

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Department of Agriculture
Market and Warren Streets
1st Floor Auditorium
Trenton, NJ 08625**

REGULAR MEETING

June 26, 2014

Acting Chairperson Monique Purcell called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. Ms. Payne read the notice indicating the meeting was held in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Roll call indicated the following:

Members Present

Monique M. Purcell, Acting Chairperson
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Eristoff)
Denis C. Germano, Esq.
Jane Brodhecker
James Waltman
Peter Johnson
Torrey Reade

Members Absent

Douglas H. Fisher, Chairman
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)
Alan A. Danser, Vice Chairman

Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
Jason Stypinski, Deputy Attorney General

Others present as recorded on the attendance sheet: Heidi Winzinger, Stefanie Miller, Brian Smith, Timothy Brill, Paul Burns, Dan Knox, Hope Gruzlovic, Jeffrey Everett, Jill Gorman, Cindy Roberts, Judy Andrejko, Steve Bruder,

Charles Roohr, David Clapp, and Patricia Riccitello, SADC staff; Christopher Howard, Esq., Governor's Authorities Unit; Dan Pace, Mercer County Agriculture Development Board; Nicole Kavanaugh, New Jersey Farm Bureau; Diane Tribble, Landowner, Warren County; Henry Riewerts, Landowner, Warren County; Donna Rue, Landowner, Monmouth/Warren County; Earle Steeves, Max Spann Real Estate, Hunterdon County; Autumn Sylvester, Sussex County Agriculture Development Board; Brian Wilson, Burlington County Agriculture Development Board; Mark Villinger, Ocean County Agriculture Development Board; Rebecca Ziefle and Jenny Jimenez, Ocean County; and Laurie Sobel, Middlesex County Agriculture Development Board.

Minutes

A. SADC Regular Meeting of May 22, 2014 (Open and Closed Sessions)

It was moved by Mr. Regua and seconded by Ms. Brodhecker to approve the Open Session minutes and the Closed Session minutes of the SADC regular meeting of May 22, 2014. The motion was approved. (Mr. Schilling abstained from the vote.)

REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON

Ms. Purcell stated that she is filling in for Secretary Fisher who is attending the "Top Seafood Chef" event at Viking Village. Ms. Purcell related the following to the Committee:

- New Jersey State Board of Agriculture

The New Jersey State Board of Agriculture met yesterday in Hammonton. The Governor's Office has approved Roger Kumpel to come back to the State Board to fill Mr. Klemm's seat until the next New Jersey Agriculture Convention. Mr. Klemm, a horse farmer, passed away about three months ago. Mr. Kumpel will return to fill that seat until a new member is found.

The State Board of Agriculture also was debating the locally grown proposal, which had been discussed at the Agriculture Convention as well. There is a proposal to try to define what "locally grown" means. It looks like the outcome will be locally grown in Maryland, locally grown in South Carolina, depending on the state. The proposal will go back to a subcommittee of the State Board before moving forward.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ms. Payne made the following comments:

- SADC Annual Report for 2013

Ms. Payne stated that the Committee members have been provided with copies of the 2013 SADC Annual Report in their meeting binders, and copies also were provided on the table for members of the public.

- Senate Bill # S837

Ms. Payne stated that this bill started off as the special occasion events bill and, after the Governor conditionally vetoed it, it now only applies to wineries on preserved farmland. It is now a very narrow bill. The conditionally vetoed version passed the Senate on Monday and is up for an Assembly vote today. If it passes, she expects it to be signed into law. Under that law the SADC would be required to adopt regulations. The SADC would have to carefully go through the bill and understand everything that it says and then work to figure out what the regulations should contain. She stated that she plans to speak to Secretary Fisher when he returns and that she felt it may be helpful to have a subcommittee of the SADC to work with staff to hammer out what those draft rules may look like.

- Future Funding

Ms. Payne discussed Senate Bill SCR84, which would dedicate 4 percent of the corporate business tax to preservation programs, including Green Acres, the SADC, Blue Acres and Historic Preservation. It would escalate over time, starting off with \$71 million a year and then increase to \$117 million a year in about six years or so. The bill is scheduled for a vote in the Senate today but nothing is scheduled in the Assembly at this time.

- Senate Bill S1050 – Dual Appraisal Bill

Ms. Payne stated that this bill would extend the dual appraisal provision for property owners in the Highlands. The bill is scheduled to be voted on in the Assembly today but nothing is scheduled in the Senate as yet.

- Assembly Bill A1294 – Right to Farm Beekeeper Bill

Ms. Payne stated that this bill would extend Right to Farm protection to beekeepers, as long as they have \$10,000 of income from either apiary products or from their services. Beekeepers take their hives to different places where the bees pollinate plants and the beekeepers are paid for that. That would be an apiary service that would count toward the \$10,000 income. The bill would remove the need for the property to qualify for farmland assessment. Many beekeeping operations are on properties that are smaller than five acres and cannot qualify for farmland assessment. The bill passed the Assembly on Monday and still needs Senate action, which was still not scheduled as of late yesterday. There seems to be broad support for it.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Payne reminded the Committee to take home the various articles provided in the meeting binders. Ms. Payne stated that there is an article in the packet that talks about a historic log cabin and the need to obtain a special kind of clay to repair it. The article says that the gentleman who is trying to maintain the cabin was not able to continue to get clay from where he used to get it because that farm has since been preserved. Ms. Payne stated that, in fact, that property is not preserved. SADC staff is working with the property owner to try to help him obtain the clay he needs so he can repair the cabin.

Ms. Payne stated that the other big issue here relates to the Demarest farm in Bergen County. The SADC recently certified values on this farm. Staff has not seen the paperwork for final approval yet but the Bergen County freeholders have announced that Mr. Demarest has accepted the value and we will be preserving that farm. That is a big accomplishment for Bergen County and for the program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Eight Year Farmland Preservation Program – Renewals, Terminations and Withdrawals**

Funding expended at time of termination: \$25,900.13

B. Stewardship

1. House Replacement Request
Goldman Farm, Plumsted Township, Ocean County

SADC staff referred the Committee to Resolution FY2014R6(1) for a request by Elmer and Lina Goldman, owners of Block 82, Lot 35, in Plumsted Township, Ocean County, comprising 39.61 acres, to replace an existing single-family residence on the property. The proposed new residence will be built on the footprint of the previous residence and will utilize the existing driveway. The residence that existed on the property at the time of preservation has been removed. It had significant structural damage and was divided into three rental units. There are no agricultural labor residential units, no RDSOs and no exception areas on the property. The size of the new residence would be approximately 2,800 square feet of heated living space to replace the original farmhouse, which was approximately 4,000 square feet. Staff recommendation is to approve the request as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Mr. Waltman to approve Resolution FY2014R6(1) granting a request by Elmer and Lina Goldman, owners of Block 82, Lot 35, in Plumsted Township, Ocean County, comprising 39.61 acres, to approve the construction of a single-family residence on the property, consisting of approximately 2,800 square feet of heated living space, in the location shown in Schedule "A," to replace the multi-family residence that existed on the property at the time of preservation and has since been removed. This approval is valid for a period of three years from the date of this resolution and this approval is non-transferable. The construction of the new residence is subject to all applicable local, State and Federal regulations and is considered a final agency decision appealable to the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey. The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(1) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

2. Request for Agricultural Labor Housing
 - a. Twentyone Newbold Lane, LLC, Chesterfield Township, Burlington County

Note: Mr. Johnson recused himself from any discussion/action pertaining to this agenda item to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Johnson is a member of the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board.

SADC staff referred the Committee to Resolution FY2014R6(2) for a request by Twentyone Newbold Lane, LLC, owner of Block 600, Lot 41.01 in Chesterfield Township, Burlington County, to convert an existing block barn into a dormitory-style agricultural labor housing unit consisting of approximately 3,530 square feet of living space. The property was preserved with no single-family housing on it, no Residual Dwelling Site Opportunity (RDSO), no agricultural labor housing and no exception areas. The owner has brought three mobile home trailers onsite to provide temporary housing for the laborers currently working on the farm. The owner currently employs eight full-time laborers from March through November and anticipates needing between five to seven additional laborers during the peak season of August through October, and finds that having farm workers onsite is essential to the continuation and expansion of his fresh market specialty Asian vegetable operation.

The owner proposes to convert an existing agricultural barn into a dormitory-style agricultural labor housing unit consisting of four bedrooms, four bathrooms, two kitchens, two dining areas, two utility rooms and a laundry room, to house up to eight laborers. The owner would like to keep all three trailers on site until the dormitory is completed and then have the ability to keep two of the mobile home trailers onsite permanently in order to accommodate additional short-term labor needs during peak months of production. The farm workers will be full-time employees of the farm directly involved with the day-to-day production activities onsite. The types of specialty Asian vegetables grown require a high amount of hand labor and time-sensitive harvest requirements. The owner believes that having on-farm housing will allow them to hire and retain a more consistent workforce, which is needed to produce and harvest these crops. Staff recommendation is to approve the request, as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Mr. Requa and seconded by Mr. Siegel to approve Resolution FY2014R6(2) granting a request by Twentyone Newbold Lane, LLC, owner of Block 600, Lot 41.01 in Chesterfield Township, Burlington County, to convert an existing barn on the premises into an agriculture labor unit, consisting of a dormitory-style unit of approximately 3,530 square feet in size, as depicted on Schedule "A," subject to municipal, State and Federal requirements. The SADC approves the current use of three mobile home trailers for housing of agriculture labor until the dormitory unit is complete. The SADC approves two of the mobile home trailers remaining onsite in order to accommodate additional housing needs during peak harvest seasons. Only agricultural labor employed on the Premises, in production aspects of the operation, and their immediate family may live in the agricultural labor structures. The agricultural laborers shall be engaged in the day-to-day production activities on the Premises, which at this time include the seeding, planting, crop maintenance, irrigation, cultivation, harvest and

packing of vegetable crops grown on the Premises. A copy of the signed resolution will be forwarded to the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board (CADB), the Chesterfield Township municipal offices and the owner. This approval is valid for a period of three years from the date of approval and is not transferable. The owner's use of any structures for housing agricultural laborers shall be in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, County and local regulations. This approval is considered a final agency decision appealable to the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey. The motion was approved. (Mr. Johnson recused himself from the vote.) (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(2) is attached to and is part of these minutes.)

3. Right-of-Way Relocation Request
New Village Farms, LLC, Greenwich Township, Warren County

Mr. Everett explained that this is a right-of-way relocation request relating to a farm that was preserved in 2010 with cost-sharing from Warren County, the SADC and the NRCS Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program. In 1951, the right of way was recorded. What makes this right of way unique is that it does not have a metes and bounds description; it just says a 15-foot wide road in the existing location. There is a railroad underpass and the road makes two 90-degree turns on its way to the Riewerts/Tribble dwelling and another dwelling. The request by Mr. Santini, the farmer owner of the preserved farm, and Mr. Riewerts and Dr. Tribble, his neighbors, is to relocate this right of way to the west of the existing right of way.

Mr. Everett reviewed an aerial map with the Committee that shows the existing right of way, and that roadway goes back 84 years. He showed the Committee the relocation proposed by the landowners. Mr. Riewerts, Dr. Tribble and the Mr. Santini believe that this location will not only address safety concerns but have agronomic and conservation benefits as well.

Mr. Everett stated that the railroad underpass is about 12 feet wide and 13-½ feet high. The landowners are concerned about the blind turn as vehicles turn in and out because that same 90-degree turn is also on the other side of the underpass. That is one of the things we have to assess. Is there an agricultural purpose or agricultural benefit to this relocation or are there other considerations? He has had several conversations with Mr. Santini, the farmer who is not present today. Although Mr. Santini's request stated that there are safety concerns and he cannot move his farm equipment through the underpass, it turns out he has a John Deere 9670 combine, which is about 35 feet wide and 15 feet tall. He uses an at-grade crossing (shown in a photo to the Committee). Mr. Everett went back into the land records and stated that Mr. Santini does have, from the now-defunct

Central New Jersey Railroad, legal access to use this crossing to get from his preserved farm to the Riewerts/Tribble property, which he rents. That was one issue that staff had concerns about, whether there was an agronomic purpose to the straightening of this road, when in fact this combine cannot go through the right-of-way underpass anyway.

Mr. Everett showed the Committee a photo showing the landowners' proposed relocation. Again, the question is whether there is an agricultural purpose or benefit to the farm. He has concerns that, although the 90-degree turn is straightened on the Santini property, once you get onto the Riewerts/Tribble property there is no contemplation in their engineer's plans of straightening the road on their property. Staff thought that this request is more for a convenience for folks getting back to the Riewerts/Tribble property rather than for an agronomic purpose. Since this is an FRPP easement, there is an impervious cover limitation of 4%. For what staff feels is the more appropriate alternative, impervious cover would be reduced by 38 square feet. Staff sought advice from the NRCS, which is a co-holder of the easement, and they agreed that there is significant concern about the landowners' proposal regarding steep slopes and the potential for further erosion as opposed to either leaving the driveway in its existing location or taking this other path, which he will discuss later.

Mr. Everett reviewed various photos with the Committee, including the area of the alternative preferred by the landowners. Staff requested input from the District Conservationist for the local NRCS office, the N.J. Department of Agriculture's Division of Agricultural and Natural Resources, and David Clapp of the SADC. Mr. Clapp agrees with the NRCS District Conservationist that the alternative favored by the landowners indicates the need to have swales along that driveway in order to deal with the runoff. That is a big concern to the SADC. If you look at the topography map of the landowners' preferred approach, the slopes are evident. If you look at where that driveway has been for at least 84 years, he felt it was put there for a reason as it is probably the path of least resistance.

Mr. Everett reviewed soils mapping with the Committee. He stated that in addition to ascertaining an agricultural purpose and benefit, there is also a need to consider detrimental effects to soil conservation, erosion control, drainage control and continued agricultural use of the premises.

Mr. Everett stated that staff feels there are existing concerns. He showed the Committee pictures that Mr. Riewerts took of the paved area. The runoff comes right off the county road into the property. You can see where the residue collects in an area adjacent to the driveway. Staff believes there are existing resource conservation concerns as it stands

now and perhaps it would be prudent to relocate the driveway but we do not believe it would be prudent to relocate it on a steep slope. We believe you could actually cut that bend off and hit that railroad underpass straight on, which would help with the safety concerns that have been raised.

Dave Clapp from the SADC addressed the Committee. He stated that there definitely is existing water that comes down the road and onto the property and then down the driveway. Water comes down from a couple of different directions and settles in the low spot in the field near the first bend in the driveway shown in Mr. Riewerts' photos.

Mr. Clapp stated that there is a drainage culvert that goes under the railroad tracks and takes the water across. It is full of debris from about 50-60 years of people dumping just about anything back there. This area is about six feet lower than the driveway height. One alternative would be to look at putting a pipe structure under the lane and doing some work in the area just above the drive and having that water piped under, possibly raising part of the drive up or moving it to the alternative location, so that you have the water that comes off of that field going under the lane rather than over it. On the photo that shows the water coming down the road, one of the concerns is that the driveway is basically perfectly flat. When you look at county or highway roads they are all crowned. So one thing that could be done to avoid this water running down from the driveway would be to repave it and crown it so that the water comes off to the sides rather than going through the middle. You can also see through the photo that on one side of the lane the ground slopes off, so the lane isn't in the true low spot. It is just off the low area so water on one side of the field winds up in the low spot. Really, the water that we are concerned about is the water that is coming off the road that breaks off the corner of the field and then comes down the driveway and the water that comes off a portion of the field and up a little bit farther into the neighboring properties. So through the use of some filter strips, doing a culvert under the lane you could potentially take care of most of the issues with the water running over the lane. There are concerns with the amount of sediment coming off the field and those are things that we could address with the farmer through a conservation plan to try to manage some of his crop production techniques to reduce soil loss through tillage and those sorts of things. Those are recommendations that we could make to the farmer but he thinks that management practices in combination with driveway realignment alternative #2 would resolve the majority of the water issues.

Mr. Clapp stated that of note in the Riewerts/Tribble engineering proposal, one concern is the amount of runoff leaving the property. Their engineer addressed the three alternatives that staff had looked at – the first is alternative #1 (preferred by the landowners), the second is the SADC's preferred alternative # 2, and then the third alternative, which

would come off the road to a different spot and use the at-grade crossing. When the engineers did their analysis, the amount of runoff from all the different design storms actually increases with alternative #1 and is within .04 of existing runoff when you look at alternative # 2. Mr. Clapp showed the Committee alternative # 3 on a photo and stated that the way the engineering company did their analysis, it shows a decrease in runoff from the preserved farm but they didn't analyze the additional amount of runoff that would happen on the Riewerts/Tribble property, so that number would presumably be a larger total runoff number.

Ms. Reade asked if the farmer would be able to use his combine under any of these alternatives. Mr. Clapp stated that he would not be able to get his combine under the culvert crossing in pretty much any scenario. Mr. Siegel asked about the status of the rail line. Mr. Clapp stated it is active.

Mr. Everett stated that staff has not discussed alternative #3 because the landowners were not interested in that alternative, but it does make use of the at-grade crossing. He stated that the decision is pretty much between the staff recommendation and the landowners' preferred alternative. He stated that the engineer talked about stabilizing the area, removing the pavement and relocating the driveway. Staff had concerns about actually stabilizing that area enough to plant corn there. Right now you have two fields and this would create three fields, which would create a situation where the farmer would be inclined to farm up and down the slope rather than across it, which would create more drainage and erosion issues. So what you end up having is basically a grass filter strip for all intents and purposes.

Mr. Everett stated that staff recommendation is the preparation and implementation of a farm conservation plan and alternative # 2 – the realignment as entertained by the Committee and also a final engineering plan that actually contemplates the removal of this 90-degree turn on the Riewerts/Tribble property because right now that is not even being contemplated. Staff thinks that this proposal not only perpetuates agronomic and conservation purposes but also because this driveway does not have a metes and bounds description, if you did realign it, it would require additional title work or require that the easement to be amended.

Ms. Payne stated there is no resolution in the packet today. This is for consideration and discussion by the Committee today, and based on what the Committee action is today staff can follow up on any resolution, if necessary. Mr. Riewerts and Dr. Tribble are present today.

Dr. Tribble stated that regarding the map that the Committee viewed, there was mention of an area over the railroad tracks where he could drive his combine. First of all they have hay in that field, not corn, but this is farmed by another farmer, not Mr. Santini, so in order to get the equipment in they have to go through Mr. Santini's land and this year he put up no trespassing signs because he is having a dispute with the farmer. She would like to eliminate that as a point of argument from the SADC's perspective, is that the only way that it wouldn't be an issue is if they guaranteed Mr. Santini the rights to farm on their property.

Mr. Riewerts stated that he and Dr. Tribble are the owners of Block 44, Lot 24, comprising approximately 56 or 57 acres. It was purchased in March 2009 and the agricultural easement was put on Lot 5, Mr. Santini's property, sometime in early 2010. He stated that the railroad tracks separate the two properties. Mr. Riewerts stated they were not aware of what was taking place at that time. Mr. Riewerts provided the Committee with additional photographs of the properties in question.

Mr. Riewerts stated that they have a difficult time farming one of the fields because there is no way to bring in the equipment because of steep slopes. So having the ability to have equipment come in through the proposed alternative is an additional reason why they would like to see a change. He stated that also fire trucks cannot get through this now. They cannot make the sharp turn but coming straight down in their alternative they could.

Ms. Payne asked Mr. Riewerts to explain why his preferred alternative # 1 is preferable to the staff's suggestion of easing both those corners so that equipment and vehicles can make a straight-on approach to the culvert. Mr. Riewerts stated that is the main reason. He stated that Mr. Everett contacted the fire chief or the department representative and they have a problem with this. They indicated in a letter that coming straight-in is a big help to them because they can see where they are going, particularly at night. It is about 1,300 feet from the street to the area he shows on the map before the Committee. The other thing is that in order to reconfigure the driveway to follow the white line we still have sight problems in there because the corn grows and soon it will be six or eight feet tall and from July until October when it is cut you can't see where you're going. That condition would continue unless the easement was made much wider and he is not advocating that because that would affect the productivity of the field.

Mr. Siegel stated that we go to the black road (alternative #1) and we are in effect doubling the lost acreage because that paved road, the blue road (the existing right of way), is unrecoverable he would assume. You could tear that asphalt up and it wouldn't much matter because it is going to be a dirt road forever. It wouldn't be recoverable. Mr.

Riewerts stated that is correct; it would take a while to recover but it could recover. He has spoken to other farmers specifically about this. He stated that it has never been entirely paved. There are millings at one end up by the street. Mr. Riewerts stated that the aerials from the 1930s show that it was dirt lane at that point in time.

Mr. Waltman stated that he lives in a very small borough with small lots in a grid pattern and for better or for worse they have a very active fire station so he has seen hundreds of times very large fire trucks make 90-degree turns sometimes in succession quite successfully. He is wondering if Mr. Riewerts' main concern about the alternative in white (alternative #2) is due to fire trucks not being able to make turns or whether there are other concerns. Mr. Riewerts stated that the fire trucks are their concern. The secondary concern is Mr. Santini's field and its productivity. That is not his primary concern but he understands that it is the SADC's concern. Ms. Payne stated that water also is a concern. Mr. Riewerts referred the Committee to the photos he handed out earlier. The second photo shows water running off and coming down the driveway. Photo # 3 shows the water running over the driveway now. It doesn't settle there at all, it runs down there and in the upper left-hand corner in the photo is where the culvert is that takes the water under the railroad onto his property. Photo # 4 is the ditch into which the railroad pipe under the railroad empties onto his property. That ditch, when the photo was taken, was probably six feet wide and 2 ½ to 3 feet deep. To him, it is a danger and a hazard. The pipe enters this ditch right at the top of the photo. Mr. Riewerts stated that it is a 24-inch pipe that is under the railroad and it collects the runoff from the field and travels down on to his property and ultimately finds its way to the Musconectong River. Ms. Reade asked why he thinks that is dangerous. Mr. Riewerts stated because normally it is dry and in a matter of 10 minutes it can be like what is shown in the photo. Dr. Tribble stated that this is a light rain. Mr. Clapp asked if this was the storm that happened on June 13th. Mr. Riewerts stated he believed so. Mr. Clapp stated that just to give everyone an idea of the amount of rainfall, according to the New Jersey Weather and Climate station about ¼ mile away, 3.09 inches of water was recorded on the 13th. Dr. Tribble stated they are having more of those. Mr. Clapp stated that that figure equates to about the two-year storm. Mr. Riewerts stated that there were two storms that day and the photo was not of the heavy one because they didn't have their cameras out at the time.

