

**STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

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

**REGULAR MEETING**

**May 22, 2014**

Chairman Fisher called the meeting to order at 9:11 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**

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

Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)

---

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

---

**Others present as recorded on the attendance sheet:** Heidi Winzinger, Brian Smith, Timothy Brill, Paul Burns, Dan Knox, Hope Gruzlovic, Jeffrey Everett, Jill Gorman, Cindy Roberts, Judy Andrejko, Steve Bruder, Charles Roohr, David Clapp, Patricia Riccitello and Sandy Giambrone, SADC staff; Christopher Howard, Esq., Governor's Authorities Unit; Dan Pace, Mercer County Agriculture Development Board; Nicole Kavanaugh, New Jersey Farm Bureau;

Frank McGovern, Esq., McGovern and Roseman Law Firm, Sussex County; Earle Steeves, Max Spann Real Estate, Hunterdon County; Chris Crane, Maser Consulting, Monmouth County; Brian Wilson, Burlington County Agriculture Development Board; Glorianne Robbi, East Amwell Farmland and Open Space Preservation Committee, Hunterdon County; Lauren Wasiluski, Montgomery Township, Somerset County; MaryAnn and Jim Wickhoff, farmers, Monmouth County; Clem Fiori, Montgomery Township, Somerset County; Sarah Roberts, Montgomery Friends of Open Space, Somerset County; Harriet Honigfeld, Monmouth County Agriculture Development Board; and Christine Bell, M. Maslonka and Mark Villinger, Ocean County Agriculture Development Board.

### Minutes

#### A. SADC Regular Meeting of April 25, 2014 (Open and Closed Sessions)

It was moved by Mr. Requa and seconded by Mr. Waltman to approve the Open Session minutes and the Closed Session minutes of the SADC regular meeting of March 27, 2014. The motion was unanimously approved.

### REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON

Chairman Fisher deferred to the Executive Director to report to the Committee regarding S837, which was conditionally vetoed by the Governor.

### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ms. Payne made the following comments:

- Bill S837

The bill as previously drafted appeared to amend only the Right to Farm Act to establish a very broad definition of agritourism; including providing Right to Farm protection to special occasion events such as weddings and other social and cultural events on farms. The bill contained some provisions, such as income thresholds, that were specific to wineries. The bill, as conditionally vetoed, is no longer a Right to Farm bill. It now specifically addresses only wineries on preserved farmland so the scope of the impact has narrowed. The bill did retain some of the previous conditions for a winery to conduct special occasion events, including that gross income from special occasion events may account for no

more than 50 percent of the annual gross income of the winery. It also retained the requirement that those activities be conducted, for the most part, in compliance with municipal regulations, including for site plan review, curfews, noise, etc. We will see where it goes from there. Chairman Fisher commented that we do not know what the Legislature is going to do. If the Legislature does not accept the changes, then the bill dies. Chairman Fisher stated that there is also one more piece to this bill. Ms. Payne stated that the bill also calls on the SADC to create a pilot project for these activities at wineries on preserved farmland and authorizes the SADC to adopt regulations to administer the pilot project. The pilot project expires 44 months after the date of enactment of the bill.

Mr. Germano asked if there would be a time and place for the Committee to have some input into this. Ms. Payne stated that she had a similar conversation with another board member on the same topic and generally the position of any administration is that State agencies such as the SADC shouldn't be lobbying. What we are doing is looking at our statutes and trying to reconcile that with the fact that the Right to Farm Act that created the SADC does make reference to the fact that the SADC is supposed to make recommendations to the Legislature as it relates to agricultural viability. We will have to work through the Secretary of Agriculture's Office with the Administration to see what that could look like going forward. Mr. Requa commented that pilots usually are put in place to either prove or disprove something. He asked if anyone knew the purpose or rationale behind the pilot. Ms. Payne stated that the bill does not have clear statements in this regard so that would be some of what we would have to work through, to figure out what we think that pilot is intended to prove or disprove.

- Farmland Preservation Roundtable in Hershey, PA

Ms. Payne stated that there was a national farmland preservation conference held in Hershey, Pa., last week. Approximately 125 people from 18 states attended, including several SADC managers who presented at some of the workshops and learned a lot at others. Mr. Schilling co-organized the event. Rutgers, in addition to folks from Nebraska, Maryland and Delaware, has started to do some academic research on farmland preservation and its impacts. The presentations at the conference were preliminary results of their studies. She would like to obtain copies of their papers and final presentations to share with the Committee. She stated that New Jersey is definitely looked at as the leader on many issues because we are confronted with them earlier than most, and many states are watching how we respond.

