developed in accordance with TM 12-2, which shall include, at a minimum, the installation of:

(A) A single pumping well;

(B) Observation wells to sufficiently monitor water levels while the test well is pumped at a constant rate;

(C) Observation wells to collect time-drawdown data for aquifer characterization; and

(D) At least one piezometer to measure surface water and water table decline at: the nearest boundaries of the Preservation Area District, Forest Area, or Special Agricultural Production Area in the affected HUC-11 watershed found in any direction from the proposed well location; and the wetlands nearest to the estimated zone of influence in the affected HUC-11 watershed.

I. If the applicant cannot gain access to the parcels at the locations listed at (d)7i(2)(D) above for placement of piezometer(s), the applicant may propose to install piezometers at comparable locations if the alternate placement will adequately measure surface water and water table decline at the locations listed at (d)7i2(D) above.

II. Piezometers shall be tested to ensure hydraulic responsiveness and the results of such testing shall be included in the report submitted pursuant to (d)7i(3) below;

(3) Following the Commission's review of the hydrogeologic test procedure, the applicant shall complete the test and submit a final hydrogeologic report prepared in accordance with the "Hydrogeological Report" section of TM 12-2, which shall describe the field procedures used, all data gathered, analysis of the data, and evaluation of the effect of the proposed diversion on the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer.

(4) Using the results of the hydrogeologic testing performed in accordance with (d)7i(3) above, the applicant shall calculate an estimated zone of influence created by the proposed diversion and submit a groundwater flow model using the modular hydrologic model of the United States Geological Survey, (MODFLOW) in use at the time of the application. The MODFLOW model shall calculate the zone of influence of the water table at: the nearest boundaries of the Preservation Area District, Forest Area, or Special Agricultural Production Area in the affected HUC-11 watershed; and the boundary of the wetland nearest to the proposed diversion in the same HUC-11 watershed.

8. An applicant for a proposed diversion shall provide written documentation of water conservation measures that have been implemented, or that are planned for implementation, for all areas to be served by the proposed diversion. Water conservation measures are measurable efforts by public and private water system operators and local agencies to reduce water demand by users and reduce losses in the water distribution system.

9. The following notice requirements shall apply to the proposed diversions:

i. For applications submitted pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.31 through 4.50, the applicant shall provide notice of the application to the municipality and county in which the proposed diversion will be located, as well as all other municipalities and counties in the affected HUC-11 watershed. The notice shall state:

(1) The nature of the application submitted to the Pinelands Commission and a detailed description of the proposed diversion, including the source, location, quantity, and/or allocation of water to be diverted;

(2) The potential impact of the proposed diversion on the volume of water in the affected HUC-11 watershed that will be available for future diversions;

(3) That written comments on the application may be submitted to the Pinelands Commission;

(4) That the application is available for inspection at the office of the Pinelands Commission; and

(5) The address and phone number of the Pinelands Commission.

ii. For applications submitted pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.51 through 4.60, the applicant shall provide notice of the application for public development pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.53. In addition, the applicant shall provide notice of the application to all municipalities and counties in the affected HUC-11 watershed. The notice shall include the information required at N.J.A.C. 7:50-4.53(e), as well as the following:

(1) A detailed description of the proposed diversion, including the source, location, quantity and/or allocation of water to be diverted; and

(2) A statement of the potential impact of the proposed diversion on the volume of water in the affected HUC-11 watershed that will be available for future diversions.

iii. No application for which notice pursuant to (d)9i or ii above is required shall be deemed complete until proof that the requisite notice that has been given is received.

HUMAN SERVICES

(a)

DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Background Checks

Proposed Readoption with Amendments: N.J.A.C. 10:48A

Proposed Repeal and New Rule: N.J.A.C. 10:48A-3.7

Authorized By: Sarah Adelman, Commissioner, Department of Human Services.

Authority: N.J.S.A. 30:6D-63 et seq.

Calendar Reference: See Summary below for explanation of exception to calendar requirements.

Proposal Number: PRN 2023-022.

Submit written comments by June 5, 2023, electronically to:

DDD-CO.LAPO@dhs.state.nj.us, or by regular mail or facsimile to:

Carol Jones
Administrative Practice Officer
Division of Developmental Disabilities
PO Box 726
Trenton, NJ 08625-0726
Fax: (609) 341-2451

The agency proposal follows:

Summary

The Department of Human Services ("Department" or "DHS") proposes to readopt N.J.A.C. 10:48A, Background Checks, with amendments. Chapter 48A establishes the guidelines for obtaining criminal history background checks for employees of agencies under contract with the Division of Developmental Disabilities (Division).

On January 14, 2000, P.L. 1999, c. 358 was enacted. This statute, later amended at P.L. 2000, c. 97, requires employees of community agencies under contract with the Department to provide services to individuals who have developmental disabilities to submit to a criminal history background check. The statute was again amended at P.L. 2017, c. 328 to expand the scope of background check requirements to include community care residence applicants, alternates, and household members. This law also requires the Department to determine whether an individual is disqualified based on the background check, rather than a community agency board or community agency head. The proposed amendments to the rules reflect these statutory changes. The Division is also proposing additional technical amendments that reflect current operations.

The Department adopted N.J.A.C. 10:48A, Background Checks, as new rules effective June 2, 2003. The Department readopted Chapter 48A effective September 11, 2008, and again effective March 2, 2016. Chapter 48A was set to expire on March 2, 2023. As the Department has filed this notice of proposed readoption with amendments with the Office of Administrative Law on that date, the expiration date was extended 180 days to August 29, 2023, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-5.1.(c)2.

The Division provides services and supports for eligible individuals with developmental disabilities. Services and supports may be provided in settings such as group homes, day programs, community care residences, or in an individual's home. The rules screen out persons unfit to provide services to Division clients due to a disqualifying criminal history and are, therefore, an important part of health and safety protections. The Division has reviewed this chapter, and has found that, with the proposed amendments, the rules are reasonable, necessary, and proper for the purpose for which they were originally promulgated.

The Department is providing a 60-day comment period on this notice of proposal. Therefore, this notice is excepted from the rulemaking calendar requirements, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:30-3.3(a)5.

A summary of the rules proposed for readoption with amendments follows.