Mr. Riewerts stated that photo # 5 shows the runoff as it enters their property. Dr. Tribble stated that this is important because this is not in any ditch, it is just runoff onto their land. Mr. Riewerts stated that this occurs on his property about 100 yards in from the railroad track. It overflows from the ditch onto the property. Dr. Tribble stated that it eats away their driveway. Ms. Payne commented that the concern then is the water being funneled down the driveway through the culvert and causing erosion on your side of the

property. Mr. Riewerts stated that was correct. Mr. Siegel stated that he understands the desire for the realignment, but you are also expecting the landowner to then remediate the existing road, otherwise it is not going to change. Whether he is using the road or not there is still going to be runoff. Mr. Riewerts stated there is a grass strip now and he would expect that would be placed down in a series of shorter strips to slow the water down, more like a terrace effect. The grass strip there is about 25-30 feet wide and about 700-800 feet long. It has minimized some of the erosion but not all of it. Mr. Germano asked why would you expect, if you go with your alternative, that the landowner will have any motivation to fix the problems? Mr. Riewerts stated that they have talked about it and he knows the landowner pretty well and they do business together. Mr. Germano asked isn't he the one who just put up the no trespassing signs? Mr. Riewerts stated that he has issues with someone else, not with him.

Ms. Reade stated that what she was hearing from staff was that staff's alternative is a superior approach to controlling the runoff than the straight run down the slope, especially if you still have the compaction. She stated that this isn't new runoff, it is historically existing runoff, so if you had a 3-inch rain episode 12 years ago before you owned the farm, this condition would have still been existing. That doesn't mean that it doesn't need to be rectified. Mr. Riewerts stated that this does affect his neighbor's house. Photo # 6 shows the water and runoff going down this driveway and you can see the outline of a house behind the trees. It goes in through their basement from time to time.

Mr. Waltman stated that in the first discussion of this issue when we viewed the topography, it looks like on the topography photo that Mr. Riewerts' proposed lane comes down a steeper slope. Mr. Riewerts stated that part of it is steeper. It all starts at the road and comes to the same point. Mr. Waltman stated that he would be concerned that if you went with that alternative, that is a straight shot to his egress to his property and he doesn't know why that wouldn't flood out causing worse headaches. Mr. Riewerts stated that a lot of the water comes down the driveway today and he would propose, if this were to be eliminated entirely, putting a berm up there, maintain the water that comes in the road up by the road so it doesn't come down across the field. Mr. Santini, the farmer, who came out and walked the property with him and his engineer, said that it is unlikely that he would farm much of that area because he cannot get his equipment in there and turn. The other issue is that right now the crop rows on both sides of the driveway are parallel with the driveway and go straight up and down the hill. He knows that the issue of compaction exists and they are aware of that but he thinks there is a good chance that Mr. Santini, and he has expressed this, would go across the hill with his corn rows. He plants 15 inches apart and once the corn is growing it is virtually all roots and

that would tend to hold this water better than having a driveway there. Mr. Riewerts stated that an area (shown on photo) is used as a fertilizer, pesticide and herbicide transfer point. If there was ever a major incident, those chemicals would come down the driveway. Ms. Reade asked if there was any type of conservation plan in place. Mr. Clapp stated he believed there was a conservation plan for the property.

Mr. Riewerts stated that what hasn't been discussed at all is what he has proposed. He would put in, particularly in the area of the steep slope, some water mitigation or relief or some erosion measures and they think they can do that. Ms. Reade stated that you need them anyway so why wouldn't you put them in with the existing road and do the least amount of trauma to the farm? Mr. Riewerts felt there were a couple of other issues that he wanted to go over. He stated that this existing road allows water from the road to come down the driveway and it causes more of a hardship, along with what might be in it. They do have a concern that whatever is flowing onto their property this year came on the property probably four days after the field was fertilized and sprayed. So whatever Mr. Santini put on his field on Monday came down to their house on Thursday. That is a concern to them. Mr. Riewerts stated that he thinks that the proposal by the staff would require more mitigation than necessary, than what his proposed alternative # 1 would require in terms of ways and means to control the water runoff and soil erosion, and it would take land out of production.

Mr. Riewerts stated they have another concern. During crop season they come up their driveway and there is no sight line because the corn is six feet tall. They pull up to a county road where the speed limit is 45 mph and it is a blind turn out onto the road. The alternative he proposes is higher and they wouldn't have that problem there.

Mr. Siegel stated that he is assuming that once the new road is in that the old one would be removed and rehabilitated. Mr. Riewerts stated yes and that they have said that from day one – they want a one-for-one. They don't want two roads there. Mr. Siegel stated that once you get the road that you need there will be performance guarantees that it would be removed. Mr. Riewerts stated that he has spoken to a couple of contractors and they would probably use the materials from the existing driveway as a base for the new one. The other issue concerning to them is when they purchased the property, their deed did not restrict them as to where the driveway needed to be. It was the imposition of the agricultural deed that did that. They are not a part of that and they are not asking to be a part of that. The owner of that property received a lot of compensation from the State. They received nothing on their end and they are not asking for anything. They are just asking that in their deed, it doesn't restrict them as to where the driveway is – the property owner has to agree with them. What they are bound by are the local driveway

regulations from the town.

Mr. Johnson asked whether the county engineer needs to sign off on this since it's a road opening on a county road. Mr. Riewerts stated they didn't think so because they are just moving one-for-one. They haven't gone to the county yet but the county would want to see the sight line, which is adequate in both directions. It would be the town that would control the driveway.

Ms. Payne stated that from a staff perspective the easement that Mr. Riewerts has allows for access across the Santini farm. It says "on the existing road." While it doesn't have a metes and bounds description, the easement said "the existing road," which is what exists now. At the staff level, a really conservative reading would be there can be no change to this. But staff appreciated the fact that there is a water management issue and one of the photographs provided illuminates that pretty well, which was Photo # 3. If the drainage situation is such that you have a flooded road to drive through, it would seem to the staff reasonable to try to take care of two issues at once; for the farmer to deal with the drainage issue that he has on the property and secondly to therefore improve the condition of the road that you use to access. Staff also tried to accommodate the concern about the 90-degree turns by the underpass. The basis of staff recommendation is to ease both of those corners and in doing so create an opportunity to deal with the drainage coming down that road. Beyond that point the conversation really starts to legally get into development of a preserved farm for nonagricultural purposes. She totally understands all of the points that have been made about the preferred point of access to the road but once we permanently preserve a property we cannot create new rights to easement holders, once the easement goes in place. Ms. Payne stated that the staff approach, so the Committee understands, was to try to accommodate some of the major concerns here, while addressing the agricultural drainage issues on the property in manner staff felt was consistent with the deed of easement.

Mr. Riewerts stated that one thing he didn't understand when speaking to Mr. Everett was why this is acceptable and his proposal unacceptable, except for the possibility that this could create water runoff. He felt his proposal would create less. Ms. Payne stated it is a difference of opinion. The NRCS looked at these alternatives and that agency also has an interest in the easement, and their assessment as well as our staff assessment was that the opportunity for increased runoff, increased erosion associated with putting the road on a steeper slope was greater with alternative # 1, than with alternative # 2 for one thing. Secondly, in order to mitigate that problem, you would have to take more land out of production with swales and more accommodations associated with alternative # 1. Mr. Riewerts felt that they could do that with a 15-foot easement by a number of means. One

is that in this steep slope area where there is the greatest concern of water runoff they could use a permeable paving product, where water would go through it down into the ground. Secondly they could in that area also within the 15-foot easement, put some swales and sumps so that water would go into the ground right adjacent to the driveway. There are also products now and he thinks they are common usage for water drainage where they are essentially big plastic pipes meant to re-disburse water underground. Those would be put alongside the road, capture the runoff and channel it under the paved area, all used today commercially. It was briefly mentioned in the engineering report.

Mr. Riewerts stated that he appreciates all the effort that staff has put into this but he wanted to bring up a couple of examples. He went through some of the minutes of this group's earlier meetings and he saw a lot of instances where changes have been allowed on preserved farms in ways that are similar to what they are asking for. That is a perplexing issue to him – why were those allowed and this seems to be not allowed, the one that two landowners prefer. The ones that come to mind are in Delaware Township there was a house relocated recently for safety reasons only on a deed restricted property. He believed it was too close to the road so the property owners requested and received permission to move it to another area. Another one that perplexed him was that an aircraft landing strip was allowed on a preserved farm. What comes to mind there is what happened to the cows, the corn or soybeans if this landing strip was allowed? His neighbor, who is an owner of a 188-acre farm deed restricted, moved a house into what was a formerly productive field, probably 20,000 square feet of land with pavement and he built a pond. Mr. Riewerts stated that he checked the minutes going back to the time when he owned this property and there is no mention of that at all. There is a horse farm in Mercer County where the owner was allowed to build a parking lot, a vendor area and some seating areas for horse shows on a preserved property. Finally there was a consignment auction permitted to be operated on a preserved property.

Ms. Payne stated that she doesn't know all the specifics of the cases that were just raised but with respect to moving houses, property owners of preserved farmland are permitted explicitly to come in and request demolition of an existing house and movement of it. That is an explicit right. The horse farm that was mentioned was a farmer marketing his output so the Committee deliberated at length to make sure that that activity was a legitimate marketing of output. These are all things that are permitted under the deed of easement and are all central to the function of the farm. What makes this distinct is that you are asking for improvements and changes to the preserved farm that really don't have anything to do with the functioning of the preserved farm; they have to do with an access to an adjacent property and that's what makes this different. Ms. Payne stated that is why this may look inconsistent to you but it is not. All of the activities you identified are

either explicitly permitted under the deed of easement or the Committee found that they preexisted our easement and needed to be able to continue. Mr. Riewerts asked if they could demonstrate to staff that this alternative would not increase erosion, whether they can pursue it. Ms. Payne stated that is what the Committee will deliberate. Mr. Siegel stated that isn't the only question because the other question is there was one road and now there will be two because whatever you are going to do to this dirt lane, this dirt lane/paved lane is historic, nothing is going to grow on that. Now you're going to have a dirt lane and that is going to run water just like the asphalt did. Mr. Riewerts stated that anything growing on it, whether it be corn, it would help it. Mr. Siegel felt that it is going to look like a dirt road 100 years from now no matter what you do to it. Due to compaction and the destruction of the soil underneath the asphalt, it's going to be a lane forever. Mr. Siegel stated that the sites that were mentioned and the cases mentioned were probably for an agricultural purpose. This is negating an agricultural purpose. You have one right-of-way road going through a preserved farm and we are going to end up with two. Mr. Riewerts stated that it may look unsightly but he believes that over time the soil would regenerate itself and would produce crops. Mr. Siegel felt that would be miraculous.

Acting Chairperson Purcell stated that she appreciated Mr. Riewerts' input and she feels that the Committee has a thorough understanding of where things are at the moment. Dr. Tribble asked what their options are for an appeal if they disagree with the outcome of the Committee's deliberation. Ms. Payne stated that any final decision of the SADC can be appealed to the Appellate Court of New Jersey. Dr. Tribble commented that they would need to get a lawyer. Ms. Payne responded yes. Dr. Tribble asked if the SADC intended to compensate them for taking away their deeded rights. Ms. Payne responded no. Acting Chairperson Purcell stated that the Committee has not done anything yet. Mr. Germano stated that the Committee understands the facts and will make a decision in the future. Dr. Tribble stated that was fine but she wanted the Committee to know where they were coming from and they have been dealing with this for two years.

Mr. Siegel asked what the staff was looking for from the Committee. Ms. Payne stated that ultimately staff needs a decision. Mr. Riewerts and his wife have made this request and she believes Mr. Santini is conceding to their request, but we need to give an answer as to whether or not this driveway may be moved and reconstructed as proposed in order to deal with the issues that have been raised today. Mr. Siegel asked if staff would prepare a resolution for the next meeting. Ms. Payne stated staff would do that but wanted a discussion today for the Committee to give some direction, to see if there was any additional information the members wanted before making a decision. If the members are prepared to make a decision, they can do so and staff can come back next

month with the resolution.

Mr. Siegel stated that his concern is that existing road. Mr. Clapp stated that the engineering report that was prepared for Mr. Riewerts suggested the area where the existing road is now could be stabilized and vegetated with the standards for soil erosion and sediment control or the Chapter 251 rules. It is his understanding from talking with John Showler from the Division of Agricultural and Natural Resources that you can stabilize those using vegetative means. Mr. Siegel stated he was talking about agricultural production. Acting Chairperson Purcell stated that Mr. Showler really didn't look at that aspect as much. Mr. Clapp stated that it was his opinion from his years of doing soil erosion work that the runoff coming off this road and down to this lower area will always make it to the lower area. Mr. Riewerts suggested putting in a berm at the top of the road to stop that water from coming down but ultimately it is still going to have to get to the low spot so that means either piping it or somehow otherwise bringing it down through that. Mr. Clapp stated that a grass strip still would be required in the low area. He would not be comfortable saying that a grass strip or other conservation practice is not agricultural production.

Mr. Schilling stated to clarify Mr. Clapp's statements, he is saying that the conservation practices that would be recommended would be a permanent installation of something that wouldn't be farmable. To Mr. Siegel's point previously, he was questioning whether or not untreated, that land would be recoverable for production but from what Mr. Clapp is saying, the recommended practice would be for vegetative or conservation purposes and not revert it back to production. Mr. Clapp stated that ultimately it is his opinion that the low area where the driveway is, we saw in a few of the photos how much water comes off the road. Part of it doesn't get to the driveway and that is why there is this grass strip on the side. Ultimately, you are still going to need in the lower area of this field a way to control that runoff that comes off of the field. Mr. Siegel stated that he understood that but this land is never going to be farmable. Let's say the berm on the highway on the road does solve all their water problems for some miraculous reason. Nevertheless, that is not going to be agricultural land, it is never going to happen. It is sort of a question to staff. Mr. Everett stated that is staff's statement. It is an area of concentrated flow and it has been for years. The success of converting that to crops is minimal in staff's opinion.

Mr. Waltman stated that we have a difference of opinions here and he feels that the SADC has highly competent and skilled staff and he would have no reason to do anything but support the recommendations of staff on this, particularly because they have been in consultation with the NRCS, which also owns an interest in this property, and the

NRCS has reached the same conclusions. Mr. Waltman stated that the Committee understands the case that Mr. Riewerts and Dr. Tribble have presented very well and it was made very eloquently but he is just not persuaded that our staff is wrong and they are right. He felt that the Committee should let staff keep on the same road that they have been on and he wasn't sure if that meant that the Committee needs to take an action to affirm that or just do nothing. Mr. Siegel felt that he would agree and that a resolution would make sense.

Acting Chairperson Purcell stated it sounds like there is a motion and second for the staff recommendation. Mr. Germano stated that while his initial inclination is that the property owner should be given an opportunity to show us a plan that meets certain standards, he feels as strongly as Mr. Siegel about the impossibility of converting this road back into productive farmland. He wouldn't go with the idea of the landowners' engineer to just stabilize it. His statement to him would be unless you can convert that road into productive farmland again, then the answer is no. Ms. Reade stated that the State engineer is saying no, it cannot be done. Mr. Showler stated that it couldn't be done and that it would have to be permanently vegetated. Mr. Clapp stated that was the advice that was in the engineering report prepared by Mr. Riewerts' engineer. The area where the existing road is could be stabilized using soil erosion and sediment control standards. Ms. Purcell stated that it was her understanding that the engineer looked at both alternatives and believes that either one of them can be stabilized. He is not looking necessarily at agricultural purpose. Mr. Siegel stated he is on a different page talking about agricultural land – how much acreage does it add up to? Mr. Riewerts stated it is about a third of an acre.

Mr. Riewerts stated that someone asked about how much acreage we would be talking about for the easement. The surveyor who did the survey when the easement was placed on the property calculated the 15-foot wide easement as taking four-tenths of an acre. If you are talking just the pavement, the pavement is 10 feet out of the 15 feet and that would be in the neighborhood of less than three-tenths of an acre. That is what would be lost if there were two driveways. The one that they prefer would be three-tenths of an acre. Whether it needs water control or mitigation issues, it needs it anyway. The area that could be lost to agricultural production is that small triangle at the bottom. There was discussion about putting grass or soil and erosion mitigation measures in there.

Mr. Waltman moved to affirm the recommendation of the staff, including the adjustment to the existing driveway as they have specified on the map or any minor field adjustments that make sense when this is actually engineered. Mr. Schilling stated that the primary motivation that we have right here is being driven by soil and water conservation, the

secondary benefit would be there is a sight-line improvement coming into the underpass. Ms. Reade seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Payne stated that staff will prepare a resolution with the details for the next meeting.

C. Resolutions for Final Approval: Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program

SADC staff referred the Committee to two requests for final approval under the Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program. Staff discussed the applications with the Committee and stated that staff recommendation is to grant final approval, as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Mr. Germano and seconded by Ms. Brodhecker to approve Resolution FY2014R6(4) and Resolution FY2014R6(5) granting final approval to the following applications under the Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolutions.

1. Scott and Norma Stern, SADC # 21-0529-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(4))
Block 33, Lot 47, Harmony Township, Warren County, 105 Net Easement Acres
State cost share of \$3,700 per acre (66.07% of the certified market value) for an estimated total grant need of \$388,500 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The property includes a 2-acre nonseverable exception limited to one single-family residence, a 0.16-acre severable exception for a sewer easement and lot line adjustment, and an approximate 1.2-acre severable exception around Slater Lane within the property, zero existing single-family residences, zero agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing nonagricultural uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception areas.
2. John Anderson and Cynthia Brown, SADC # 21-0483-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(5))
Block 3, Lots 3 and 3.01, Knowlton Township, Warren County, 120 Net Easement Acres
State cost share of \$3,500 per acre (67.30% of the certified market value) for an estimated total grant need of \$420,000 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "D." The property includes a 0.6-acre nonseverable exception around an existing residence, zero existing single-family residences, zero agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing nonagricultural

uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception area.

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(4) and Resolution FY2014R6(5) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

D. Resolutions for Final Approval – County Planning Incentive Grant Program

SADC staff referred the Committee to five requests for final approval under the County Planning Incentive Grant Program. Staff discussed the applications with the Committee and stated that staff recommendation is to grant final approval, as presented and discussed.

Mr. Johnson recused himself from any discussion/action pertaining to the Cramer property in Burlington County to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Johnson is a member of the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board.

It was moved by Mr. Requa and seconded by Mr. Siegel to approve Resolution FY2014R6(6) granting final approval to the following application under the County Planning Incentive Grant Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

1. Douglas A. and Constance Cramer, SADC # 03-0376-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(6))
Block 902, Lot 6, Tabernacle Township, Burlington County, 45 Net Surveyed Easement Acres
State cost share of \$1,640 per acre (44.96% of \$3,648 per acre acquisition cost and 74.55% of the certified value of \$2,200) for a total grant need of \$73,800 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The property has a 3-acre nonseverable exception area limited to a duplex or two single-family residences, and no pre-existing nonagricultural uses, zero residences and zero agricultural labor units on the area to be preserved outside the exception area.

Discussion: The New Jersey Pinelands Commission Amended Letter of Interpretation #1571 allocated 2.5 Pinelands Development Credits (PDCs) to this property. Two $\frac{1}{4}$ credits were reserved for the existing duplex or alternatively two single-family homes on the exception, leaving a balance of 2.0 PDCs. As a result of the conveyance of the deed of easement to the County, the 2.0 PDCs will be retired. Competitive grant funding will be utilized for this property.

The motion was approved. (Mr. Johnson recused himself from the vote.) (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(6) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Mr. Germano to approve Resolution FY2014R6(7) through Resolution FY2014R6(10) granting final approval to the following applications under the County Planning Incentive Grant Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolutions:

2. Peter S. Watson, SADC # 06-0137-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(7))
Block 89, Lot 25, Hopewell Township, Cumberland County, 67 Net Acres
State cost share of \$2,620 per acre (70.81% of the purchase price) for a total grant need of \$180,806.20, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The County will utilize FY2013 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share. If Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program funding and/or Open Space Institute (OSI) funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to offset the local cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$103,248.20). If a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP and/or OSI funds, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on the property. The property has one 1.5-acre nonseverable exception area limited to one single-family residence, zero Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities, zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no preexisting nonagricultural uses outside of the exception area.

Discussion: Originally the SADC certified a development easement value without an exception area, based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of March 2012. Subsequently, the landowner requested a 1.5-acre exception area for a future dwelling, requiring both independent appraisers to evaluate the effect of this change on the per-acre value, which then compelled the SADC to amend the certified development easement value. The County has requested to encumber an additional 3 percent buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases. Therefore, 69.01 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need. The New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the USDA, NRCS Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) and it has been determined that the property and owner qualify for federal grant

funds. The landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the use of federal grant funds, including an 8% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 5.44 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the property outside of the exception area, which is the maximum allowable for this property through the federal program at this time. The Open Space Institute (OSI) indicated that it is prepared to contribute up to \$41,779 toward the total purchase price of the development easement or one-sixth of the total easement cost, whichever is less, with no additional restrictions on the property, to assist toward its goal of preserving land within the Delaware Bayshore region. The terms and conditions of the proposed OSI funding contribution are subject to advanced review and approval by the SADC legal staff and the Office of the Attorney General.