Mr. Johnson wanted to go back briefly to the S837 bill because it has a major impact on his brand of agriculture. He has been following the bill closely in its different versions because it does fall back on this Committee to sort it all out after the Legislature is done with it. He stated that the Committee, if at all possible, should get involved in the process of writing these bills. Ms. Payne stated that what Mr. Johnson is saying is that possibly a subcommittee of the Board could be created to work on that with staff. Mr. Johnson stated that could be an option. Ms. Payne stated that she would welcome that. Mr. Germano stated that it would be a way to involve the Committee. He noted that he spoke with Ms. Payne prior to today's meeting regarding legislation pertaining to Right to Farm protection and beekeeping. Ms. Payne stated that there is language in the Right to Farm Act that the SADC is to recommend to the Governor, the Legislature and the appropriate State departments and agencies, any actions that should be taken that recognize the need to provide a proper balance among the varied and sometimes conflicting interests of all lawful activities in the State, etc., minimizing unnecessary constraints on essential agricultural activities, and are consistent with the promotion of public health, safety and welfare. That is a very broad statement. She stated that we are supposed to have some input and give some advice or opinion so that is what she was looking at yesterday as a result of some of these conversations. She will have to work with the Administration and the Secretary's Office to figure out what that model might look like.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Payne reminded the Committee to take home the various articles provided in the meeting binders.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

- 1) Stan Moslowski, Mayor of Upper Freehold Township, Monmouth County, stated that he is a resident and farmer, and he is on the Township Committee in Upper Freehold Township. The Committee has an application on the agenda today regarding greenhouse construction in Upper Freehold. He felt that the Committee should look seriously at something like this for agribusiness. He stated that his Township has close to 10,000 preserved farmland acres. The property on the agenda today has been farmed for years and it seems like a great thing for Upper Freehold to have a business like this, since they do have so many acres and they

would welcome it. He feels that an operation like this in their Township would be beneficial for everyone, including for young people to come work and learn about this type of agriculture.

- 2) Sarah Roberts, President of the Montgomery Friends of Open Space, stated that she is here today on behalf of an application for preliminary approval on today's agenda. If the Committee has any questions regarding that application she would be happy to answer any questions. She is here with a couple of associates from Montgomery Township.
- 3) Linda Meade from D&R Greenway Land Trust stated that she is here today in support of the Montgomery Friends of Open Space application (the Firmenich Family Farm), working in partnership with the Montgomery Friends of Open Space. This application has support from all levels and it is a wonderful situation because the former landowner had plans to preserve this property, sold it to landowners who are committed to farmland preservation and the new landowners have signed on to the application. They look forward to bringing this to resolution. She is available should the Committee have any questions.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

##### **A. Adoption of the SADC Appraiser Handbook Amendments**

Mr. Burns stated that there have been no changes from last month regarding the amendments to the 2014 Appraiser Handbooks. At last month's meeting the Committee was provided with the Summary of Proposed Changes to the SADC Appraisal Handbook-2014. He stated that staff will be presenting the handbook at the June Appraiser Conference. We may need to revisit the handbook during the year because the dual-appraisal provision is scheduled to expire on June 30<sup>th</sup> and it is uncertain at this point when or if it will be extended. Staff recommendation is to adopt the handbook.

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Mr. Germano to adopt the 2014 Appraisal Handbook, as presented and discussed. The motion was unanimously approved. (Copies of the Summary of Changes to the SADC Appraisal Handbook - 2014 and the 2014 Appraisal Handbook are attached to and are a part of these minutes.)

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. Resolutions for Final Approval – FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program**

1. Annual County Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update

**Mr. Johnson, Mr. Danser and Ms. Brodhecker recused themselves from any discussion/action pertaining to their specific counties related to the resolution for final approval for the FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update, to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Danser is the chairperson of the Middlesex County Agriculture Development Board and Ms. Brodhecker is the chairperson of the Sussex County Agriculture Development Board. Mr. Johnson is a member of the Burlington County Agriculture Development Board.**

Mr. Brill reviewed the Annual County Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update resolution and related materials with the Committee. He stated that staff recommendation is to grant final approval to the resolution as presented and discussed.