3. Kathleen A. Casper, SADC # 06-0138-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(8))
Block 19, Lots 9, 9.02, 9.03, Stow Creek Township, Cumberland County, 29 Net Acres
State cost share of \$3,280 per acre (68.33% of the purchase price) for a total grant need of \$97,973.60 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The County will utilize FY2013 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share. If federal funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to reduce the County cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$47,397.60). If a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of federal funding, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of the encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated federal grant funding for the acquisition of a development easement on the property. The property has two 1.5-acre severable exception areas, each limited to one existing single-family residence, zero Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities, zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no preexisting nonagricultural uses outside of the exception areas.

Discussion: The New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the USDA, NRCS Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program and it was determined that the property and the owner qualify for federal grant funds. The landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the use of federal grant funding, including a 7.33% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 2.125 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the property outside of the exception areas, which is the maximum allowable for this property through the federal grant program at this time. If federal funding should not be available, the County and Township have agreed to fully fund the entire local (non-

SADC) cost share in order to proceed with the preservation of this farm. The County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases; therefore, 29.87 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need.

4. Paul and Amy Gilson, SADC #06-0136-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(9))
Block 188, Lots 4, 12, 13, Lawrence Township, Cumberland County, 103 Net Acres
State cost share of \$2,920 per acre (69.52% of the purchase price), for a total grant need of \$309,782.80 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The County will utilize FY2013 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share. If federal funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to reduce the County cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$85,654.80). If a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of federal funding and/or OSI funding, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of the encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated federal grant funding for the acquisition of a development easement on the property. The property includes zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units, zero Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities and no preexisting nonagricultural uses.

Discussion: The property was eligible for one Residual Dwelling Site Opportunity but it was not requested by the landowner. The County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases; therefore, 106.09 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need. The New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the USDA, NRCS Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program and it has been determined that the property and owner qualify for federal grant funds. The landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the use of federal funding, including a 7.67% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 7.9 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the property, which is the maximum allowable for this property through the federal program at this time. If federal funding is not available, the County and Township have agreed to fully fund the entire local (non-SADC) cost share in order to proceed with the preservation of this farm.

5. Harry W. McAllister, SADC #06-0144-PG (Resolution FY2014R6(10))
Block 18, Lot 7, Greenwich Township, Cumberland County, 29 Acres
State cost share of \$3,010 per acre (69.20% of the purchase price) for a total grant need of \$89,908.70 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained

in Schedule "C." The property includes zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no preexisting nonagricultural uses.

Discussion: The County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases; therefore, 29.87 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need.

The motion was unanimously approved. (Copies of Resolution FY2014R6(7) through Resolution FY2014R6(10) are attached to and are a part of these minutes.)

E. Resolution for Final Approval – State Acquisition Program

SADC staff referred the Committee to one request for final approval under the State Acquisition Program. Staff discussed the application with the Committee and stated that staff recommendation is to grant final approval, as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Ms. Reade to approve Resolution FY2014R6(11) granting final approval to the following application under the State Acquisition Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

1. Ed Stella, Jr., SADC #17-0257-DE
Block 59, Lots 18, 20, 21
Block 70, Lots 1, 2
Block 71, Lots 1, 2
Block 57, Lot 8
Upper Pittsgrove Township, Salem County, 314 Net Easement Acres
Acquisition of the development easement at a value of \$7,135 per acre for a total of approximately \$2,240,390, subject to the conditions contained in Schedule "B."
The property includes a 1.5-acre severable exception area, limited to zero residences, to be sold to the adjacent landowner for the purpose of enlarging the neighbors' Lot 19, and a 6-acre severable exception limited to one single-family residence. The Property has been allocated two Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities (RDSOs) and includes zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no preexisting nonagricultural uses on the area outside of the exception areas.

Discussion: As a result of the possible subdivision of the severable exceptions prior to closing, the remaining parcel may be re-designated with a new lot number and this re-

designation will be reflected in the subsequent closing documents and deed of easement.

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(11) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

F. Adoption of the SADC List of Approved Appraisers

SADC staff referred the Committee to Resolution FY2014R6(12), including Schedule "A" listing those appraisers who attended the annual appraisal conference held in June and who are being recertified. The resolution also reflects those appraisers who did not attend the appraisal conference for two years and are being removed for that reason (Schedule "B"). The resolution also reflects two new appraisers who will be added to the list of approved appraisers if the Committee approves the resolution. Staff recommendation is to approve Resolution FY2014R6(12) to reflect the re-certifications, the deletions and the new appraisers, as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Ms. Reade and seconded by Mr. Requa to approve Resolution FY2014R6(12) recertifying the list of appraisers to the Approved Appraiser List, as presented and discussed (Schedule "A"), deleting those appraisers on the Deleted Appraiser List (Schedule "B"), and adding the two new appraisers to the Approved Appraiser List (Schedule "C") as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said resolution. The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(12) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Donna Rue, representing the permanently preserved Rue Brothers farm in Cream Ridge, requested a 10-minute time period at the July meeting to provide the Committee and staff with information related to the effects of soil disturbance and continued agricultural use specific to the Rue Brothers property. The request is related to the Committee's decision at the May meeting to not approve a proposed greenhouse project on the farm and the SADC's efforts to develop soil disturbance regulations. Ms. Rue stated that because these new rules will impact future agricultural projects on preserved farmland and affect the greenhouse industry, she would like the Committee to see evidence of land use practices that show over time improved farming results and sustained land use. Ms. Rue stated she pulled together almost 30 years of site-specific information that will help the Committee with their decisions for the new rules and regulations.

Ms. Payne stated that if Ms. Rue has information that she would like the Committee to review and consider, she would ask that it be provided as soon as possible so staff can review it. Ms. Rue stated that she would provide the information as soon as she can. Ms. Payne stated that she would be happy to consider whatever Ms. Rue is able to submit.

TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

SADC Regular Meeting: Thursday, July 24 2014, beginning at 9 a.m. Location: Health/Agriculture Building, First Floor Auditorium.

CLOSED SESSION

At 11:04 a.m., Mr. Requa moved the following resolution to go into Closed Session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Germano and unanimously approved.

“Be it resolved, in order to protect the public interest in matters involving minutes, real estate, and attorney-client matters, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-12, the N.J. State Agriculture Development Committee declares the next one-half hour to be private to discuss these matters. The minutes will be available one year from the date of this meeting.”

ACTION AS A RESULT OF CLOSED SESSION

A. Real Estate Matters - Certification of Values

It was moved by Ms. Reade and seconded by Mr. Waltman to certify the following development easement values as presented and discussed in Closed Session:

County Planning Incentive Grant Program

1. Raymond A. Coleman (II), SADC #06-0154-PG
Block 59, Lot 5, Deerfield Township, Salem County, 22 Acres
2. Hubschmidt (1) Farm, SADC #06-0161-PG
Block 2301, Lot 13, Upper Deerfield Township, Cumberland County, 14 Acres
3. Terrance T., Karen and Travis J. Uhland, SDAC # 06-0160-PG
Block 23, Lot 11, Stow Creek Township, Cumberland County, 30 Acres

4. EJG Properties/Eric Gulotta, SADC #12-0020-PG
Block 2, Lot 4.01, Monroe Township, Middlesex County, 16 Acres
5. Carol Bullock and Estate of Clarence Bullock, SADC # 21-0549-PG
Block 69, Lot 3, White Township, Warren County, 61.11 Acres
6. Robert Cericola # 2, SADC # 21-0547-PG
Block 58, Lot 10, Franklin Township, Warren County, 30.5 Acres (AOC)
7. James and Karen Smith # 1, SADC # 21-0541-PG
Block 37, Lot 17.02, Harmony Township, Warren County, 46 Acres
8. James and Karen Smith # 2, SADC # 21-0-542-PG
Block 37, Lot 17, Harmony Township, Warren County, 51 Acres

The motion was unanimously approved. (Copies of the Certification of Value Reports are attached to and are a part of the Closed Session minutes.)

Mr. Johnson, Mr. Schilling and Mr. Requa recused themselves from any discussion/action pertaining to the certification of values for the McNaughton farm in Burlington County to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Johnson is a member of the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board. Mr. Requa is a personal acquaintance of Mr. McNaughton. Mr. Schilling and Mr. McNaughton are named together in litigation.

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Mr. Germano to certify the following development easement values as presented and discussed in Closed Session:

1. William McNaughton, SADC # 03-0396-PG
Block 1101, Lot 13.02, Tabernacle Township, Burlington County, 79 Acres

The motion was approved. (Mr. Johnson, Mr. Requa and Mr. Schilling recused themselves from the vote.) (A copy of the Certification of Value Report is attached to and is a part of the Closed Session minutes.)

It was moved by Mr. Germano and seconded by Ms. Reade to certify the following development easement values as presented and discussed in Closed Session:

Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program

1. Russo Homes, LLC, SADC # 08-0179-PG
Block 14, Lot 12, Woolwich Township, Gloucester County, 55 Acres

Direct Easement Purchase Program

1. Linden Lane Legacy, LLC (Blaus), SADC #10-0219-DE
Block 30, Lots 22, 22.01, 22.02, Franklin Township, Hunterdon County, 111.84
Acres (AOC)

The motion was approved. (Copies of the Certification of Value Reports are attached to and are a part of the Closed Session minutes.)

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, it was moved by Ms. Reade and seconded by Mr. Siegel and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 11:39 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

Attachments

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R6(1)

Request to Replace a Single Family Residence

Elmer & Lina Goldman

June 26, 2014

Subject Property: Block 82, Lot 35
Plumsted Township, Ocean County
39.61 - Acres

WHEREAS, Elmer and Lina Goldman, hereinafter "Owners," are the record owners of Block 82, Lot 35 in Plumsted Township, Ocean County, by Deed dated July 25, 2013, and recorded in the Ocean County Clerk's Office in Book 15601, Page 31, totaling approximately 39.61 acres, hereinafter referred to as "Premises" (as shown on Schedule "A"); and

WHEREAS, the development easement on the Premises was conveyed to the County of Ocean, by the former owner Clarence Tilghman, by Deed dated June 12, 2001 and recorded in the Ocean County Clerk's Office in Book 10452, Page 489, pursuant to the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:1C-11 et seq., PL 1983, and the Garden State Preservation Trust Act, N.J.S.A. 13:8C, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2014, the SADC received a request to replace an existing single family residence on the Premises from the Ocean CADB on behalf of the Owners; and

WHEREAS, the Deed of Easement identifies one multi-family residence on the Premises, no agricultural labor residential units, no RDSOs, and no exception areas; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 14ii of the Deed of Easement allows for the replacement of any existing single family residential building anywhere on the Premises with the approval of the Grantee and Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Premises is being managed in hay over approximately 25-acres; and

WHEREAS, the residence that existed on the Premises at the time of preservation has been removed; and

WHEREAS, the previous residence had significant structural damage and was divided into three rental units; and

WHEREAS, the Owners propose to replace the previous residence on the Premises with a new single family residence for themselves; and

WHEREAS, the proposed new residence will be built on the footprint of the previous residence as shown on Schedule "A"; and

WHEREAS, the new residence will utilize the existing driveway; and

WHEREAS, the Owners propose to build a single-story residence with approximately 2,800 sq./ft. of heated living space to replace the original farmhouse which was approximately 4,000 sq./ft.; and

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2014, the Ocean CADB reviewed and approved the replacement of the existing residence on the Premises; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC, pursuant to the restrictions as contained in the Deed of Easement, finds that the replacement of a multi-family residence on the Premises with a single-family residence will have a positive impact on the continued agricultural operations of this farm by replacing the deteriorated residence with a new residence which shall serve as the primary residence for the Owners; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee approves the construction of a single family residence, consisting of approximately 2,800 sq./ft. heated living space, in the location shown in Schedule "A", to replace the multi-family residence which existed on the Premises at the time of preservation that has since been removed; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is valid for a period of three years from the date of this resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is non-transferable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the construction of the new residence is subject to all applicable local, State and Federal regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is considered a final agency decision appealable to the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this action is not effective until the Governor's review period expires pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4f.

6/26/14
Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE TO BE RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

S:\EP\99 EPRND\99EPRD\OCEAN\TILGHMAN\Stewardship-Post Closing\Replacement of
Residence Reso - for merge.doc

Schedule "A"

Goldman/Tilghman Farm

u:/county_folder/project_name.mxd



FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Goldman/Tilghman Farm
Block 82, Lot 35
Plumsted Township, Ocean County
39.61 -acres



0 137.5 275 550 825 1,100 Feet

Farmland Preservation Program

- PRESERVED EASEMENT
- EXCEPTION AREA
- PRESERVED EASEMENT / NR
- EXCEPTION AREA / NR
- FINAL APPROVAL
- PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
- ACTIVE APPLICATION
- 8 YEAR PRESERVED
- TARGETED FARM
- INACTIVE APPLICATION
- NO CORRESPONDING DATA

- State Planning Areas:**
- (PA1) METRO
 - (PA2) SUBURBAN
 - (PA3) FRINGE
 - (PA4) RURAL
 - (PA4b) RURAL ENV SENS
 - (PA5) ENV SENS
 - (PA5b) ENV SENSITIVE BARRIER IS
 - (P10) PINELANDS
 - PARK
 - MILITARY
 - NEW JERSEY MEADOWLANDS
 - WATER
 - ELLIS ISLAND- NJ
 - ELLIS ISLAND- NY
- Base Map**
- County Boundaries
 - Municipal Boundaries
 - Highlands Planning Area
 - Highlands Preservation Area
 - Pinelands Area
 - Green Acres Preserved Easements

month/day/year

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R6(2)

Construction of Onsite Agricultural Labor Housing

Twentyone Newbold Lane, LLC

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, Twentyone Newbold Lane, LLC ("Owner") is the current record owner of Block 600, Lot 14.01, as identified in the Township of Chesterfield, County of Burlington, by deed dated October 18, 2013 and recorded in the Burlington County Clerk's office in Deed Book 13111, Page 69470, totaling 121.03 acres, hereinafter referred to as "Premises", see attached Schedule "A"; and

WHEREAS, the development easement on the Premises was conveyed to Burlington County on May 8, 1985, pursuant to the Agriculture and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:1C-11 et seq., PL 1983, c. 32 as recorded in Deed Book 300, Page 49; and

WHEREAS, the farmland preservation Deed of Easement identifies no residual dwelling site opportunities (RDSOs), no existing single family residential buildings, no residential units used for agricultural labor purposes and no exception areas; and

WHEREAS, on May 13, 2014, the SADC received a request from the Burlington CADB on behalf of the Owner to convert an existing block barn into an agriculture labor dormitory consisting of approximately 3,530 sq./ft. of living space, on the Premises in the location as shown on Schedule "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Owner operates a diversified fresh market specialty Asian vegetable operation on the Premises; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has approximately 65 acres in production on the Premises; and

WHEREAS, the Owner acquired this property last fall after approximately 20 years of leasing farm ground in western Monmouth county; and

WHEREAS, since acquiring the Premises the Owner has installed a well, irrigation mains, two hoopouses and rehabbed some of the existing deteriorated structures on the Premises; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has brought three mobile home trailers onsite to provide temporary housing for laborers currently working on the farm; and

WHEREAS, the Owner currently employs eight full-time laborers during the season of March through November, and anticipates needing between five to seven additional laborers during the peak season of August through October, and finds that having farm workers onsite is essential to the continuation and expansion of the operation; and

WHEREAS, paragraph number 12 of the Deed of Easement states: "No new residential units or recreation buildings or improvements to existing buildings for purposes other than agricultural production shall be allowed except for such new residential structure or structures or improvements or converted residential structures as will provide housing for agricultural labor for the subject farm....."; and

WHEREAS, the Owner proposes to convert an existing agricultural barn on the Premises into a dormitory style agricultural labor housing unit consisting of four bedrooms, four bathrooms, two kitchens, two dining areas, two utility rooms and a laundry room totaling approximately 3,530 sq./ft., to house up to eight laborers throughout the growing season of March through November; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has requested the ability to keep two of the mobile home trailers onsite in order to accommodate additional short term labor needs in the peak months of production on the Premises; and

WHEREAS, the farm workers will be a full-time employees of the farm directly involved with the day-to-day production activities of seeding, planting, crop maintenance, irrigation, cultivation, harvest and packing of vegetable crops grown onsite; and

WHEREAS, the types of specialty Asian vegetables that the Owner raises require a high amount of hand labor and have time sensitive harvest requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Owner believes that having on-farm housing for agricultural labor will allow them to hire and retain a more consistent work force which is needed to produce and harvest these crops; and

WHEREAS, the BCADB and the SADC have reviewed the Owner's request to construct an agricultural labor unit and have determined that the size and location of the proposed unit minimize any adverse impact on the agricultural operation; and

WHEREAS, by resolution dated May 8, 2014, the BCADB approved the Owner's request; and

WHEREAS, the SADC finds that the proposed construction of the agriculture labor unit is consistent with the requirements of the Deed of Easement; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC approves the request to convert an existing barn on the Premises into an agriculture labor unit, consisting of a dormitory style unit of approximately 3,530 square feet in size, as depicted on Schedule "A" , subject to municipal, state and federal requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC approves the current use of three mobile home trailers for housing of agriculture labor until the dormitory unit is complete; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC approves two of the mobile home trailers remaining onsite in order to accommodate additional housing needs during the peak harvest season; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the agricultural laborers shall be engaged in the day-to-day production activities on the Premises, which at this time include the seeding, planting, crop maintenance, irrigation, cultivation, harvest and packing of vegetable crops grown on the Premises; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of the signed resolution will be forwarded to the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board, the Chesterfield Township municipal offices and the Owner; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is valid for a period of three years from the date of approval; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is not transferrable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Owner's use of any structures for housing agricultural laborers shall be in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, County and local regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is considered a final agency decision appealable to the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this approval is not effective until the Governor's review period expires pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4f.

6/26/14
DATE


Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	RECUSED
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

Schedule "A"

Twentyone Newbold Lane Farm

u:/county_folder/project_name.mxd



FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Twentyone Newbold Lane Farm
Block 600, Lot 14.01
Chesterfield Township, Burlington County
121.03 -acres



0 230 460 920 1,380 1,840 Feet

Farmland Preservation Program

	PRESERVED EASEMENT
	EXCEPTION AREA
	PRESERVED EASEMENT / NR
	EXCEPTION AREA / NR
	FINAL APPROVAL
	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
	ACTIVE APPLICATION
	8 YEAR PRESERVED
	TARGETED FARM
	INACTIVE APPLICATION
	NO CORRESPONDING DATA

State Planning Areas	
	(PA1) METRO
	(PA2) SUBURBAN
	(PA3) FRINGE
	(PA4) RURAL
	(PA4a) RURAL ENV SENS
	(PA5) ENV SENS
	(PA5a) ENV SENSITIVE BARRIER IS
	(P10) PINELANDS
	PARK
	MILITARY
	NEW JERSEY MEADOWLANDS
	WATER
	ELLIS ISLAND- NJ
	ELLIS ISLAND- NY
Base Map	
	County Boundaries
	Municipal Boundaries
	Highlands Planning Area
	Highlands Preservation Area
	Pinelands Area
Green Acres Preserved Easements	

month/day/year

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(3)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO

HARMONY TOWNSHIP

for the

PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Scott and Norma Stern ("Owners")
Harmony Township, Warren County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A

SADC ID# 21-0529-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2007, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.4, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") application from Harmony Township, Warren County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.7, the SADC granted approval to Harmony Township's Farmland Preservation FY15 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2013, the SADC received an individual application for the sale of a development easement from Harmony Township for the Stern Farm, identified as Block 33, Lot 47, Harmony Township, Warren County, totaling approximately 105 net easement acres (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Stern Farm is located in the Township's Project Area 2; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 2-acre non-severable exception limited to one single family residence, a 0.16-acre severable exception for a sewer easement/lot line adjustment and a severable exception to include the entirety of Slater Lane as it extends into the Property (approximately 1.2 acres); and

WHEREAS, the Property has zero (0) existing single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception areas; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in corn and hay production; and

WHEREAS, the owners have read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9A(b) on July 22, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.11, on January 23, 2014 the SADC certified a development easement value of \$5,600 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of 1/01/04 and \$5,200 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of the current date of October 2013; and

WHEREAS, the certification was contingent upon a severable exception being taken encompassing the entirety of Slater Lane, with the final width to be determined after survey and title, which the landowner has accepted; and

WHEREAS, the Township contracted with the owners at \$5,600 per acre for the development easement; and

WHEREAS, to date \$1,250,000 of FY09 – FY13 funding has been appropriated for the purchase of development easements on the eligible list of farms identified in the Township's approved PIG Plan; and

WHEREAS, to date Harmony Township has encumbered \$512,900 of its SADC grant funds, leaving a cumulative balance of \$737,100 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, Harmony Township has no other projects pending against this balance; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.13, on June 3, 2014 the Harmony Township Committee approved the application and a commitment of funding for a cost share of \$950/acre; and

WHEREAS, the Warren County Agriculture Development Board approved the application on May 15, 2014 and secured a commitment of funding on May 28, 2014 from the Warren County Board of Chosen Freeholders for the required local match (\$950/acre); and

WHEREAS, the cost share breakdown is approximately as follows (based on 105 net acres):

	<u>Total</u>	
SADC	\$388,500	(\$3,700/acre and 66.07% of purchase)
Warren County	\$ 99,750	(\$ 950/acre and 16.96% of purchase)
Harmony Township	\$ 99,750	(\$ 950/acre and 16.96% of purchase)
Total Easement Purchase	\$588,000	(\$5,600/acre)

WHEREAS, the Township is requesting \$388,500 from the available municipal PIG funding, resulting in a balance of \$348,600; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.15, the County shall hold the development easement since the County is providing funding for the preservation of the farm; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11, the SADC shall provide a cost share grant to the Township for up to 50% of the eligible ancillary costs for the purchase of a development easement which will be deducted from its PIG appropriation and subject to the availability of funds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Harmony Township for the purchase of a development easement on the Property by Warren County, comprising approximately 105 acres, at a State cost share of \$3,700/acre, (66.07% of certified market value), for an estimated total grant need of \$388,500 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes a 2-acre non-severable exception limited to one single family residence, a 0.16-acre severable exception for a sewer easement and lot line adjustment, and an approximately 1.2 acre severable exception around Slater Lane within the property, zero (0) existing single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Township and County agree to the SADC providing its grant directly to Warren County, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the Township and County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement and for residual dwelling site opportunities allocated pursuant to Policy P-19-A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14
Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES



X:\counties\warco\projects\stem_sol2.mxd

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Scot and Norma Stern/Farley Acres Farm
Block 33 Lots P/O 47 (105.0 ac);
P/O 47-ES (severable exception- 0.2 ac);
& P/O 47-EN (non-severable exceptions - 2.0 & 1.2 ac)
Gross Total = 109.4 ac
Harmony Twp., Warren County

500 250 0 500 1,000 1,500 Feet

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor



Sources:
NRCS - SSURGO 2013 Soil Data
NJDOT Road Data
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
NJOTITOGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

June 3, 2014

Schedule B

Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Harmony Township, Warren County Plan Approval March 26, 2009

Farm	SADC ID#	Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	SADC		733 - GSPT		
							Cost Basis	Cost Share	Encumbered	Expended	Balance
Schanzlin	21-0247-PG	83.000	6,000.00	6,000.00	3,900.00	498,000.00	498,000.00	323,700.00	323,700.00		1,250,000.00
Waters & Schanzlin "Ruby"	21-0524-PG	24.000	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	168,000.00	168,000.00	105,600.00	105,600.00		926,300.00
Apgar Cider Press	21-0251-PG	19.000	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	133,000.00	133,000.00	83,600.00	83,600.00		820,700.00
Stern	21-0529-PG	105.000	5,600.00	5,600.00	3,700.00	588,000.00	588,000.00	388,500.00	388,500.00		737,100.00
											348,600.00
Waiting for final approval											
Withdrawn											
Steckel	21-0520-PG	64.000									
Total Pending	4	231.000						901,400.00			
Total Encumbered	3	231.000							901,400.00		
Closed/Expended										0.00	
Total											348,600.00
Reprogram Out											

Schedule B

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Scot & Norma Stern
21- 0529-PG
PIG EP - Municipal 2007 Rule
105 Acres

Block 33	Lot 47	Harmony Twp.	Warren County
SOILS:		Other	80% * 0 = .00
		Prime	1% * .15 = .15
		Statewide	19% * .1 = 1.90
			SOIL SCORE: 2.05
TILLABLE SOILS:		Cropland Pastured	8% * .15 = 1.20
		Cropland Harvested	48% * .15 = 7.20
		Woodlands	44% * 0 = .00
			TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 8.40
FARM USE:	Corn-Cash Grain	48 acres	
	Hay	10 acres	

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:
 - 1st two (2) acres for future residence
Exception is not to be severed from Premises
Exception is to be limited to one future single family residential unit(s)
 - 2nd (.16) acres for Sewer easement / Lot line adjustment
Exception is severable
 - 3rd (1.2) acres for Exception of Slater Lane within Property
Exception is not to be severed from Premises
 - c. Additional Restrictions: No Additional Restrictions
 - d. Additional Conditions: No Additional Conditions
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises:
No Structures On Premise
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(4)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO

KNOWLTON TOWNSHIP

for the

PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of

John Anderson & Cynthia Brown ("Owners")

Knowlton Township, Warren County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A

SADC ID# 21-0483-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2007, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.4, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") application from Knowlton Township, Warren County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.7, the SADC granted approval to Knowlton Township's Farmland Preservation FY15 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2013, the SADC received an individual application for the sale of a development easement from Knowlton Township for the Anderson Farm, identified as Block 3, Lot 3 & 3.01, Knowlton Township, Warren County, totaling approximately 120 net easement acres (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Anderson Farm is located in the Township's Knowlton Township Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 0.6-acre non-severable exception around an existing residence; and

WHEREAS, the Property has zero (0) existing single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception area; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in timber and hay production; and

WHEREAS, at the time of green light approval an inspection of the Property determined that 25.4 acres met the tillability requirement needed to satisfy the minimum criteria described in N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.20; and

WHEREAS, green light approval was granted subject to confirmation that all 25.4 acres are in production at the time of final approval and on June 3, 2014 staff inspected the farm and confirmed that the 25.4 acres in question are in production and able to be categorized as tillable (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the owners have read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9A(b) on September 26, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.11, on January 23, 2014 the SADC certified a development easement value of \$5,200 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of the current valuation date of November 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Township has contracted with the owners at \$5,200 per acre for the development easement; and

WHEREAS, to date \$1,750,000 of FY09 – FY13 funding has been appropriated for the purchase of development easements on the eligible list of farms identified in the Township's approved PIG Plan; and

WHEREAS, to date Knowlton Township has expended \$589,927.93 of its SADC grant funds leaving a cumulative balance of \$1,160,072.07 (Schedule C); and

WHEREAS, Knowlton Township has no other projects pending against this balance; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.13, on April 14, 2014 the Knowlton Township Committee approved the application and a commitment of funding for a cost share of \$850/acre; and

WHEREAS, the Warren County Agriculture Development Board approved the application on May 15, 2014 and secured a commitment of funding on May 28, 2014 from the Warren County Board of Chosen Freeholders for the required local match (\$850/acre); and

WHEREAS, the cost share breakdown is approximately as follows (based on 120 net acres):

	<u>Total</u>	
SADC	\$420,000	(\$3,500/acre and 67.30% of purchase)
Warren County	\$102,000	(\$850/acre and 16.35% of purchase)
Knowlton Township	\$102,000	(\$850/acre and 16.35% of purchase)
Total Easement Purchase	\$624,000	(\$5,200/acre)

WHEREAS, the Township is requesting \$420,000 from the available municipal PIG funding, resulting in a balance of \$740,072.07; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.15, the County shall hold the development easement since the County is providing funding for the preservation of the farm; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11, the SADC shall provide a cost share grant to the Township for up to 50% of the eligible ancillary costs for the purchase of a development easement which will be deducted from its PIG appropriation and subject to the availability of funds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Knowlton Township for the purchase of a development easement on the Property by Warren County, comprising approximately 120 acres, at a State cost share of \$3,500/acre, (67.30% of certified market value), for an estimated total grant need of \$420,000 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule D); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes a 0.6-acre non-severable exception around an existing residence, zero (0) existing single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved outside of the exception area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Township and County agree to the SADC providing its grant directly to Warren County, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the Township and County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement and for residual dwelling site opportunities allocated pursuant to Policy P-19-A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14
Date

Susan E. Payne

Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

Date: 3/26/2014

Tillable Area

Schedule D

Application within the (PA5) Environmentally Sensitive Area

Total Tillable Land - 25.4 ac

3 / P/O 3-R

3 / P/O 3-P

1.4 ac

0.3 ac

2.3 ac


21.4 ac

x:\counties\warco\projects\Anderson_Sub_TILL2.mxd

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

John Anderson and Cynthia Brown
Block 3 P/O Lot 3-R (Remaining lot - 119.0 ac)
P/O Lot 3-P (Proposed Subdivision 39.3 ac)
& P/O Lot 3-P-EN (non-severable exception - 0.6 ac)
Gross Total - 119.6
Knowlton Twp., Warren County

200 100 0 200 400 600 Feet



DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor.

Sources:
NJDA-SADC Farmland Preservation Program
NJIT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

August 1, 2013

Schedule -

**Municipal Planning Incentive Grant
Knowlton Township, Warren County
Plan Approval March 26, 2009**

Farm	SADC ID#	Acres	Pay Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	SADC		Encumbered	Expended	Balance
								Cost Basis	Cost Share			
Peck	21-0473	37.643		3,500.00	3,900.00	2,500.00	146,807.70	131,750.50	94,107.50		94,107.50	1,750,000.00
Buchman	21-0485	59.199	59.146	4,300.00	2,736.39	2,015.47	161,846.52		119,206.99		119,206.99	1,655,892.50
Ring	21-0495	41.659	38.439	4,100.00	4,100.00	2,860.00	157,599.90	157,599.90	109,935.54		109,935.54	1,426,749.97
Bertholf	21-0514	55.628	55.628	5,300.00		3,550.00	294,828.40	294,828.40	197,479.40		197,479.40	1,229,270.57
Ritter	21-0521	7.000	6.981	10,000.00	10,000.00	6,000.00	69,810.00	69,810.00	41,886.00		41,886.00	1,187,384.57
Ancillary Cost Payment											27,312.50	1,160,072.07
Anderson	21-0483	120.000		5,200.00	5,200.00	3,500.00	624,000.00	624,000.00	420,000.00	420,000.00		740,072.07
Total Pending	1	120.000							420,000.00			
Total Encumbered										420,000.00		
Closed/Expended	5	201.129									589,927.93	
Total												740,072.07
Reprogram Out												

Schedule D

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Anderson, John & Cynthia Brown
21- 0483-PG
PIG EP - Municipal 2007 Rule
119 Acres

Block 3	Lot 3	Knowlton Twp.	Warren County
Block 3	Lot 3.01	Knowlton Twp.	Warren County
SOILS:		Other	100% * 0 = .00
			SOIL SCORE: .00
TILLABLE SOILS:		Cropland Pastured	6% * .15 = .90
		Cropland Harvested	10% * .15 = 1.50
		Permanent Pasture	5% * .02 = .10
		Woodlands	79% * 0 = .00
			TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 2.50
FARM USE:		Timber Tracts	95 acres
		Hay	25 acres
			pasture / Hay

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:
 - 1st (.6) acres for existing single family residence
 - Exception is not to be severed from Premises
 - c. Additional Restrictions: No Additional Restrictions
 - d. Additional Conditions:

At the time of final approval there must be confirmation that all 25.4 acres needed to meet the minimum tillability requirement must be in production.
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises: No Dwelling Units
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R(6)(5)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO

BURLINGTON COUNTY

for the

PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Douglas A. & Constance Cramer ("Owners")
Tabernacle Township, Burlington County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.
SADC ID# 03-0376-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2007, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") plan application from Burlington County, hereinafter "County" pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, Burlington County received SADC approval of its FY2014 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on September 14, 2012 the SADC received an application for the sale of a development easement from Burlington County for the Cramer Farm identified as Block 902, Lot 6, Tabernacle Township, Burlington County, totaling 45 net surveyed easement acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in Burlington County's South Project Area and in the Pinelands Special Agricultural Production Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property has a 3-acre non-severable exception area, which has a duplex and is limited to a duplex or two-single family residences; and

WHEREAS, the Property has no pre-existing non-agricultural uses, zero (0) residences, and zero (0) agricultural labor units on the area to be preserved outside of the exception area; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in soybean and blueberry production; and

WHEREAS, the owners have read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property has a quality score of 71.52 which is greater than 70% of the County's average quality score of 45 as determined by the SADC on July 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b), on October 8, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(a); and

WHEREAS, the New Jersey Pinelands Commission Amended Letter of Interpretation # 1571 allocated 2.5 Pinelands Development Credits (PDCs) to the Property; and

WHEREAS, two $\frac{1}{4}$ credits were reserved for the existing duplex or alternatively two single family homes on the exception, leaving a balance of 2.0 PDC's; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the conveyance of the deed of easement to the County, the 2.0 PDCs will be retired; and

WHEREAS, as per N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.3 landowners shall have a choice of having their development easement appraised as per the Pinelands Valuation Formula (Formula) or pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-31; and

WHEREAS, on October 2, 2012, a Pinelands Valuation Formula (Formula) was finalized between SADC and CADB staff as per N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.3, yielding:
Formula Valuation without impervious cover option: \$3,202.31 per acre
Formula Valuation with 10% impervious cover option: \$3,602.60 per acre; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.11, on May 22, 2014, the SADC certified a development easement value of \$2,200 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of July 2012 and a fee simple "before" value of \$6,700 per acre; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted an offer from the County to purchase a development easement for \$3,648 per acre, (which is higher than the SADC certified easement value, but less than the highest appraised easement value of \$4,663 per acre); and

WHEREAS, currently the County has \$0 of base grant funding available, and \$0 available from the FY11 competitive grant and is eligible for up to \$2,458,855.22 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14 (d)-(f), if there are insufficient funds available in a county's base grant the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, the County prioritized its farms and submitted this application to the SADC to conduct a final review of the application for the sale of a development easement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.4, the County is requesting \$73,800 from the competitive grant, leaving a maximum FY13 Competitive grant eligibility to the County of \$2,385,055.22 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 45 net surveyed easement acres):

Cost Share

SADC \$ 73,800.00 (\$1,640 per acre; 44.96% of purchase price and 74.55% of certified value)
 County \$ 90,360.00 (\$2,008 per acre; 55.04% of purchase price and 91.27% of certified value)
\$164,160.00 (\$3,648 per acre); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 the Burlington CADB approved the application on July 11, 2013, the Burlington Board of Chosen Freeholders approved the application on August 14, 2013 with a cost share of \$2,008 per acre, and the Tabernacle Township Committee approved the application on August 12, 2013, but is not participating financially in the easement purchase; and

WHEREAS, Burlington County closed on the development easement on December 17, 2013 for \$164,160 (\$3,648 per acre), which was recorded in Deed Book 13110, Page 7065; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Burlington County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising 45 surveyed easement acres, at a State cost share of \$1,640 per acre, (44.96% of \$3,648 per acre acquisition cost and 74.55% of the certified value of \$2,200) for a total grant need of \$73,800 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property has a 3-acre non-severable exception area limited to a duplex or two single family residences; and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses, zero (0) residences, and zero (0) agricultural labor units on the area to be preserved outside of the exception area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any unused funds encumbered from either the base or competitive grants at the time of final approval shall be returned to their respective sources (competitive or base grant fund) after closing on the easement purchase; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement and for residual

dwelling site opportunities allocated pursuant to Policy P-19-A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14

Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	RECUSED
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

Schedule A



x:\counties\burco\projects\cramer_fwv.mxd

Application within the Pinelands Ag Production Area

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Douglas and Constance Cramer
Block 902 Lots P/O 6 (45.4 ac)
& P/O 6-EN (non-severable exception - 3.0 ac)
Gross Total = 48.4 ac
Tabernacle Twp., Burlington County

250 125 0 250 500 Feet

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor



Wetlands Legend:
F - Freshwater Wetlands
L - Linear Wetlands
M - Wetlands Modified for Agriculture
N - Non-Wetlands
B - 300' Buffer
W - Water

Sources:
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
DDVRFC 2010 Digital Aerial Image

October 1, 2012

									BASE GRANT				COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)	
											Balance FY11	1,500,000		FY11 Balance	0	3,000,000	
											Balance FY13	1,000,000		FY13 Balance	13,866,836		5,000,000
							SADC				Total:	2,500,000					
Farm	Municipality	App Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Basis	Cost Share	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability
Bur Cty/Griffin	North Hanover	104.0730	2,745.00	2,956.00	2,021.50	307,639.79	307,639.79	199,945.86	210,383.57	199,945.86	199,945.86	2,300,054.14					
Bur Cty/Krause	North Hanover	96.0750	6,800.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	643,702.50	643,702.50	405,845.25	408,318.75	405,845.25	405,845.25	1,894,208.89					
Bur Cty/Clayton Block East	New Hanover	196.3000	2,300.00	2,287.30	1,701.11	448,996.60	448,996.99	291,847.72	316,817.11	291,847.72	291,847.72	1,602,361.17					
Bur Cty/Wainright, Cora	Mansfield	135.0000	9,600.00	9,650.00	5,760.00	1,318,890.95	1,310,467.20	785,280.32	602,361.17	602,361.17	602,361.17	1,000,000.00	183,919.15	183,919.15	183,919.15	2,816,080.85	
Bur Cty/Wainright, Curtis	Mansfield	106.0000	10,700.00	10,650.00	6,390.00	1,132,947.00	1,107,802.35	664,681.41					664,681.41	664,681.41	664,681.41	2,151,399.44	
Bur Cty/D'Amico	North Hanover	52.0000	8,000.00	7,550.00	4,675.00	387,450.90	387,450.90	239,911.65					239,911.65	239,911.65	239,911.65	1,911,487.79	
Bur Cty/Murphy	Hainesport	80.0000	5,300.00	7,425.00	3,550.00	596,732.40	424,890.40	284,596.40					285,306.40	284,596.40	284,596.40	1,626,891.39	
Bur Cty/Durr Estate	Mansfield	110.0000	17,300.00	19,000.00	10,380.00	2,123,079.00	1,913,290.04	1,147,974.02					1,176,054.00	1,147,974.02	1,147,974.02	478,917.37	
Bur Cty/Stattel	Pemberton	152.400	3,195.02	3,195.00	1,917.00	486,918.00	482,614.34	292,151.00					292,151.00	292,151.00	292,151.00	186,766.37	
Bur Cty/Stevenson	Pemberton	110.653	3,050.00	4,550.00	2,230.00	503,471.15	337,491.65	246,756.19					151,131.95	151,131.95	151,131.95	35,634.42	
Balance-\$95,624.24 paid with FY09 (2007) competitive grant funds																	5,000,000.00
Bur Cty/DiTullio, Anthony	Mansfield	90.000	7,700.00	9,650.00	4,750.00	868,114.00	689,981.60	425,638.00	427,500.00	425,638.00	425,638.00	574,362.00					
Bur Cty/Alloway Family	Shamong	103.000	4,440.00	4,536.00	3,064.00	497,264.96	486,526.32	335,746.99	335,746.99	335,746.99	335,746.99	238,615.01					
Bur Cty/Bush	Pemberton	60.689	2,952.00	4,001.00	2,166.40	242,816.69	179,153.93	121,408.34	121,408.34	121,408.34	121,408.34	117,206.67					
Chung	Shamong	91.000	3,590.00	4,165.00	2,554.00	390,385.45	336,490.70	239,386.42	117,206.67				0.00			28,079.98	
												FY13 comp.	7,554.44				
Thompson - Goose Pond	Tabernacle	620.000	1,355.00	2,564.00	1,894.79	1,637,370.40	1,637,364.01	1,210,012.89					114,625.310				4,885,374.69
Thompson - Peach	Woodland	224.000	1,735.00	2,912.00	2,138.28	671,856.64	671,817.42	493,343.96					1,210,012.894				3,675,361.80
Thompson - Vincentown	Southampton	26.000	7,400.00	7,400.00	4,600.00	198,172.00	198,172.00	123,188.00					493,343.962				3,182,017.83
Simon's Berry Farm	Tabernacle	266.000	978.00	1,725.00	1,307.50	472,615.50	472,615.50	358,228.85					123,188.000				3,058,829.83
Thompson & Wright (Birches)	Tabernacle	112.902	1,922.00	2,916.00	2,141.20	329,222.23	329,222.23	241,745.76					358,228.850				2,700,600.98
Cramer	Tabernacle	45.000	2,200.00	3,648.00	1,640.00	164,160.00	164,160.00	73,800.00					241,745.76				2,458,855.22
													73,800.00				2,385,055.22

JUNE 6, 2014

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Douglas A. and Constance Cramer
03- 0376-PG
County PIG Program
46 Acres

Block 902	Lot 6	Tabernacle Twp.	Burlington County
SOILS:		Other	8% * 0 = .00
		Prime	58% * .15 = 8.70
		Statewide	34% * .1 = 3.40
			SOIL SCORE: 12.10
TILLABLE SOILS:		Cropland Harvested	94% * .15 = 14.10
		Wetlands	2% * 0 = .00
		Woodlands	4% * 0 = .00
			TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 14.10
FARM USE:		Berry	41 acres
		Soybeans-Cash Grain	1 acres

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
4. Execution of and agreement between the Municipality, State Agriculture Development Committee and Landowner.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:

1st three (3) acres for 2 existing resid. (duplex) and future farmstand

Exception is not to be severed from Premises

No additional residences would be permitted per Pinelands credit allocation.
 - c. Additional Restrictions: No Additional Restrictions
 - d. Additional Conditions: No Additional Conditions
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises:

No Structures On Premise
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(6)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO
CUMBERLAND COUNTY
for the
PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Peter S. Watson ("Owner")
Hopewell Township, Cumberland County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.
SADC ID# 06-0137-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2008, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") plan application from Cumberland County, hereinafter "County" pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, Cumberland County received SADC approval of its FY2015 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2013 the SADC received an application for the sale of a development easement from Cumberland County for the Watson #2 farm identified as Block 89, Lot 25, Hopewell Township, Cumberland County, totaling approximately 67 net acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in Cumberland County's Hopewell South Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property has one (1) 1.5-acre non-severable exception area limited to one single family residence; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, no pre-existing non-agricultural uses outside of the exception areas; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in wheat production; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property's quality score of 70.06 exceeds 41, which is 70% of the County's average quality score as determined by the SADC on September 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b) on June 25, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.11, on July 25, 2013 the SADC originally certified a development easement value of \$4,050 per acre for the Property, without an exception area, based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as of March 2012; and