**CAMDEN, CAPE MAY, CUMBERLAND, GLOUCESTER, HUNTERDON,  
MERCER, MONMOUTH, MORRIS, OCEAN, PASSAIC, SALEM, SOMERSET,  
WARREN COUNTIES**

It was moved by Mr. Requa and seconded by Mr. Germano to approve Resolution FY2014R5(1) granting final approval to the FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program Annual County Plans Update for Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Mercer, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Salem, Somerset and Warren Counties, with the exception of Burlington County, Middlesex County and Sussex County, which will be taken via a separate vote (under the same Resolution), subject to any conditions of said Resolution. The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(1) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

**BURLINGTON COUNTY**

It was moved by Mr. Germano and seconded by Mr. Waltman to approve Resolution FY2014R5(1) granting final approval to the FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program Annual County Plans Update for Burlington County, as presented and discussed and subject to any conditions of said Resolution. The motion was approved. (Mr. Johnson recused himself from the vote.) (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(1) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

**MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Ms. Brodhecker to approve Resolution

FY2014R5(1) granting final approval to the FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program Annual County Plans Update for Middlesex County, as presented and discussed and subject to any conditions of said Resolution. The motion was approved. (Mr. Danser recused himself from the vote.) (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(1) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

## SUSSEX COUNTY

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Mr. Waltman to approve Resolution FY2014R5(1) granting final approval to the FY2014 Planning Incentive Grant Program Annual County Plans Update for Sussex County, as presented and discussed and subject to any conditions of said Resolution. The motion was approved. (Ms. Brodhecker recused herself from the vote.) (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(1) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

### 2. Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update

Mr. Bruder reviewed the Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update resolution and related materials with the Committee. Staff recommendation is to approve the resolution as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Mr. Danser and seconded by Mr. Germano to approve Resolution FY2014R5(2) granting final approval to the FY2014 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program Plans Update, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution. The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(2) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

#### A. Stewardship

##### 1. Review of Activities – Holland Greenhouses Project

###### a. Rue Farm, Upper Freehold Township, Monmouth County

Mr. Roohr stated that Rue Farm, located in Upper Freehold Township, Monmouth County, originally consisted of 332 acres preserved in 1996 through the County Easement Purchase Program. In July 2013, the SADC approved a division of the premises of a 78-acre parcel for the sale to Mr. Jansen. Mr. Jansen is Vice President of Holland Greenhouses, a sizable wholesale greenhouse operation in Monroe Township. He currently is under contract to purchase the 78-acre piece. His proposal calls for three 5.17-acre permanent greenhouses, all adjacent to each other, so ultimately the plan would be for approximately 15.5 acres of permanent greenhouse space on the farm.

Mr. Roohr stated that Mr. Jansen wanted him to make it clear that the Holland Greenhouse business is raising potted and trays of flowers, vegetables, plants and herbs, and that would be the primary operation in this new location. However, the potted plants are a very early spring and summer project and there is some downtime in the late summer and early fall. In that downtime, when greenhouses typically are empty, he is proposing to leave the floors as a soil floor, except for the concrete walk space to get to places. He intends to use that soil floor to raise vegetables in the ground. He has experience with different wholesale locations through his plant sales, where he could also sell locally grown vegetables.

Mr. Roohr stated that staff made two things very clear in the resolution for the division of the premises. First, staff made Mr. Jansen aware of the Quaker Valley Farms (QVF) litigation and the implications that case has on greenhouse operations and earth work in order to build structures. Secondly, staff strongly advised in that resolution that Mr. Jansen provide plans or something more formal as to what his operation would actually entail, including how he was going to get to the point of putting up those greenhouses and be able to use them. Subsequently, Mr. Jansen provided staff with engineering plans for the complete project. What Mr. Jansen also made clear was that in order for him to purchase this property and do this project, he needs to know whether he can build out all three greenhouses. They will be in stages of 5.1 acres at a time over a period of the estimated 7-10 years for the ultimate build-out, but he has to know if he can build all three. That is the proposal that makes this all work.

Mr. Roohr reviewed with the Committee various in-house drawings that reflect Mr. Jansen's project showing the approximate total greenhouse area, a loading area where trucks would pull up to a loading dock, employee parking, the driveway entrance to get in and also an unpreserved property area that the Rue family owns but that Mr. Jansen is also under contract to purchase. Chairman Fisher asked about the surface of the loading area. Mr. Roohr stated that on the drawing it is gravel. It does not indicate what the parking lot would be, and then there is a concrete loading dock. There would be an approximate 2-acre retention basin, and that is what would be needed to accommodate the 100-year storm. There is a concrete perimeter, a concrete center aisle and then smaller white lines on his drawing that represent little walkways that would break it up so you could get all your materials down there and all the automated equipment. Everything that is brown on his drawing would conceivably be soil. There are also hash marks on the overlay that represent where they would have to grade, cut and fill that 15-acre area to make it perfectly level. The hash marks are the graded slopes that would be the perimeter so in the area that is lower you're going to have some slopes that go up and where it is



higher you'll have slopes that go the other way. The hash marks around the perimeter will total approximately five acres of 12% or greater slopes and that is what would get you sloped up to make that flat plateau. He stated that in order to have everything work to peak efficiency everything needs to be level.