WHEREAS, subsequently, the landowner requested a 1.5 acre exception area on the Property, for a future dwelling, requiring both independent appraisers to evaluate the effect of this change on the per acre value, which then compelled the SADC to amend the certified easement value to \$3,700 based on zoning and environmental regulation in place as of March 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted the County's offer of \$3,700 per acre for the development easement for the Property; and

WHEREAS, the County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases, therefore, 69.01 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need; and

WHEREAS, the New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP); and

WHEREAS, the NRCS has determined that the Property and Owner qualify for FRPP grant funds; and

WHEREAS, the Watson Farm was approved by the NRCS for an estimated grant up to \$207,000 not to exceed 50% of the federal current fair market value and

WHEREAS, at this time the FRPP approved current easement value has not been finalized, therefore, the FRPP grant will be calculated based on the estimated FRPP current easement value of \$4,000 per acre (highest of the two appraisals) equating to an FRPP grant of \$2,000 per acre (50% of \$4,000) or approximately \$136,000 in total FRPP funds; and

WHEREAS, the landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the FRPP Grant, including a 8% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 5.44 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the Property outside of exception area which is the maximum allowable for this property through the FRPP program at this time; and

WHEREAS, the Open Space Institute (OSI) indicated that it is prepared to contribute up to \$41,779 toward the total purchase price of the development easement or one-sixth of the total easement cost whichever is less with no additional restrictions on the Property, to assist toward its goal of preserving land within the Delaware Bayshore region; and

WHEREAS, the terms and conditions of the proposed OSI funding contribution is subject to advanced review and approval by SADC legal staff and the Office of the Attorney General; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on November 27, 2013, the Cumberland CADB passed a resolution granting final approval for funding the Property; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on December 23, 2013, the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Cumberland passed a resolution granting final approval and a commitment of funding for \$1,080 per acre per acre to cover the entire local cost share; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13, on January 6, 2014, the Hopewell Township Committee approved the Owner's application for the sale of a development easement, with a funding commitment of \$185 per acre; and

WHEREAS, to best leverage available funding, the County requested to use the OSI and FRPP funding to first cover the County and Township's cost share and then, with the remaining funds, reduce the SADC's cost share if the FRPP and OSI funding is utilized; and

WHEREAS, should OSI and FRPP funding not be available, the County and Township have agreed to fully fund the entire local (non-SADC cost-share in order to proceed with preservation of this farm; and

WHEREAS, on April 29, 2014 the County prioritized its farms and submitted its applications in priority order to the SADC to conduct a final review of the application for the sale of a development easement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 69.01 acres); and

	<u>Cost Share</u>	
SADC	\$180,806.20	(\$2,620/ acre; 70.81%)
Cumberland County	\$ 61,763.95	(\$ 895/ acre; 24.19%)
Hopewell Twp.	\$ 12,766.85	(\$ 185/ acre; 5.00%)
Total Easement Purchase	\$255,337	(\$3,700/ acre)

Cost share breakdown if FRPP grant \$136,000 and OSI grant \$41,779 is applied:

	Total	OSI	FRPP \$	New Cost Share
SADC	\$180,806.20	\$ _____	\$103,248.20	\$ 77,558
County	\$ 61,763.95	\$ 29,012.15	\$ 32,751.80	
Twp.	\$ 12,766.85	\$ 12,766.85	\$0	
OSI				\$ 41,779
FRPP				\$ 136,000
TOTAL	\$255,337	\$41,779	\$136,000.00	\$ 255,337

WHEREAS, currently the County has \$2,785.51 of base grant funding available and \$0 of FY11 competitive funding and is eligible for up to \$2,434,228.71 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14 (d) (f), if there are insufficient funds available in a county's base grant, the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the Cumberland County Agriculture Development Board is requesting \$180,806.20 from the FY13 competitive grant, leaving a cumulative base grant balance of \$2,253,422.51 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the SADC has determined that the encumbrance of competitive grant funds associated with the acquisition of development easements that ultimately may be purchased, in part, with FRPP funds does not have an immediate adverse impact on another county's access to competitive funds, but if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP and/or OSI funds, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on an affected Property; and

WHEREAS, should alternate FRPP funding become available from other funding years or through other qualified entities such as a Non-Profit organization, the SADC or the County, the alternate funding may be utilized if such funding benefits the easement acquisition and/or the successful use of FRPP funding; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Cumberland County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising approximately 69.01 acres, at a State cost share of \$2,620 per acre, (70.81% of purchase price), for a total grant need of \$180,806.20 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the county will utilize FY 2013 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if FRPP and/ or OSI funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to offset the local cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$103,248.20); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP and/ or OSI funds, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on the Property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if additional base grant funds are needed due to an increase in acreage the grant may be adjusted so long as it does not impact any other applications' encumbrance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any unused funds encumbered from either the base or competitive grants at the time of final approval shall be returned to their respective sources (competitive or base grant fund); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property has (1) 1.5-acre non-severable exception area limited to one single family residence, zero (0) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities, zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses outside of the exception areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.



6/26/14

Date

Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

Application within both the (PA4) Rural
and the (PA5) Env Sens Areas



x:/counties/cumco/projects/watson2_fwv.mxd


FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Peter S. Watson (#2)
Block 89 Lots P/O 25 (67.4 ac)
& P/O 25-EN (non-severable exception - 1.5 ac)
Gross Total = 68.9 ac
Hopewell Twp., Cumberland County

500 250 0 500 1,000 Feet

TIDELANDS DISCLAIMER:
The linear features depicted on this map were derived from the NJDEP's CD ROM series 1, volume 4, "Tidelands Claims Maps". These linear features are not an official NJDEP determination and should only be used as a general reference. Only NJDEP, Bureau of Tidelands Management can perform an official determination of Tidelands/Riparian claims.

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor.



Wetlands Legend:
F - Freshwater Wetlands
L - Linear Wetlands
M - Wetlands Modified for Agriculture
T - Tidal Wetlands
N - Non-Wetlands
B - 300' Buffer
W - Water

Sources:
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
NJOT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

March 19, 2013

New Jersey Farmland Preservation Program
Preservation Program
County Planning Incentive Grant - N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.

Schedule B

									BASE GRANT			COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)	
									Balance FY11	1,500,000		FY11 Balance		0	3,000,000	
									Balance FY13	1,000,000						
							SADC		Total base grant			2,500,000	FY13 Balance	14,438,303	5,000,000	
Farm	Municipality	Plus 3 Percent Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Share	SADC Federal Grant	Encumbered at Final	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability
Shimp, Newton B. III	Stow Creek	105.06	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	458,617.50	315,936.50	not used	325,686.00	315,936.50	2,184,063.5					
Kacewich, Norman & Lynette	Stow Creek	17.891	8,000.00	8,000.00	4,900.00	135,704.00	75,704.00	7,414.70	87,665.90	75,704.00	2,108,359.5					
Jones, Clifton & Dorothy	Greenwich	72.1	4,000.00	4,000.00	2,800.00	274,000.00	169,000.00	22,800.00	201,880.00	169,000.00	1,939,359.5					
Newton, Thomas	Greenwich	46.659	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	195,853.50	100,065.50	34,855.80	144,642.90	100,065.50	1,839,294.0					
Dickinson, Everett et al	Shiloh Boro	41.2	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	257,178.60	165,329.10		166,860.00	165,329.10	1,673,964.9					
Cum Cty/Kates, Thomas	Lawrence	25.75	5,200.00	6,500.00	3,500.00	165,145.50	88,924.50		90,125.00	88,924.50	1,585,040.4					
Coll #1, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	48.41	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	224,910.00	153,306.00		161,689.40	153,306.00	1,431,734.4					
Cum Cty/Sheppard Anne	Greenwich	73.13	3,750.00	4,082.81	2,850.00	292,092.20	188,791.30		193,794.50	188,791.30	1,242,943.1					
Coll #2, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	42.23	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	198,900.00	134,550.00		145,693.50	134,550.00	1,108,393.1					
Adamucci #2, Carmen	Hopewell	49.44	7,200.00	7,200.00	4,500.00	339,796.80	212,373.00	57,500.00	1,489.70	1,489.70	1,106,903.4	222,480.00	210,883.30	210,883.30	2,789,116.7	
Cumberland Co/Riggins #2	Stow Creek	76.154	3,500.00	3,500.00	2,500.00	266,021.00	190,015.00				190,385.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	2,599,101.70	
Ruske, Roger, Margaret & Chris	Fairfield Twp.	211.150	5,500.00	5,500.00	3,650.00	1,131,856.00	648,244.80	102,896.00	770,697.50	648,244.80	648,244.80	648,244.80	648,244.80	648,244.80	1,950,856.90	
Van Meter, Alfred #1	Hopewell	41.200	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	262,465.80	166,489.50		175,100.00	166,489.50	1,784,367.40					
Van Meter, Alfred #2	Hopewell	42.230	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	273,668.20	173,595.50	43,159.30	179,477.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	1,610,771.90	
Keung Lam Realty	Lawrence	71.070	4,300.00	4,300.00	2,980.00	297,560.00	206,216.00		211,788.60	206,216.00	2,062,216.00	211,788.60	206,216.00	206,216.00	1,404,555.90	
Paladino, Vincent	Deerfield	30.900	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	184,842.00	116,186.40		135,960.00	116,186.40	1,166,186.40	135,960.00	116,186.40	116,186.40	1,288,369.50	
Baltinger, Frank P., III	Hopewell	72.100	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	452,666.50	106,079.96	162,930.15	299,215.00	106,079.96	1,060,799.96	299,215.00	106,079.96	106,079.96	1,182,289.54	
Minch, Michael et al	Hopewell	11.330	12,100.00	12,100.00	7,260.00	134,600.40	80,760.24			2,116.46	1,104,786.94	82,255.80	78,643.78	78,643.78	1,103,645.76	
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #1	Shiloh Boro	61.800	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	411,425.70	258,610.44	34,757.00	7,827.41	1,096,959.53	264,185.40	250,783.03	250,783.03	250,783.03	852,862.73	
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #2	Shiloh Boro	103.000	6,000.00	6,000.00	3,900.00	590,184.00	383,619.60	80,700.00	401,700.00	383,619.60	383,619.60	383,619.60	383,619.60	383,619.60	469,243.13	
Cum.Co/Mooneyham	Greenwich		6,800.00	6,650.00	4,225.00	155,935.85	96,959.53		99,072.03	96,959.53	1,000,000.00					
Cruzan, Daniel & Diane	Hopewell	95.184	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	582,542.10	374,491.35				374,268.60	374,491.35	374,491.35	374,491.35	94,751.78	
Cross #1	Hopewell		9,250.00	9,250.00	5,550.00	131,091.00	78,654.60	2,834.40	78,654.60	75,669.09	924,130.91					
Cross #2	Hopewell	55.672	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	361,868.00	231,038.80	22,268.80	231,038.80	231,038.80	693,092.11					
Cross #3	Hopewell	70.040	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	350,200.00	238,136.00	37,536.00	238,136.00		454,956.11					
Cross #4	Hopewell	70.040	6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	434,248.00	280,160.00	46,512.00	280,160.00		174,796.11					
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #3	Shiloh Boro		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	444,457.00	289,769.70	51,283.50	172,010.60		2,785.51	94,751.78			0.00	
												17,008.32				4,982,993.68
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #4	Hopewell		6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	235,643.40	152,028.00	34,206.30			152,028.00	152,028.00	152,028.00	152,028.00		4,830,965.68
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #5	Hopewell		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	240,656.00	153,649.60	33,321.60			153,649.60	153,649.60	153,649.60	153,649.60		4,677,316.08
Adamucci #1, Carmen Sr.	Hopewell		5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	635,666.00	414,799.00	92,128.95			417,289.95	414,799.00				4,262,517.08
SF Systems Company(sheppard)	Lawrence	43.260	4,400.00	4,400.00	3,040.00	190,344.00	131,510.40				131,510.40	131,510.40	131,510.40	131,510.40	4,131,006.68	
DeVecchio, Brian & Susan	Lawrence		5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	230,795.40	156,126.30				156,126.30	156,126.30	156,126.30	156,126.30	3,974,880.38	
Edwards	Upper Deerfield	41.200	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	206,000.00	140,080.00				140,080.00				3,834,800.38	
Tirelli	Upper Deerfield	47.562	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	242,567.78	159,310.65				164,089.97	159,310.65	159,310.65	159,310.65	3,675,489.73	
Blew	Hopewell	25.750	5,400.00	5,400.00	3,600.00	139,050.00	92,700.00	23,102.50			92,700.00				3,582,789.73	
Cum.Co/Sheppard Mark K.	Stow Creek		5,200.00	6,000.00	3,500.00	423,600.00	245,700.00				245,700.00				3,337,089.73	
Cimino, Joseph & Edith	Hopewell	53.560	5,700.00	5,700.00	3,750.00	296,183.40	194,857.50				200,850.00				3,136,239.73	
Hasher	Stow Creek		4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	279,812.40	194,536.24				194,536.24	194,536.24			2,941,703.49	
Rook	Hopewell		3,400.00	3,400.00	2,440.00	382,234.80	274,309.68				274,309.68				2,667,393.81	
Van DerVeer	Hopewell	17.510	5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	103,309.00	64,595.30				64,595.30				2,602,798.51	
Watson #1	Hopewell	50.470	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	247,303.00	168,569.80				168,569.80				2,434,228.71	
Watson #2	Hopewell	69.010	3,700.00	3,700.00	2,620.00	255,337.00	180,806.20	103,248.20			180,806.20				2,253,422.51	
									Encumbered	Expend	Balance	Encumbered		Expend		Balance
Encumbered/Expended FY11									0.00	1,500,000.00	0.00	94,751.78		2,905,248.22	0.00	
Encumbered/Expended FY13									690,306.60	306,907.89	2,785.51	1,993,952.54		752,624.95		2,253,422.51
Total						13,116,332	8,240,585	0.00	690,306.60	1,806,907.89	2,785.51	2,088,704.32		3,657,873.17	0.00	
Reprogram Out																

Schedule B

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Watson, Peter S. (2)
06- 0137-PG
County PIG Program
67 Acres

Block 89	Lot 25	Hopewell Twp.	Cumberland County
SOILS:		Prime	59% * .15 = 8.85
		Statewide	20% * .1 = 2.00
		Unique zero	21% * 0 = .00
			SOIL SCORE: 10.85
TILLABLE SOILS:		Cropland Harvested	74% * .15 = 11.10
		Other	3% * 0 = .00
		Wetlands	13% * 0 = .00
		Woodlands	10% * 0 = .00
			TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 11.10
FARM USE:	Wheat-Cash Grain	48 acres	rotating with soybeans

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:
 - 1st (1.5) acres for Future dwelling
 - Exception is not to be severed from Premises
 - Exception is to be limited to zero existing single family residential unit(s) and one future single family residential unit(s)
 - c. Additional Restrictions:
 1. Possible FRPP funding via NJCF and OSI funding from the Open Space Institute
 - d. Additional Conditions:

If FRPP funding is secured, pursuant to the Federal farm and Ranch Land Protection Program, the landowner agreed to a maximum impervious coverage of 8% or approximately 5.36 acres

If OSI money is secured the terms and conditions of the funding are subject to the advanced review and approval of SADC legal staff and the Office of the Attorney General.
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises:

No Structures On Premise
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(7)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO
CUMBERLAND COUNTY
for the
PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Kathleen A. Casper ("Owner")
Stow Creek Township, Cumberland County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.
SADC ID# 06-0138-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2008, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") plan application from Cumberland County, hereinafter "County" pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, Cumberland County received SADC approval of its FY2015 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2013 the SADC received an application for the sale of a development easement from Cumberland County for the subject farm identified as Block 19, Lots 9, 9.02 & 9.03, Stow Creek Township, Cumberland County, totaling approximately 29 net acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in Cumberland County's Stow Creek Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property has two (2) 1.5-acre severable exception areas, each associated with and limited to one existing single family residence; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, no pre-existing non-agricultural uses outside of the exception areas; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in wheat and soybean production; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property's quality score of 63.38 exceeds 41, which is 70% of the County's average quality score as determined by the SADC on September 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b) on June 10, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.11, on November 14, 2013 the SADC certified a development easement value of \$4,800 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as January 2013; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted the County's offer of \$4,800 per acre for the development easement for the Property; and

WHEREAS, the New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP); and

WHEREAS, the NRCS has determined that the Property and Owner qualify for FRPP grant funds; and

WHEREAS, the Casper Farm was approved by the NRCS for an estimated grant of up to \$98,000 not to exceed 50% of the federal current fair market value; and

WHEREAS, at this time the FRPP approved current easement value has not been finalized, therefore, the FRPP grant will be calculated based on the estimated FRPP current easement value of \$6,400 per acre (highest of the two appraisals) equating to an FRPP grant of \$3,200 per acre (50% of \$6,400) or approximately \$92,800 in total FRPP funds; and

WHEREAS, the landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the FRPP Grant, including a 7.33% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 2.125 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the Property outside of exception areas which is the maximum allowable for this property through the FRPP program at this time; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on November 27, 2013, the Cumberland CADB passed a resolution granting final approval for funding the Property; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on December 23, 2013, the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Cumberland passed a resolution granting final approval and a commitment of funding for \$1,520 per acre per acre to cover the entire local cost share; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13, on March 11, 2014, the Stow Creek Township Committee approved the Owner's application for the sale of a development easement, but is not participating financially in the easement purchase; and

WHEREAS, to best leverage available funding, the County requested to use the FRPP funding to first to cover the County's cost share and then, with any remaining funds, reduce the SADC's cost share; and

WHEREAS, should FRPP funding not be available, the County and Township have agreed to fully fund the entire local (non-SADC) cost-share in order to proceed with the preservation of this farm; and

WHEREAS, on April 29, 2014 the County prioritized its farms and submitted its applications in priority order to the SADC to conduct a final review of the application for the sale of a development easement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76 17.14 (d) (f), if there are insufficient funds available in a county's base grant, the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, the County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases, therefore, 29.87 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 29.87 acres); and

	<u>Cost Share</u>	
SADC	\$ 97,973.60	(\$3,280/ acre; 68.33%)
Cumberland County	\$ 45,402.40	(\$1,520/ acre; 31.67%)
Total Easement Purchase	\$143,376.00	(\$4,800/ acre)

Estimated Cost share breakdown if the \$92,800 FRPP Grant is finalized and applied:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FRPP \$</u>	<u>New Cost Share</u>
SADC	\$97,973.60 (\$3,280/ acre)	\$47,397.60	\$50,576 (\$1,600/ acre)
Cumberland County	\$45,402.40 (\$1,520/ acre)	\$45,402.40	\$0
FRPP Grant			\$ 92,800.00 (\$3,200/ acre)
TOTAL	\$143,376.00	\$92,800	\$143,376.00 (\$4,800/ acre)

WHEREAS, currently the County is eligible for up to \$2,785.51 in FY13 base grant funding and \$2,253,422.51 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the Cumberland County Agriculture Development Board is requesting \$97,973.60 from the FY13 competitive grant, leaving a cumulative base grant balance of \$2,155,448.91 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the SADC has determined that the encumbrance of competitive grant funds associated with the acquisition of development easements that ultimately may be purchased, in part, with FRPP funds does not have an immediate adverse impact on another county's access to competitive funds, but if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP, the SADC retains the right to rescind its

Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on an affected Property; and

WHEREAS, should alternate FRPP funding become available from other funding years or through other qualified entities such as a Non-Profit organization, the SADC or the County, the alternate funding may be utilized if such funding benefits the easement acquisition and/or the successful use of FRPP funding; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Cumberland County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising approximately 29.87 acres, at a State cost share of \$3,280 per acre, (68.33% of purchase price), for a total grant need of \$97,973.60 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County will utilize FY13 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if FRPP funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to reduce the County cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$47,397.60); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on the Property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if additional base grant funds are needed due to an increase in acreage the grant may be adjusted so long as it does not impact any other applications' encumbrance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any unused funds encumbered from either the base or competitive grants at the time of final approval shall be returned to their respective sources (competitive or base grant fund); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property has (2) 1.5-acre severable exception areas, each limited to one existing single family residence; and zero (0) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities, zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses outside of the exception areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14


Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES



- Property In Question**
- EH - (Non-Severable) Exception
 - ES - (Severable) Exception
- Wellands Boundaries**
- Primary - Limited Access
 - Federal or State Hwy
 - County Roads
 - Municipal/Local Roads
 - Municipal, County and Non-Profit
 - Preserved Open Space
 - State Owned Conservation Easement
 - State Owned OS & Recreation Easement
- Wellands Legend:**
- F - Freshwater Wetlands
 - M - Marine Wetlands
 - T - Tidal Wetlands
 - B - 300' Buffer
 - W - Water



Application within the (PA4) Rural Area
FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM
NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Kathleen A. Casper
 Block 19 Lots P/O 9 (10.3 ac); P/O 9-ES (severable exception - 1.5 ac);
 P/O 9.02 (5.5 ac); P/O 9.02-ES (severable exception - 1.5 ac) & 9.03 (12.2 ac)
 Gross Total = 31.0 ac
 Stow Creek Twp., Cumberland County

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The compilation and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed for planning purposes. The geospatial accuracy and precision of the data is not warranted. The data is not to be used for legal purposes. All contours as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed professional surveyor.

Sources:
 NDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
 NDEP Marine Wetlands Data
 NDEP Tidal Wetlands Data
 NDEP 300' Buffer
 NDEP Water
 ch 20, 2013

New Jersey Farmland Preservation Program
Preservation Program
County Planning Incentive Grant - N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.

									BASE GRANT			COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)			
									SADC	Encumbered at Final	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final		Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability
Balance FY11			1,500,000	FY11 Balance			0	3,000,000										
Balance FY13			1,000,000	FY13 Balance			14,438,303	5,000,000										
Total base grant			2,500,000	FY13 Balance			14,438,303	5,000,000										
Farm	Municipality	Plus 3 Percent Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Share	SADC Federal Grant	Encumbered at Final	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability		
Shimp, Newton B. III	Stow Creek	105.06	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	458,617.50	315,936.50	not used	325,686.00	315,936.50	2,184,663.5							
Kacewich, Norman & Lynette	Stow Creek	17.891	8,000.00	8,000.00	4,900.00	135,704.00	75,704.00	7,414.70	87,665.90	75,704.00	2,108,359.5							
Jones, Clifton & Dorothy	Greenwich	72.1	4,000.00	4,000.00	2,800.00	274,000.00	169,000.00	22,800.00	201,880.00	169,000.00	1,939,359.5							
Newton, Thomas	Greenwich	46.659	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	195,853.50	100,065.50	34,855.80	144,642.90	100,065.50	1,839,294.0							
Dickinson, Everett et al	Shiloh Boro	41.2	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	257,178.60	165,329.10		166,860.00	165,329.10	1,673,964.9							
Cum Cty/Kates, Thomas	Lawrence	25.75	5,200.00	6,500.00	3,500.00	165,145.50	88,924.50		90,125.00	88,924.50	1,585,040.4							
Coll #1, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	48.41	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	224,910.00	153,306.00		161,689.40	153,306.00	1,431,734.4							
Cum Cty/Sheppard Anne	Greenwich	73.13	3,750.00	4,082.81	2,650.00	292,092.20	188,791.30		193,794.50	188,791.30	1,242,943.1							
Coll #2, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	42.23	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	198,900.00	134,550.00		145,693.50	134,550.00	1,108,393.1							
Adamucci #2, Carmen	Hopewell	49.44	7,200.00	7,200.00	4,500.00	339,796.80	212,373.00	57,600.00	1,489.70	1,489.70	1,106,903.4	222,480.00	210,883.30	210,883.30	2,789,116.7			
Cumberland Co/Riggins #2	Stow Creek	76.154	3,500.00	3,500.00	2,500.00	266,021.00	180,015.00					190,385.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	2,599,101.70			
Ruske, Roger, Margaret & Chris	Fairfield Twp.	211.150	5,500.00	5,500.00	3,650.00	1,131,856.00	648,244.80	102,896.00				770,697.50	648,244.80	648,244.80	1,950,856.90			
Van Meter, Alfred #1	Hopewell	41.200	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	262,465.80	166,489.50					175,100.00	166,489.50	166,489.50	1,784,367.40			
Van Meter, Alfred #2	Hopewell	42.230	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	273,668.20	173,595.50	43,159.30				179,477.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	1,610,771.90			
Keung Lam Realty	Lawrence	71.070	4,300.00	4,300.00	2,980.00	297,560.00	206,216.00					211,788.60	206,216.00	206,216.00	1,404,555.90			
Paladino, Vincent	Deerfield	30.900	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	184,842.00	116,186.40					135,960.00	116,186.40	116,186.40	1,288,369.50			
Baltinger, Frank P., III	Hopewell	72.100	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	452,666.50	106,079.96	182,930.19				299,215.00	106,079.96	106,079.96	1,182,289.54			
Minch, Michael et al	Hopewell	11.330	12,100.00	12,100.00	7,260.00	134,600.40	80,760.24			2,116.46	1,104,786.94	82,255.80	78,643.78	78,643.78	1,103,645.76			
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #1	Shiloh Boro	61.800	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	411,425.70	258,610.44	27,570.00		7,827.41	1,096,959.53	264,185.40	250,783.03	250,783.03	852,862.73			
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #2	Shiloh Boro	103.000	6,000.00	6,000.00	3,900.00	590,184.00	383,619.60	80,700.00			1,096,959.53	401,700.00	383,619.60	383,619.60	469,243.13			
Cum.Co/Mooneyham	Greenwich		6,800.00	6,650.00	4,225.00	155,935.85	96,959.53		99,072.03	96,959.53	1,000,000.00							
Cruzan, Daniel & Diane	Hopewell	95.184	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	582,542.10	374,491.35					374,268.60	374,491.35	374,491.35	94,751.78			
Cross #1	Hopewell		9,250.00	9,250.00	5,550.00	131,091.00	78,654.60	2,834.40		78,654.60	924,130.91							
Cross #2	Hopewell	55.672	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	361,868.00	231,038.80	22,268.80		231,038.80	693,092.11							
Cross #3	Hopewell	70.040	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	350,200.00	238,136.00		37,536.00	238,136.00	454,956.11							
Cross #4	Hopewell	70.040	6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	434,248.00	280,160.00		46,512.00	280,160.00	174,796.11							
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #3	Shiloh Boro		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	444,457.00	283,768.70	51,283.50		172,010.60	2,785.51				0.00			
												94,751.78						
												17,006.32				4,982,993.68		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #4	Hopewell		6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	235,643.40	152,028.00	34,206.30				152,028.00	152,028.00	152,028.00		4,830,965.68		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #5	Hopewell		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	240,656.00	153,649.60	33,321.60				153,649.60	153,649.60	153,649.60		4,677,316.08		
Adamucci #1, Carmen Sr.	Hopewell		5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	635,666.00	414,799.00	92,128.95				417,289.95	414,799.00			4,262,517.08		
SF Systems Company(sheppard)	Lawrence	43.260	4,400.00	4,400.00	3,040.00	190,344.00	131,510.40					131,510.40	131,510.40	131,510.40		4,131,006.68		
DelVecchio, Brian & Susan	Lawrence		5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	230,795.40	156,126.30					156,126.30	156,126.30	156,126.30		3,974,880.38		
Edwards	Upper Deerfield	41.200	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	206,000.00	140,080.00					140,080.00				3,834,800.38		
Tirelli	Upper Deerfield	47.562	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	242,567.78	159,310.65					164,089.97	159,310.65	159,310.65		3,675,489.73		
Blew	Hopewell	25.750	5,400.00	5,400.00	3,600.00	139,050.00	92,700.00	23,102.50				92,700.00				3,582,789.73		
Cum.Co/Sheppard Mark K.	Stow Creek		5,200.00	6,000.00	3,500.00	423,600.00	245,700.00					245,700.00				3,337,089.73		
Cimino, Joseph & Edith	Hopewell	53.560	5,700.00	5,700.00	3,750.00	296,183.40	194,857.50					200,850.00				3,136,239.73		
Hasher	Stow Creek		4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	279,812.40	194,536.24					194,536.24	194,536.24			2,941,703.49		
Rook	Hopewell		3,400.00	3,400.00	2,440.00	382,234.80	274,309.68					274,309.68				2,667,393.81		
Van DerVeer	Hopewell	17.510	5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	103,309.00	64,595.30					64,595.30				2,602,798.51		
Watson #1	Hopewell	50.470	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	247,303.00	168,569.80					168,569.80				2,434,228.71		
Watson #2	Hopewell	69.010	3,700.00	3,700.00	2,620.00	255,337.00	180,806.20	103,248.20				180,806.20				2,253,422.51		
Casper	Stow Creek	29.870	4,800.00	4,800.00	3,280.00	143,376.00	97,973.60					97,973.60				2,155,448.91		
									Encumbered	Expend	Balance	Encumbered		Expend	Balance			
Encumbered/Expended FY11									0.00	1,500,000.00	0.00	94,751.78		2,905,248.22	0.00			
Encumbered/Expended FY13									690,306.60	306,907.89	2,785.51	2,091,926.14		752,624.95	2,155,448.91			
Total									690,306.60	1,806,907.89	2,785.51	2,186,677.92		3,657,873.17	0.00			
Reprogram Out																		

Schedule B

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Kathleen A. Casper
06- 0138-PG
County PIG Program
29 Acres

Block 19	Lot 9	Stow Creek Twp.	Cumberland County
Block 19	Lot 9.02	Stow Creek Twp.	Cumberland County
Block 19	Lot 9.03	Stow Creek Twp.	Cumberland County

SOILS:	Prime	100% * .15 = 15.00	
			SOIL SCORE: 15.00
TILLABLE SOILS:	Cropland Harvested	96% * .15 = 14.40	
	Woodlands	4% * 0 = .00	
			TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 14.40
FARM USE:	Wheat-Cash Grain	11 acres	rotating with soybeans

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:
 - 1st (1.5) acres for Existing dwelling
Exception is severable
Exception is to be limited to one existing single family residential unit(s) and zero future single family residential unit(s)
 - 2nd (1.5) acres for Existing dwelling
Exception is severable
Exception is to be limited to one existing single family residential unit(s) and zero future single family residential unit(s)
 - c. Additional Restrictions:
 1. Possible FRPP funding via NJCF
 - d. Additional Conditions:

If FRPP funding is secured, pursuant to the Federal Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program the landowner agreed to a maximum impervious coverage of 7.33% or approximately 2.125 acres.
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises:

No Structures On Premise
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(8)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO
CUMBERLAND COUNTY
for the
PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Paul and Amy Gilson ("Owners")
Lawrence Township, Cumberland County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.
SADC ID# 06-0136-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2008, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") plan application from Cumberland County, hereinafter "County" pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, Cumberland County received SADC approval of its FY2015 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2013 the SADC received an application for the sale of a development easement from Cumberland County for the subject farm identified as Block 188, Lots 4, 12 & 13, Lawrence Township, Cumberland County, totaling approximately 103 net acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in Cumberland County's Fairfield-Lawrence Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, no pre-existing non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property was eligible for one (1) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunity but it was not requested by the landowner; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in ornamental nursery production; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property's quality score of 53.69 exceeds 41, which is 70% of the County's average quality score as determined by the SADC on September 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b) on October 25, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.11, on December 12, 2013 the SADC certified a development easement value of \$4,200 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as January 2013; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted the County's offer of \$4,200 per acre for the development easement for the Property; and

WHEREAS, the County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases, therefore, 106.09 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need; and

WHEREAS, the New Jersey Conservation Foundation submitted a parcel application to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP); and

WHEREAS, the NRCS has determined that the Property and Owner qualify for FRPP grant funds; and

WHEREAS, the Gilson Farm was approved by the NRCS for an estimated grant up to \$273,000 not to exceed 50% of the federal current fair market value and

WHEREAS, at this time the FRPP approved current easement value has not been finalized, therefore, the FRPP grant will be calculated based on the estimated FRPP current easement value of \$4,300 per acre (highest of the two appraisals) equating to an FRPP grant of \$2,150 per acre (50% of \$4,300) or approximately \$221,450 in total FRPP funds; and

WHEREAS, the landowner has agreed to the additional restrictions associated with the FRPP Grant, including a 7.67% maximum impervious coverage restriction (approximately 7.9 acres) for the construction of agricultural infrastructure on the Property which is the maximum allowable for this property through the FRPP program at this time; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on February 19, 2014, the Cumberland CADB passed a resolution granting final approval for funding the Property; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13 on March 25, 2014, the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Cumberland passed a resolution granting final approval and a commitment of funding for \$1,280 per acre per acre to cover the entire local cost share; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13, on April 14, 2014, the Lawrence Township Committee approved the Owner's application for the sale of a development easement,

without a funding commitment; and

WHEREAS, to best leverage available funding, the County is requesting that the FRPP funding first cover the local cost share and then reduce the SADC's cost share; and

WHEREAS, should FRPP funding not be available, the County and Township have agreed to fully fund the entire local (non-SADC) cost-share in order to proceed with the preservation of this farm; and

WHEREAS, on April 29, 2014 the County prioritized its farms and submitted its applications in priority order to the SADC to conduct a final review of the application for the sale of a development easement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 106.09 acres); and

	<u>Cost Share</u>	
SADC	\$309,782.80	(\$2,920/ acre; 69.52%)
Cumberland County	\$135,795.20	(\$1,280/ acre; 30.47%)
Total Easement Purchase	\$445,578	(\$4,200/ acre)

Cost share breakdown after FRPP grant of \$221,450 is applied:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FRPP \$</u>	<u>New Cost Share</u>
SADC	\$309,782.80	\$ 85,654.80	\$224,128
County	\$135,795.20	\$135,795.20	\$0
FRPP			\$221,450
TOTAL	\$445,578	\$221,450	\$445,578

WHEREAS, currently the County has \$2,785.51 of base grant funding available, zero (\$0) of FY11 competitive funding and is eligible for up to \$2,155,448.91 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76 17.14 (d) (f), if there are insufficient funds available in a county's base grant, the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the Cumberland County Agriculture Development Board is requesting \$309,782.80 from the FY13 competitive grant, leaving a cumulative base grant balance of \$1,845,666.11 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the SADC has determined that the encumbrance of competitive grant funds associated with the acquisition of development easements that ultimately may be purchased, in part, with FRPP funds does not have an immediate adverse impact on another county's access to competitive funds, but if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on an affected Property; and

WHEREAS, should alternate FRPP funding become available from other funding years or through other qualified entities such as a Non-Profit organization, the SADC or the County, the alternate funding may be utilized if such funding benefits the easement acquisition and/or the successful use of FRPP funding; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Cumberland County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising approximately 106.09 acres, at a State cost share of \$2,920 per acre, (69.52% of purchase price), for a total grant need of \$309,782.80 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County will utilize FY13 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if FRPP funding is secured and approved for use by the SADC, said funding will be used to reduce the County cost share first and then offset SADC grant needs (estimated to be \$85,654.80) ; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, if a closing is unreasonably delayed for any reason, including securing the use of FRPP and/or OSI funds, the SADC retains the right to rescind its Final Approval of encumbered competitive grant funds equal to the amount of the anticipated FRPP grant for the acquisition of a development easement on the Property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if additional base grant funds are needed due to an increase in acreage the grant may be adjusted so long as it does not impact any other applications' encumbrance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any unused funds encumbered from either the base or competitive grants at the time of final approval shall be returned to their respective sources (competitive or base grant fund); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes, zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, zero (0) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14
Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

Application within the (PA4) Rural Area

x:/counties/cumco/projects/gilson_fwv.mxd



FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Paul and Amy Gilson
Block 188 Lots 4 (66.8 ac); 12 (28.9 ac) & 13 (8.9 ac)
Gross Total = 104.7 ac
Lawrence Twp., Cumberland County

500 250 0 500 1,000 Feet

TIDELANDS DISCLAIMER:
The linear features depicted on this map were derived from the NJDEP's CD ROM series 1, volume 4, "Tidelands Claims Maps". These linear features are not an official NJDEP determination and should only be used as a general reference. Only NJDEP, Bureau of Tidelands Management can perform an official determination of Tidelands/Riparian claims.

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor.



Wetlands Legend:
F - Freshwater Wetlands
L - Linear Wetlands
M - Wetlands Modified for Agriculture
T - Tidal Wetlands
N - Non-Wetlands
B - 300' Buffer
W - Water

Sources:
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
NJOT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

March 8, 2013

berland County

New Jersey Farmland Preservation Program
Preservation Program
County Planning Incentive Grant - N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.

										BASE GRANT			COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)		
										Balance FY11	1,500,000		FY11 Balance		0	3,000,000		
										Balance FY13	1,000,000 <th></th> <th colspan="2"></th> <th></th> <td colspan="2"></td>							
SADC										Total base grant			2,500,000	FY13 Balance		14,030,547	5,000,000	
Farm	Municipality	App Acres	Plus 3 Percent Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Share	SADC Federal Grant	Encumbered at Final	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability	
Shlmp, Newton B. III	Stow Creek	102	105.06	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	458,617.50	315,936.50	not used	325,666.00	315,936.50	2,184,063.5						
Kacewlich, Norman & Lynette	Stow Creek	17.37	17.891	8,000.00	8,000.00	4,900.00	135,704.00	75,704.00	7,414.70	87,665.90	75,704.00	2,108,359.5						
Jones, Clifton & Dorothy	Greenwich	70	72.1	4,000.00	4,000.00	2,800.00	274,000.00	169,000.00	22,800.00	201,880.00	169,000.00	1,939,359.5						
Newton, Thomas	Greenwich	45.3	46.659	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	195,853.50	100,065.50	34,855.80	144,642.90	100,065.50	1,839,294.0						
Dickinson, Everett et al	Shiloh Boro	40	41.2	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	257,178.60	165,329.10		166,660.00	165,329.10	1,673,964.9						
Cum Cty/Kates, Thomas	Lawrence	25	25.75	5,200.00	5,200.00	3,500.00	165,145.50	88,924.50		90,125.00	88,924.50	1,585,040.4						
Coll #1, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	47	48.41	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	224,910.00	153,306.00		161,689.40	153,306.00	1,431,734.4						
Cum Cty/Sheppard Anne	Greenwich	71	73.13	3,750.00	4,082.81	2,650.00	292,092.20	188,791.30		193,794.50	188,791.30	1,242,943.1						
Coll #2, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	41	42.23	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	198,900.00	134,550.00		145,693.50	134,550.00	1,108,393.1						
Adamucci #2, Carmen	Hopewell	48	49.44	7,200.00	7,200.00	4,500.00	339,796.80	212,373.00	57,600.00	1,489.70	1,489.70	1,106,903.4	222,480.00	210,883.30	210,883.30	2,789,116.7		
Cumberland Co/Riggins #2	Stow Creek	76.154	76.154	3,500.00	3,500.00	2,500.00	266,021.00	190,015.00					190,385.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	2,599,101.70		
Ruske, Roger, Margaret & Chris	Fairfield Twp.	205	211.150	5,500.00	5,500.00	3,650.00	1,131,856.00	648,244.80	102,896.00				770,697.50	648,244.80	648,244.80	1,950,856.90		
Van Meter, Alfred #1	Hopewell	40	41.200	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	262,465.80	166,489.50					175,100.00	166,489.50	166,489.50	1,784,367.40		
Van Meter, Alfred #2	Hopewell	41	42.230	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	273,668.20	173,595.50	43,159.30				179,477.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	1,610,771.90		
Keung Lam Realty	Lawrence	69	71.070	4,300.00	4,300.00	2,980.00	297,560.00	206,216.00					211,788.60	206,216.00	206,216.00	1,404,555.90		
Paladino, Vincent	Deerfield	30	30.900	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	184,842.00	116,186.40					135,960.00	116,186.40	116,186.40	1,288,369.50		
Baltinger, Frank P., III	Hopewell	70	72.100	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	452,666.50	106,079.96	182,930.19				299,215.00	106,079.96	106,079.96	1,182,289.54		
Minch, Michael et al	Hopewell	11	11.330	12,100.00	12,100.00	7,260.00	134,600.40	80,760.24			2,116.46	1,104,786.94	82,255.80	78,643.78	78,643.78	1,103,645.76		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #1	Shiloh Boro	60	61.800	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	411,425.70	258,610.44			7,827.41	1,096,959.53	264,185.40	250,783.03	250,783.03	852,862.73		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #2	Shiloh Boro	100	103.000	6,000.00	6,000.00	3,900.00	590,184.00	383,619.60	80,700.00				1,096,959.53	401,700.00	383,619.60	469,243.13		
Cum.Co/Mooneyham	Greenwich	23.449		6,800.00	6,650.00	4,225.00	155,935.85	96,959.53		99,072.03	96,959.53	1,000,000.00				94,751.78		
Cruzan, Daniel & Diane	Hopewell	92.412	95.184	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	582,542.10	374,491.35					374,268.60	374,491.35	374,491.35			
Cross #1	Hopewell	14.172		9,250.00	9,250.00	5,550.00	131,091.00	78,654.60	2,834.40	78,654.60	75,869.09	924,130.91						
Cross #2	Hopewell	55.672	55.672	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	361,868.00	231,038.80	22,268.80	231,038.80	231,038.80	693,092.11						
Cross #3	Hopewell	68	70.040	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	350,200.00	238,136.00		238,136.00		454,956.11						
Cross #4	Hopewell	68	70.040	6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	434,248.00	280,160.00		46,512.00	280,160.00	174,796.11						
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #3	Shiloh Boro	68.378		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	444,457.00	283,788.70	51,283.50	172,010.60		2,785.51	94,751.78			0.00		
													17,006.32				4,982,993.68	
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #4	Hopewell	38.007		6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	235,643.40	152,028.00	34,206.30				152,028.00			152,028.00	4,830,965.68	
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #5	Hopewell	37.024		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	240,656.00	153,649.60	33,321.80				153,649.60			153,649.60	4,677,316.00	
Adamucci #1, Carmen Sr.	Hopewell	108.987		5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	635,666.00	414,799.00	92,128.95				417,289.95			414,799.00	4,262,517.00	
SF Systems Company/sheppard	Lawrence	42	43.260	4,400.00	4,400.00	3,040.00	180,344.00	131,510.40					131,510.40			131,510.40	4,131,006.68	
DelVecchio, Brian & Susan	Lawrence	45.254		5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	230,795.40	156,126.30					156,126.30			156,126.30	3,974,880.38	
Edwards	Upper Deerfield	40	41.200	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	206,000.00	140,080.00					140,080.00				3,834,800.38	
Tirelli	Upper Deerfield	46.177	47.562	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	242,567.78	159,310.65					164,089.97		159,310.65	159,310.65	3,675,489.73	
Blew	Hopewell	25	25.750	5,400.00	5,400.00	3,600.00	139,050.00	82,700.00	23,102.50				92,700.00				3,582,789.73	
Cum.Co/Sheppard Mark K.	Stow Creek	70.6		5,200.00	6,000.00	3,500.00	423,600.00	245,700.00					245,700.00				3,337,089.73	
Cimino, Joseph & Edith	Hopewell	52	53.580	5,700.00	5,700.00	3,750.00	296,183.40	194,857.60					200,850.00				3,136,239.73	
Hasher	Stow Creek	66.622		4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	279,812.40	194,536.24					194,536.24		194,536.24		2,941,703.49	
Roorck	Hopewell	112.422		3,400.00	3,400.00	2,440.00	382,234.80	274,809.68					274,809.68				2,667,393.81	
Van DerVeer	Hopewell	17	17.510	5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	103,309.00	64,595.30					64,595.30				2,602,798.51	
Watson #1	Hopewell	49	50.470	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	247,303.00	168,569.80					168,569.80				2,434,228.71	
Watson #2	Hopewell	67	69.010	3,700.00	3,700.00	2,620.00	255,337.00	180,806.20	103,248.20				180,806.20				2,253,422.51	
Casper	Stow Creek	29	29.870	4,800.00	4,800.00	3,280.00	143,376.00	97,973.60			47,397.60		97,973.60				2,155,448.91	
Gilson	Lawrence	103	106.090	4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	445,578.00	309,782.80			85,654.80		309,782.80				1,845,666.11	
										Encumbered	Expend	Balance	Encumbered		Expend	Balance		
Encumbered/Expended FY11										0.00	1,500,000.00	0.00	94,751.78		2,905,248.22	0.00		
Encumbered/Expended FY13										690,306.60	305,907.89	2,785.51	2,401,708.94		752,624.95		1,845,666.11	
Total										690,306.60	1,806,907.89	2,785.51	2,496,480.72		3,657,873.17	0.00		
Reprogram Out																		

Schedule B

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Gilson Farm
06- 0136-PG
County PIG Program
103 Acres

Block 188	Lot 4	Lawrence Twp.	Cumberland County
Block 188	Lot 12	Lawrence Twp.	Cumberland County
Block 188	Lot 13	Lawrence Twp.	Cumberland County

SOILS:	Prime	23% * .15	=	3.45
	Statewide	77% * .1	=	7.70

SOIL SCORE: 11.15

TILLABLE SOILS:	Cropland Harvested	80% * .15	=	12.00
	Woodlands	20% * 0	=	.00

TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 12.00

FARM USE:	Ornament Nursery Products	84 acres
-----------	---------------------------	----------

In no instance shall the Committee's percent cost share for the purchase of the development easement exceed 80% of the purchase price of the easement. This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation, not to exceed 0 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
5. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions: No Exceptions Recorded
 - c. Additional Restrictions:
 1. Possible FRPP funding via NJCF
 - d. Additional Conditions:

If FRPP funding is secured, pursuant to the Federal Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program, the landowner agreed to a maximum impervious coverage of 7.67% or approximately 7.9 acres.
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises: No Dwelling Units
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
6. The SADC's grant for the acquisition of the development easement is subject to the terms of the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:10-11 et seq., P.L. 1983, c.32, and N.J.A.C. 2:76-7.14.
7. Review and approval by the SADC legal counsel for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R6(9)

FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT TO
CUMBERLAND COUNTY
for the
PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of
Harry W. McAllister ("Owner")
Greenwich Township, Cumberland County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.
SADC ID# 06-0144-PG

June 26, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2008, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") plan application from Cumberland County, hereinafter "County" pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, Cumberland County received SADC approval of its FY2015 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on June 14, 2013 the SADC received an application for the sale of a development easement from Cumberland County for the subject farm identified as Block 18, Lot 7, Greenwich Township, Cumberland County, totaling approximately 29 acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in Cumberland County's Greenwich Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, no pre-existing non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in ornamental nursery production; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property's quality score of 67.00 exceeds 41, which is 70% of the County's average quality score as determined by the SADC on September 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b) on August 19, 2013 it was determined that the application for the sale of a development easement was complete and accurate and satisfied the criteria contained in N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(a); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.11, on September 26, 2013 the SADC certified a development easement value of \$4,350 per acre based on zoning and environmental regulations in place as May 2013; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted the County's offer of \$4,350 per acre for the development easement for the Property; and

WHEREAS, the County has requested to encumber an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases, therefore, 29.87 acres will be utilized to calculate the grant need; and

WHEREAS, currently the County has \$2,785.51 of base grant funding zero (\$0) of FY11 competitive funding and \$1,845,666.11 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76 17.14 (d) (f), if there are insufficient funds available in a county's base grant, the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, on April 29, 2014 the County prioritized its farms and submitted its applications in priority order to the SADC to conduct a final review of the application for the sale of a development easement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 29.87 acres); and

	<u>Cost Share</u>	
SADC	\$ 89,908.70	(\$3,010/ acre; 69.20%)
<u>Cumberland County</u>	<u>\$ 40,025.80</u>	<u>(\$1,340/ acre; 30.80%)</u>
Total Easement Purchase	\$129,934.50	(\$4,350/ acre)

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13, Greenwich Township approved the application on November 12, 2013 with no funding commitment; the Cumberland County Agriculture Development Board approved the application on October 9, 2013, and the Cumberland County Board of Chosen Freeholders approved the required local match (\$1,340/ acre) on October 22, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Cumberland County Agriculture Development Board is requesting \$89,908.70 from its FY13 competitive grant, leaving a balance of \$1,755,757.41 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.14, the SADC shall approve a cost share grant for the purchase of the development easement on an individual farm consistent with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval to provide a cost share grant to Cumberland County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising approximately 29.87 acres, at a State cost share of \$3,010 per acre, (69.20% of purchase price), for a total grant need of \$89,908.70 pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in (Schedule C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County will utilize FY13 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if additional base grant funds are needed due to an increase in acreage the grant may be adjusted so long as it does not impact any other applications' encumbrance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any unused funds encumbered from either the base or competitive grants at the time of final approval shall be returned to their respective sources (competitive or base grant fund); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC shall enter into a Grant Agreement with the County pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.18, 6.18(a) and 6.18(b); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's cost share grant to the County for the purchase of a development easement on the approved application shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the premises adjusted for proposed road rights-of-way, other rights-of-way or easements as determined by the SADC, streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the premises as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall be subject to review and approval by the SADC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's final approval is conditioned upon the Governor's review pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4.

6/26/14
Date




Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

x:/counties/cumco/projects/mcallister_fw.mxd



Application within the (PA4) Rural Area

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Harry W. McAllister
Block 18 Lot 7 (25.4 ac)
Gross Total = 25.4 ac
Greenwich Twp., Cumberland County



TIDELANDS DISCLAIMER:
The linear features depicted on this map were derived from the NJDEP's CD ROM series 1, volume 4, "Tidelands Claims Maps". These linear features are not an official NJDEP determination and should only be used as a general reference. Only NJDEP, Bureau of Tidelands Management can perform an official determination of Tidelands/Riparian claims.

DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geodetic accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map shall not be, nor are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground horizontal and/or vertical controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed Professional Land Surveyor.



Wetlands Legend:
F - Freshwater Wetlands
L - Linear Wetlands
M - Wetlands Modified for Agriculture
T - Tidal Wetlands
N - Non-Wetlands
B - 300' Buffer
W - Water

Sources:
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
NJOT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

July 16, 2013

New Jersey Farm Preservation Program
Preservation Program
County Planning Incentive Grant - N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.

Schedule B

Farm	Municipality	App Acres	Pius 3 Percent Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Share	BASE GRANT			COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)		
									Balance FY11	1,500,000		FY11 Balance		0	3,000,000		
									Balance FY13	1,000,000		FY13 Balance		13,866,838	5,000,000		
SADC									Total base grant			2,500,000	FY13 Balance		13,866,838		
Encumbered at Final	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability										
Shimp, Newton B. III	Stow Creek	102	105.06	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	458,617.50	315,936.50	325,686.00	315,936.50	2,184,063.5						
Kacewicz, Norman & Lynette	Stow Creek	17.37	17.891	8,000.00	8,000.00	4,900.00	135,704.00	75,704.00	87,665.90	75,704.00	2,108,359.5						
Jones, Clifton & Dorothy	Greenwich	70	72.1	4,000.00	4,000.00	2,800.00	274,000.00	169,000.00	201,880.00	169,000.00	1,939,359.5						
Newton, Thomas	Greenwich	45.3	46.659	4,500.00	4,500.00	3,100.00	195,853.50	100,065.50	144,642.90	100,065.50	1,839,294.0						
Dickinson, Everett et al	Shiloh Boro	40	41.2	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	257,178.60	165,329.10	166,860.00	165,329.10	1,673,964.9						
Cum Cty/Kates, Thomas	Lawrence	25	25.75	5,200.00	5,500.00	3,500.00	165,145.50	88,924.50	90,125.00	88,924.50	1,585,040.4						
Coll #1, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	47	48.41	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	224,910.00	153,306.00	161,689.40	153,306.00	1,431,734.4						
Cum Cty/Sheppard Anne	Greenwich	71	73.13	3,750.00	4,082.81	2,650.00	292,092.20	188,791.30	193,794.50	188,791.30	1,242,943.1						
Coll #2, Kevin A.	Stow Creek	41	42.23	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	198,900.00	134,550.00	145,693.50	134,550.00	1,108,393.1						
Adamucci #2, Carmen	Hopewell	48	49.44	7,200.00	7,200.00	4,500.00	339,796.80	212,373.00	1,489.70	1,489.70	1,106,903.4	222,480.00	210,883.30	210,883.30	2,789,116.7		
Cumberland Co/Riggins #2	Stow Creek	76.154	76.154	3,500.00	3,500.00	2,500.00	266,021.00	190,015.00			190,015.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	190,015.00	2,599,101.70		
Ruske, Roger, Margaret & Chris	Fairfield Twp.	205	211.150	5,500.00	5,500.00	3,650.00	1,131,856.00	648,244.80			648,244.80	770,697.50	648,244.80	648,244.80	1,950,856.90		
Van Meter, Alfred #1	Hopewell	40	41.200	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	262,465.80	166,489.50			166,489.50	175,100.00	166,489.50	166,489.50	1,784,367.40		
Van Meter, Alfred #2	Hopewell	41	42.230	6,700.00	6,700.00	4,250.00	273,668.20	173,595.50			173,595.50	179,477.50	173,595.50	173,595.50	1,610,771.90		
Keung Lam Realty	Lawrence	69	71.070	4,300.00	4,300.00	2,980.00	297,560.00	206,216.00			206,216.00	211,788.60	206,216.00	206,216.00	1,404,555.90		
Paladino, Vincent	Deerfield	30	30.900	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	184,842.00	116,186.40			116,186.40	135,960.00	116,186.40	116,186.40	1,288,369.50		
Baltinger, Frank P., III	Hopewell	70	72.100	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	452,666.50	106,079.96			106,079.96	299,215.00	106,079.96	106,079.96	1,182,289.54		
Minch, Michael et al	Hopewell	11	11.330	12,100.00	12,100.00	7,260.00	134,600.40	80,760.24		2,116.46	1,104,786.94	82,255.80	78,643.78	78,643.78	1,103,645.76		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #1	Shiloh Boro	60	61.800	7,000.00	7,000.00	4,400.00	411,425.70	258,610.44		7,827.41	1,096,959.53	264,185.40	250,783.03	250,783.03	852,862.73		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #2	Shiloh Boro	100	103.000	6,000.00	6,000.00	3,900.00	590,184.00	383,619.60			1,096,959.53	401,700.00	383,619.60	383,619.60	469,243.13		
Cum.Co/Mooneyham	Greenwich	23.449		6,800.00	6,650.00	4,225.00	155,935.85	96,959.53	99,072.03	96,959.53	1,000,000.00						
Cruzan, Daniel & Diane	Hopewell	92.412	95.184	6,300.00	6,300.00	4,050.00	582,542.10	374,491.35			374,491.35	374,268.60	374,491.35	374,491.35	94,751.78		
Cross #1	Hopewell	14.172		9,250.00	9,250.00	5,550.00	131,091.00	78,654.60		78,654.60	924,130.91						
Cross #2	Hopewell	55.672	55.672	6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	361,668.00	231,038.80	231,038.80	231,038.80	693,092.11						
Cross #3	Hopewell	68	70.040	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	350,200.00	238,136.00			454,956.11						
Cross #4	Hopewell	68	70.040	6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	434,248.00	280,160.00			174,796.11						
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #3	Shiloh Boro	68.378		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	444,457.00	283,768.70	172,010.60		2,785.51	94,751.78			0.00		
											17,006.32					4,982,993.68	
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #4	Hopewell	38.007		6,200.00	6,200.00	4,000.00	235,643.40	152,028.00			152,028.00	152,028.00	152,028.00	152,028.00	4,830,965.68		
DeWilde,Bakker Jr., Abram #5	Hopewell	37.024		6,500.00	6,500.00	4,150.00	240,656.00	153,649.60			153,649.60	153,649.60	153,649.60	153,649.60	4,677,316.08		
Adamucci #1, Carmen Sr.	Hopewell	108.387		5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	635,666.00	414,799.00			414,799.00	417,289.95	414,799.00	414,799.00	4,262,517.08		
SF Systems Company(sheppard)	Lawrence	42	43.260	4,400.00	4,400.00	3,040.00	190,344.00	131,510.40			131,510.40	131,510.40	131,510.40	131,510.40	4,131,006.68		
DelVecchio, Brian & Susan	Lawrence	45.254		5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	230,795.40	156,126.30			156,126.30	156,126.30	156,126.30	156,126.30	3,974,880.36		
Edwards	Upper Deerfield	40	41.200	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,400.00	206,000.00	140,080.00			140,080.00				3,834,800.36		
Tirelli	Upper Deerfield	46.177	47.562	5,100.00	5,100.00	3,450.00	242,567.78	159,310.65			159,310.65	164,089.97	159,310.65	159,310.65	3,675,489.73		
Blew	Hopewell	25	25.750	5,400.00	5,400.00	3,600.00	139,050.00	92,700.00			92,700.00				3,582,789.73		
Cum.Co/Sheppard Mark K.	Stow Creek	70.6		5,200.00	6,000.00	3,500.00	423,600.00	245,700.00			245,700.00				3,337,089.73		
Cimino, Joseph & Edith	Hopewell	52	53.560	5,700.00	5,700.00	3,750.00	296,183.40	194,857.60			194,857.60	200,850.00			3,136,239.73		
Hasher	Stow Creek	66.622		4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	279,812.40	194,536.24			194,536.24	194,536.24	194,536.24		2,941,703.46		
Roork	Hopewell	112.422		3,400.00	3,400.00	2,440.00	382,234.80	274,309.68			274,309.68				2,667,393.61		
Van DerVeer	Hopewell	17	17.510	5,900.00	5,900.00	3,850.00	103,309.00	64,595.30			64,595.30				2,602,798.5		
Watson #1	Hopewell	49	50.470	4,900.00	4,900.00	3,340.00	247,303.00	168,569.80			168,569.80				2,434,228.7		
Watson #2	Hopewell	67	69.010	3,700.00	3,700.00	2,620.00	255,337.00	180,806.20			180,806.20				2,253,422.5		
Casper	Stow Creek	29	29.870	4,800.00	4,800.00	3,280.00	143,376.00	97,973.60			97,973.60				2,155,448.9		
Gilson	Lawrence	103	106.090	4,200.00	4,200.00	2,920.00	445,578.00	309,782.80			309,782.80				1,845,666.1		
McAllister	Greenwich	29	29.870	4,350.00	4,350.00	3,010.00	129,934.50	89,908.70			89,908.70				1,755,757.4		
									Encumbered	Expend	Balance	Encumbered		Expend	Balance		
Encumbered/Expended FY11									0.00	1,500,000.00	0.00	94,751.78		2,905,248.22	0.00		
Encumbered/Expended FY13									690,308.60	306,907.89	2,785.51	2,491,617.64		752,624.95	1,755,757.41		
Total									690,308.60	1,806,907.89	2,785.51	2,586,369.42		3,657,873.17	0.00		
Reprogram Out																	

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R6(10)

Final Approval and Authorization to Execute Closing Documents
Authorization to Contract for Professional Services
SADC Easement Purchase

On the Property of
Ed Stella, Jr. ("Owner")

June 26, 2014

Subject Property: Ed Stella, Jr. ("Owner")
 Block 59, Lots 18, 20, 21; Block 70, Lot 1, 2; Block 71, Lot 1, 2
 Block 57, Lot 8
 Upper Pittsgrove Township, Salem County
 Salem County
 SADC ID#: 17-0257-DE
 Approximately 314 Net Easement Acres

WHEREAS, on February 4, 2013, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a development easement sale application from Ed Stella, Jr., hereinafter "Owner," identified as Block 59, Lots 18, 20, 21; Block 70, Lot 1, 2; Block 71, Lot 1, 2; Block 57, Lot 8 Upper Pittsgrove Township, Salem County, hereinafter "Property," totaling approximately 314 net easement acres, identified in (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the SADC is authorized under the Garden State Preservation Trust Act, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 13:8C-1 et seq., to purchase development easements directly from landowners; and

WHEREAS, staff evaluated this application for the sale of development easement pursuant to SADC Policy P-14-E, Prioritization criteria, N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.16 and the State Acquisition Selection Criteria approved by the SADC on September 27, 2012, which categorized applications into "Priority", "Alternate" and "Other" groups; and

WHEREAS, SADC staff determined that the Property meets the SADC's "Priority" category for Salem County (minimum acreage of 95 and minimum quality score of 59) because it is 314 acres and has a quality score of 70.39; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 1.5-acre severable exception area, limited to zero residences, to be sold to the adjacent landowner for the purpose of enlarging the neighbors' Lot 19, and a 6-acre severable exception limited to one single family residence; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the possible subdivision of the severable exceptions prior to closing, the remaining parcel may be re-designated with a new lot number and this re-designation will be reflected in the subsequent closing documents and deed of easement; and

WHEREAS, the Property has been allocated two (2) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities (RDSOs), zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area outside of the exception areas; and

WHEREAS, at the time of application, the Property was devoted to peach, soybean, hay and corn production; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has read and signed SADC Guidance Documents regarding Exceptions, Division of the Premises, Division of the Premises for Non-Contiguous Parcels and Non-agricultural uses; and

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2014, the SADC certified the development easement value of the Property at \$7,135 per acre based on current zoning and environmental conditions as of December 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Owner accepted the SADC's offer to purchase the development easement on the Property for \$7,135 per acre; and

WHEREAS, to proceed with the SADC's purchase of the development easement it is recognized that various professional services will be necessary including but not limited to contracts, survey, title search and insurance and closing documents; and

WHEREAS, contracts and closing documents for the acquisition of the development easement will be prepared and shall be subject to review by the Office of the Attorney General;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the SADC grants final approval to the Property, for its acquisition of the development easement at a value of \$7,135 per acre for a total of approximately \$2,240,390 subject to the conditions contained in (Schedule B); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes a 1.5-acre severable exception area, limited to zero residences, to be sold to the adjacent landowner for the purpose of enlarging the neighbors' Lot 19; a 6-acre severable exception limited to one single family residence; two (2) Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities (RDSOs); and zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area outside of the exception areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's purchase price shall be based on the final surveyed acreage of the Property adjusted for proposed road rights of way, other rights of way or easements as determined by the SADC, tidelands claim and streams or water bodies on the boundaries of the Property as identified in Policy P-3-B Supplement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that contracts and closing documents shall be prepared subject to review by the Office of the Attorney General; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the SADC authorizes Secretary of Agriculture Douglas H. Fisher, Chairperson, SADC or Executive Director Susan E. Payne, to execute an Agreement to Sell Development Easement and all necessary documents to contract for the professional services necessary to acquire said development easement, including but not limited to a survey and title search; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this action is not effective until the Governor's review period expires pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-4f.

6/26/14
Date




Page 3 of 3

Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES



Application within the (PA4) Rural Area

- Property In Question**
- EH - (Non-Severable) Exception
 - ES - (Severable) Exception
 - Wetlands Boundaries
 - Primary - Limited Access
 - Federal or State Hwy's
 - County Roads
 - Municipal/Local Roads
 - Non-Profit
 - State Owned Conservation Easement
 - State Owned OS & Recreation Easement

- Wetlands Legend:**
- F - Freshwater Wetlands
 - L - Upland Wetlands
 - T - Tidal Wetlands
 - N - Non-Wetlands
 - W - Water

Sources:
 NUDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data
 Green Acres Conservation Easement Data
 NOT/OSIS 2010
 May 15, 2013



FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Edward Stella, Jr. (# 1)
 Block 57 Lot 8 (83.7 ac); Block 59 P/O 18 (27.6 ac);
 P/O 18-ES (severable exceptions - 6.0 & 1.5 ac); 20 (60.4 ac) & 21 (38.6 ac)
 Block 70 Lots 1 (52.3 ac) & 2 (17.4 ac) & Block 71 Lots 1 (9.1 ac) & 2 (22.0 ac)
 Gross Total = 318.6 ac
 Upper Pittsgrove Twp., Salem County



DISCLAIMER: Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user. The configuration of the parcels and the boundaries shown on this map are approximate and were developed for planning purposes. The geospatial accuracy and precision of the GIS data contained in this file and map are intended to be, relied upon in matters requiring delineation and location of true ground features. Actual controls as would be obtained by an actual ground survey conducted by a licensed surveyor.

State Agriculture Development Committee
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Stella Farm #1
State Acquisition
Easement Purchase - SADC
314 Acres

Block 57	Lot 8	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 59	Lot 18	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 59	Lot 20	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 59	Lot 21	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 70	Lot 1	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 70	Lot 2	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 71	Lot 1	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County
Block 71	Lot 2	Upper Pittsgrove Twp. Salem County

SOILS:	Other	9% *	0	=	.00
	Prime	85% *	.15	=	12.75
	Statewide	6% *	.1	=	.60

SOIL SCORE: 13.35

TILLABLE SOILS:	Cropland Harvested	93% *	.15	=	13.95
	Other	6% *	0	=	.00
	Wetlands	1% *	0	=	.00

TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 13.95

FARM USE:	Deciduous Tree Fruit	30 acres	peaches
	Soybeans-Cash Grain	169 acres	
	Hay	169 acres	
	Corn-Cash Grain	34 acres	

This final approval is subject to the following:

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation of 2 Residual Dwelling Site Opportunity(ties) on the Premises subject to confirmation of acreage by survey.
3. Compliance with all applicable statutes, rules and policies.
4. Other:
 - a. Pre-existing Nonagricultural Use: No Nonagricultural Uses
 - b. Exceptions:
 - 1st six (6) acres for future single family residence
Exception is severable
Exception is to be limited to one future single family residential unit(s)
 - 2nd (1.5) acres for To increase size of lot 19
Exception is severable
Exception is to be limited to zero future single family residential unit(s)
 - c. Additional Restrictions: No Additional Restrictions
 - d. Additional Conditions: No Additional Conditions
 - e. Dwelling Units on Premises:
No Structures On Premise
 - f. Agricultural Labor Housing Units on Premises: No Ag Labor Housing
5. Review and approval by the Office of the Attorney General for compliance with legal requirements.

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R6(11)

CERTIFICATION, RE-CERTIFICATION AND
REMOVAL OF APPRAISERS
FROM THE SADC
APPROVED APPRAISER LIST

JUNE 26, 2014

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.7, the State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) shall adopt a list of appraisers who are designated as state certified general real estate appraisers (SCGREA) pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:40A-1.2; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.22 the SADC shall conduct an annual review of all approved appraisers for the purpose of re-certification; and


WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.22 staff has confirmed that the approved appraisers contained in Schedule "A" satisfy all the requirements for re-certification and the appraisers as identified in Schedule "B" do not meet the requirements for re-certification due to not attending at least one of the SADC's annual appraiser seminars in the last two years; and

WHEREAS, any new appraiser that requests inclusion on the approved appraiser list must satisfy the requirements of N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.21;

WHEREAS, SADC staff has reviewed the qualifications, experience and mandatory attendance at the June 4, 2014 Appraiser Conference of the appraisers contained in Schedule "C" and has determined that the appraisers satisfy all of the requirements for certification.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.21 and 22, the SADC certifies the appraisers identified in Schedule "A" and as approved appraisers and removes the appraisers identified in Schedule "B" from the SADC list of approved appraisers.

6/26/14
Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director
State Agriculture Development Committee

VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

Monique Purcell, Acting Chairperson	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	ABSENT
Alan Danser, Vice Chairman	ABSENT
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	YES
Denis C. Germano, Esq.	YES
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	YES
Jane R. Brodhecker	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

S:\APPRAISAL\CertsRecerts2012\certs recerts 2014 res.doc

Schedule 7

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Ms. Thelma Achenbach Approved for Yellow Book	Achenbach & Associates, LLC 23 Sherwood Drive	Morristown	NJ	07960	Morris	(973) 886-0181	(973) 656-0567	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. J. Paul Bainbridge Approved for Yellow Book	J.P. Bainbridge & Assoc., Inc. 6 Woodland Road	Cape May Court House	NJ	08210	Cape May	(609) 465-9978	(609) 465-9969	June 4th, 2014, Mercer Maintained - Special Permission
Mr. Steven W. Bartelt Approved for Yellow Book	P O Box 8169 Bartlet Associates	Turnersville	NJ	08012	Gloucester	(609) 582-5892	(609) 582-3493	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Allen Black MAI Approved for Yellow Book	Todd & Black Inc. 1209 S. Union Ave.	Cherry Hill	NJ	08002-3333	Camden	(609) 662-7676	(856) 662-0188	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Ms. Pamela J. Brodowski	BRB Valuation & Consulting Serv 22 Windham Drive	Eastampton	NJ	08060-4362	Burlington	(609) 261-4220	(609) 261-4224	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Richard J. Carabelli	123 Franklin Corner Rd., Ste 203 Martin Appraisal Associates	Lawrenceville	NJ	08648-2572	Mercer	(609) 896-2245	(609) 896-1533	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Bruce L. Carlin	PO Box 372 One S. Finley Ave.	Basking Ridge	NJ	07920	Somerset	(908) 766-2600	(908) 766-7971	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Phillip L. Cassell SRA	Cassell's Appraisal Serv. 58 Flatbrook Rd	Branchville	NJ	07826	Sussex	(973) 222-8564	(973) 242-4958	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Ms. Lana D. Chiappetta Approved for Yellow Book	Aspen Valuation Group 547 McKendinan Road	Medford	NJ	08055	Burlington	(609) 714-7402	(609) 784-7899	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Lynford L. Collins Approved for Yellow Book	302 Spruce St, Box 348 C L Orbaker & Assoc., Inc.	Doylestown	PA	18901		(908) 782-3900	(215) 348-5410	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Patrick K. Conover Approved for Yellow Book	Conover Appraisal Assoc. 722 S. Second Ave.	Absecon	NJ	08205-9546	Atlantic	(609) 652-6553	(609) 748-0007	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert G. Cooper, Jr. Approved for Yellow Book	555 East Main St, P O Box 121 Landmark I Appraisal LLC	Chester	NJ	07930	Morris	(908) 879-2424	(908) 879-8014	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. George A. Copeland, Jr., MAI	Copeland Appraisal Associates, Inc. 971 U.S. Route 202	Somerville	NJ	08876	Somerset	(908) 526-5520	(908) 526-5266	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Albert Crosby	Colliers International Valuation 109 Appaloosa Way	Sewell	NJ	08080	Gloucester	(609) 922-4815	(856) 582-4711	June 4th, 2014, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Ms. Susanne M Curran MAI, PP Approved for Yellow Book	Curran Realty Advisors 195 Nassau Street, Suite 17	Princeton	NJ	08542	Mercer	(609) 921-8778	(609) 921-8224	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. Ernest R. Darpino PhP, ASA	137 Stokes Road	Medford Lakes	NJ	08055	Burlington	(609) 654-2125	(609) 953-7434	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Kenneth Depew Approved for Yellow Book	DePew & Martin Real Estate Appr. 302 North Washington Avenue Ste 2	Moorestown	NJ	08057	Burlington	(856) 231-9300	(856) 231-7419	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Victor D. DiSanto Approved for Yellow Book	145 West End Avenue P O Box 977	Somerville	NJ	08876	Somerset	(908) 526-4244	(908) 526-3228	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Daniel P. Donovan Approved for Yellow Book	19 Skytop Road	Cedar Grove	NJ	07009-1316	Essex	(973) 857-3120		June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Halvor J. Egeland MAI Approved for Yellow Book	1415 Hooper Ave, Suite 202 Integra Realty Resources	Toms River	NJ	08753-2887	Monmouth	(732) 244-7000	(732) 505-9498	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Darryl Fanelli	Fanelli Real Estate, LLC 151 Fries Mill Road, Suite 306B	Turnersville	NJ	08012	Gloucester	(609) 313-1721	(856) 227-7226	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Carl Fleming	2 Ridge Lane	Colonia	NJ	07067-3207	Middlesex	(908) 388-2177	(908) 499-7233	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert W. Frankenfield Approved for Yellow Book	521 Middle Road Robert W. Frankenfield Associate	Hammononton	NJ	08037	Atlantic	(609) 457-9570	(609) 704-8665	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert Gagliano MAI Approved for Yellow Book	1129 Broad Street Suite 104	Shrewsbury	NJ	07702	Monmouth	(732) 380-0880	(732) 380-1521	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Jerome J. Gall SCGRE	10 Woodbridge Ctr Dr., P O Box 14 Jacobson, Goldfarb & Tanzman	Woodbridge	NJ	07095-1408	Middlesex	(732) 750-4000	(732) 750-1290	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Norman J. Goldberg Approved for Yellow Book	44 Leigh Street	Clinton	NJ	08809	Hunterdon	(908) 730-8808	(908) 730-6242	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Anthony S. Graziano Approved for Yellow Book	Atlantic Coast Realty Advisory 1415 Hooper Ave. Suite 202	Toms River	NJ	08753-2887	Ocean	(732) 244-7000	(732) 505-9498	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Andrew Gytevan Jr.	91 Kennedy Drive	Fairless Hills	PA	19030		(856) 795-4042		June 5th, 2013, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Mr. Ronald A. Hagel MAI, SRA Approved for Yellow Book	605 Rostan Court R. A. Hagel & Associates	Vineland	NJ	08361	Cumberland	(856) 691-7055	(856) 691-7017	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. Richard E. Hall MAI, CRE Approved for Yellow Book	29 Hadley Avenue	Toms River	NJ	08753	Ocean	(732) 503-4109	(856) 360-8596	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Mark J. Hanson PC Approved for Yellow Book	809 Second Street	Ocean City	NJ	08226-4117	Cape May	(609) 457-7297	(609) 398-6218	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Joseph V. Heenan	615 Ocean Avenue PO Box 1405	Ocean City	NJ	08226	Cape May	(609) 457-0852	(609) 456-3352	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert F. Heffernan Approved for Yellow Book	19 Uptom Pine Rd PO Box 611	Oldwick, NJ	NJ	08858-0611	Hunterdon	(908) 236-7098	(908) 236-7613	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Francis C. Heil III Approved for Yellow Book	750 Route 73, South Suite 505	Marlton	NJ	08053	Burlington	(856) 985-7799	(856) 985-1771	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Michael E. Hostenstein Approved for Yellow Book	Holzhauser & Hostenstein, LLC 70 Sparta Avenue-Knoll Pl Ste 20	Sparta	NJ	07871	Sussex	(973) 300-0121	(973) 300-0171	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Mohammad Imran Approved for Yellow Book	Imran Appraisals 479 Skyline Lake Drive	Ringwood	NJ	07456	Passaic	(973) 835-0045	(973) 835-6238	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Paul R. Johnson	P O Box 434	Sea Girt	NJ	08750-0434	Monmouth	(732) 449-1400	(732) 449-1333	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Michael D. Jones Approved for Yellow Book	Legore & Jones Appraisal 664 Washington Street, 1st Floor	Cape May	NJ	08204	Cape May	(609) 770-7146	(609) 770-7194	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Patrick Josephs Approved for Yellow Book	21 Crestview Drive PO Box 5055	Kendall Park	NJ	08824	Middlesex	(732) 297-5400	(732) 297-7220	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. Edwin F. Kay Approved for Yellow Book	Kay & Assoc. Inc. 107 E. Commerce St.	Bridgeton	NJ	08302	Cumberland	(856) 451-2000	(856) 451-2001	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. Barry J. Krauser MAI, CRE Approved for Yellow Book	Integra Realty Resources 80 S. Jefferson Road	Whippany	NJ	07981-1038	Morris	(973) 538-3188	(973) 515-2999	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Matthew Krauser MAI, CRE Approved for Yellow Book	80 South Jefferson Road Integra Realty Resources Ste 204	Whippany	NJ	07981	Morris	(973) 538-3188	(973) 515-2999	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Mr. Joshua D. Mackoff	44 Maple Avenue	Morristown	NJ	07960	Morris	(973) 539-0406	(973) 540-1499	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Henry J. Mancini Approved for Yellow Book	Henry J. Mancini & Associates 691 Mill Creek Rd, Unit 11	Manahawkin	NJ	08050	Ocean	(609) 978-9750	(609) 978-9180	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Richard J. Martin Approved for Yellow Book	DePew & Martin Real Estate Appr 302 North Washington Ave. Ste. 20	Moorestown	NJ	08057	Burlington	(856) 231-9300	(856) 231-7419	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Joseph L. Mazotas	344 Nassau Street	Princeton	NJ	08540	Mercer	(609) 924-5353	(609) 497-9325	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Thomas J. McCartney Approved for Yellow Book	James P. Casey Appraisal Assoc. 2164 Route 35 - Bldg. C, Ste. 12	Sea Girt	NJ	08750	Monmouth	(732) 974-7744	(732) 974-7766	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. John K. McChesney Approved for Yellow Book	Swift Real Estate Solutions 16 Church Street	Newton	NJ	07860	Sussex	(973) 300-0044	(973) 300-0079	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Charles A. McCullough Approved for Yellow Book	Giuliano, Miller & Co. 307 Andrews Lane	Moorestown	NJ	08057	Burlington	(856) 923-5879	(856) 767-3500	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Jerome J. McHale Approved for Yellow Book	J McHale & Associates Inc. 693 Main St, Bldg C 2nd FL PO Bx	Lumberton	NJ	08008	Burlington	(609) 914-4679	(609) 914-0079	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. Edward T. Molinari Approved for Yellow Book	14 Harrison St., Suite 202 Harrison Professional Building	Woodbury	NJ	08096	Gloucester	(856) 853-7622	(856) 853-7627	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Joseph Murray	469 Morris Avenue - PO Box 579 Professional Appraisal Associate	Summit	NJ	07902	Somerset	(908) 273-2412	(908) 273-9189	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. John J. Musnuff, MAI Approved for Yellow Book	Musnuff Group, LLC 17 E. Main Street - P.O. Box 517	Clinton	NJ	08809-0175	Hunterdon	(908) 735-0009	(908) 735-0067	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Joseph F. Pino	572 Rt. 40	Elmer	NJ	08318	Salem	(856) 358-8049	(856) 358-8899	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Ronald B. Rebish Approved for Yellow Book	Appraisal Services of North Jerse Sparta 13 Ginger Lane		NJ	07871	Sussex	(973) 726-9304	(973) 726-9314	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Harry F. Renwick Jr	1001 Lenola Road Renwick & Associates	Maple Shade	NJ	08052	Burlington	(856) 779-7050	(856) 608-8981	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Ms. Tracy A. Reuter	44 Leigh Street	Clinton	NJ	08809	Hunterdon	(908) 730-8808	(888) 501-3398	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Jay R. Ricigliano Approved for Yellow Book	1410 Route # 33	Hamilton	NJ	08690	Mercer	(609) 890-7535	(609) 890-1182	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Thomas Rodriguez Approved for Yellow Book	74 Lambert Road	Stockton	NJ	08559	Hunterdon	(908) 788-5543	(908) 788-6881	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Lee L. Romm Approved for Yellow Book	12000 Lincoln Drive West Suite 207, Route 73	Marlton	NJ	08053	Burlington	(856) 983-5500	(856) 983-9523	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Ronald L. Rubinstein	Comprehensive Appraisal Corp. 16 Jefferson Ct.	Freehold	NJ	07728	Monmouth	(732) 308-0909	(732) 431-5031	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. R. Michael Schaible	Vanguard Appraisal Services 7 Sandford Road	Stockton	NJ	08559	Hunterdon	(609) 460-4530	(609) 460-4776	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert G. Schwarz MAI	28-30 N. Sussex Street PO Box 1008	Dover	NJ	07802-1008	Morris	(973) 366-5600	(973) 366-6594	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Timothy W. Sheehan MAI, SRA Approved for Yellow Book	T.W. Sheehan & Associates, LLC 312 Ninth Avenue	Haddon Heights	NJ	08035	Camden	(856) 662-0027	(856) 547-3559	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Richard S. Sheldon	420 Bradshaw Avenue	Haddonfield	NJ	08033	Camden	(856) 546-5992	(856) 546-6311	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Ms. Bettina Durmaskin Sholk Approved for Yellow Book	5 Rosemary Road	East Brunswick	NJ	08816	Middlesex	(732) 254-4410	(732) 254-0451	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Peter E. Sockler	299 Ward Street, Suite C	Hightstown	NJ	08520	Mercer	(609) 918-1000	(609) 918-1006	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Frank J. Stearle Jr.	Associates Appraisal Agcy of NJ I Trenton 1111 South Clinton Avenue		NJ	08611	Mercer	(609) 695-4666	(609) 695-2427	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Russell K. Sterling Approved for Yellow Book	145 West End Avenue PO Box 977	Somerville	NJ	08876	Somerset	(908) 526-4244	(908) 526-3228	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. James Stuart	1904 Hampden Street	Oakhurst	NJ	07755	Monmouth	(732) 801-9720	(732) 842-0115	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Approved Appraisers
As of June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Mr. Christopher Sullivan Approved for Yellow Book	Sullivan & Company 136 Meadows Road	Lafayette	NJ	07848	Sussex	(973) 875-7430	(973) 875-7986	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Mark W. Sussman Approved for Yellow Book	Lasser Sussman Assoc. 469 Morris Avenue	Summit	NJ	07901	Essex	(973) 535-9600	(973) 535-9811	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Merrill Taub Approved for Yellow Book	PO Box 914 4 Benjamin Street	Somerset	NJ	08873	Somerset	(908) 229-5161	(908) 450-1181	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert Tighue MAI Approved for Yellow Book	Eastern Valuation Group 24 Buxton Road	Cherry Hill	NJ	08003	Camden	(609) 792-0684	(856) 831-7199	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mark W. Tinder	Mark Tinder Appraisals, LLC 29 Somerset Street - 2nd Floor	Somerville	NJ	08876	Somerset	(908) 526-1226	(908) 526-6267	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Damian Tryjankowski	General Appraisal Services 121 Inverness Drive	Moorestown	NJ	08057	Burlington	(856) 220-3182		June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Robert M. Vance Approved for Yellow Book	29 Somerset Street Second Floor	Somerville	NJ	08876	Somerset	(908) 526-1226	(908) 526-6267	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Richard M. Ward	17 Balmoral Drive	Jackson	NJ	08527	Monmouth	(732) 253-7192	(732) 615-0337	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Daniel C. Webb Approved for Yellow Book	Lasser Sussman Associates, LLC 220 South Orange Avenue	Livingston	NJ	07039	Essex	(973) 535-9600	(973) 535-9811	June 4th, 2014, Mercer
Mr. John R. Weber Jr.	Curini Appraisal Inc. 1540 Kuser Road - Suite A-7	Hamilton	NJ	08619	Mercer	(609) 586-3500	(609) 586-3504	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Ms. Barbara M. Wenner	BMW Inc. Real Estate 108 Pixie Moss Trail	Medford	NJ	08055	Burlington	(609) 654-7842	(609) 654-2872	June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. Michael White	2 Ridge Lane	Colonia	NJ	07067-3207	Middlesex	(732) 388-2177	(908) 499-7233	June 4th, 2014, Mercer June 5th, 2013, Mercer
Mr. William S. Yetke Approved for Yellow Book	1315 Walnut Street Suite 808	Philadelphia	PA	19107		(215) 546-3241	(215) 546-3879	June 5th, 2013, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Appraisers Which Will Be Removed
Effective June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Mr. A. Craig Black SRF, CTA	Todd, Black, Inc. 1209 South Union Avenue	Cherry Hill	NJ	08002		(856) 662-7676	(856) 662-0188	June 10th 2009, Mercer June 2002 Middlesex June 2003 Mercer June 2004 Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Mr. Edward J. Bligh MAI	8 Charter Oak Drive	Marlton	NJ	08053	Burlington	(856) 983-3218	(856) 983-0677	June 6th 2007, Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 8th 2011, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Mr. Thomas DeMartin	100 Federal City Road, Suite 102 DeMartin Schwartz Consulting Srv	Trenton	NJ	08648-1664	Mercer			June 11th 2008, Mercer June 2004 Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 7th 2006, Mercer June 8th 2011, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Arthur A. Linfante	Value Research Group 301 South Livingston Avenue Suite	Livingston	NJ	07039		(973) 422-9800	(973) 422-9797	June 6th 2012, Mercer
Mr. William L. Linville	Valuation Consultants 1021 Tullo Farm Road	Bridgewater	NJ	08807	Somerset	(732) 627-0567	(732) 627-0571	June 11th 2008, Mercer June 1998 Mercer June 2000 Middlesex June 2001 Middlesex June 2002 Middlesex June 2003 Mercer June 2005 Mercer June 6th 2007, Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 7th 2006, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer

State Agriculture Development Committee
Farmland Preservation Program
Appraisers Which Will Be Removed
Effective June 26, 2014

Name	Address	City	State	Zip	County	Phone	Fax	Meetings Attended
Ms. Bonnie L. Longo	438 Ganttown Road, Unit A2	Sewell	NJ	08080	Gloucester	(856)582-4611	(856)582-4711	June 11th 2008, Mercer June 6th 2007, Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 7th 2006, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Mr. Peter A. Maher	PO Box 1008 Cayuga Lane	Jackson	NJ	08527	Ocean	(732)928-1550	(732)928-1501	June 10th 2009, Mercer June 1996 Burlington June 1998 Mercer June 2000 Middlesex June 2002 Middlesex June 2005 Mercer June 6th 2007, Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Mr. Mark Pomykacz	460 US Highway 22 West Suite 403	Whitehouse Station	NJ	08889		(908)534-3590	(908)823-0575	June 6th 2012, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer
Ms. Coleen Schwartz	DeMartin Schwartz Consulting Serv 100 Federal City Road, Suite 102	Trenton-Circle Branch	NJ	08648				June 10th 2009, Mercer June 11th 2008, Mercer June 2004 Mercer June 6th 2012, Mercer June 7th 2006, Mercer June 8th 2011, Mercer June 9th 2010, Mercer

9

SCHEDULE C
STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

LIST OF APPRAISERS TO BE APPROVED

JUNE 26, 2014

New Appraiser:

Name: Dustin Tenenbaum
Address: 205 Main Street
Chatham, NJ 07928
County: Morris County
Phone: (973) 515-4700
Fax: (973) 515-4720
Email: www.lzenbergAppraisal.com
License # 42RG00241900

Name: Samuel Levi, MAI
Address: 603 W. County Line Road – Suite 2
Lakewood, NJ 08701
County: Ocean County
Phone: (732) 886-6695
Fax: (732) 886-7115
Email: sam@starmarkappraisals.com
License # 42RG00222500