Mr. Roohr reviewed various photos with the Committee. He stated that staff initially thought that growing in the ground meant that there would be four corners in a big box with a roof on it over the existing turf. What staff learned is that in order to get this absolutely level surface there is some cut and fill that is necessary. The dark spots on the photo that Mr. Roohr showed the Committee are numbers that range from a half-foot to in some cases 12 feet. The dark numbers are fill and the light numbers are cut. The cut is less substantial than the fill. The cut ranges from a half-foot to as much as 30 inches. In portions of that you would have a 30-inch cut and in portions you would have from one foot to 10 feet of fill, and that is what you need to get this perfectly level. The earth work that would be necessary to do this project is what triggered staff's concern regarding the project.

Mr. Roohr stated that the related issue with this is something the SADC always considers, which is what the next owner would be able to do with this property. Mr. Jansen would like to build the greenhouse. It will have some amount of concrete for the perimeter and walkways, excavation for the retention basin, and the driveway area but then you have this 15-acre plateau that angles up and slopes going down to get to the rest of the field. What does that leave the next farmer with if they were to take the greenhouse down and wanted to do some kind of field-based agriculture? Mr. Roohr stated that Mr. Jansen is present today should the Committee have any questions for him. The Committee has already heard the Mayor's comments during public comment in support of the project. Mr. Jansen did provide some YouTube clips of farms in Holland where they actually do grow in the ground should the Committee wish to see those.

Mr. Siegel asked what the Committee is being asked to do. Mr. Roohr stated that when Mr. Jansen brought this to the SADC and the staff saw the engineering plans and raised the earlier noted concerns, we told him that we do have the soil disturbance subcommittee in progress now and will soon be providing regulations that would give more clear guidance on the amount of earth work that can be done. Mr. Jansen is the contract purchaser and the landowners who he is under contract with cannot wait that long for an answer so Mr. Jansen requested that if possible he would like an answer sooner. He was before the Committee a couple of months ago and asked for essentially a site-specific answer to this particular project. Mr. Siegel stated that he is seeking an advance indemnification, in effect, that if he follows the plans as outlined here the SADC

is guaranteeing that it will not act against him for a soil disturbance violation. Ms. Payne stated he is not asking for an indemnification but rather is asking if this project is consistent with the Deed of Easement. He is not asking for indemnification if it violates the Deed of Easement. She felt that if the Committee says yes, then we cannot find him in violation down the road. Mr. Siegel asked about the status of the subcommittee regarding the development of regulations pertaining to soil disturbance. Ms. Payne stated that staff met with the subcommittee last month and expects to provide the subcommittee with draft text of the regulation in June. Staff is working with Rowan University to finish up some analysis in July and expects to provide a final draft rule to the subcommittee in August. The Committee likely would see it publicly at the earliest in September since the SADC typically doesn't have an August meeting. Then the Committee will have to review and discuss it, and see whether it is comfortable with it or wants changes. Once the Committee is comfortable with it, staff will send it out as a pre-proposal to solicit comments from the agricultural community. Once staff receives and analyzes those comments, the rule would be published in the New Jersey Register as a proposed rule and be subject to the 60-day comment period. She stated that rule adoption is at least a year away.

Mr. Johnson asked to hear the pertinent language in the deed of easement. Ms. Payne stated that the main provisions are that the deed of easement prohibits any activity that is detrimental to soil conservation. The other is detrimental to continued agricultural use of the premises. Ms. Payne stated that Paragraph 7 in the deed of easement states "no activity shall be permitted on the premises, which would be detrimental to drainage, flood control, water conservation, erosion control or soil conservation, nor shall any other activity be permitted which would be detrimental to the continued agricultural use of the premises."

Chairman Fisher stated that one of the questions at issue is what this use was in terms of the ground in the greenhouse. Mr. Johnson commented that the amount of impervious coverage is not mentioned in the deed of easement but it has been added in recently when there are federal monies that are used. Ms. Payne stated that when you use federal money you have to have the impervious coverage language associated with the federal program. Ms. Payne stated that we are not assessing impervious coverage, we are assessing soil disturbance, which are two different things.

Mr. Roohr stated that staff was not coming with a recommendation today but letting the Committee know that this triggered concern based on the earth work. Ms. Payne stated that a resolution has not been prepared but staff did indicate in the memorandum that staff believes that the nature and scale of this disturbance would violate the provisions of

the deed of easement related to soil conservation and continued agricultural use of the property. That is staff's assessment and that is what was provided to the Committee. She stated that in the memorandum staff characterized the hard disturbances -- the concrete required to build the greenhouse and within the greenhouse -- and also about five acres of support infrastructure with the retention basin, the gravel parking and all the areas that are no longer available for agricultural production. That is the hard disturbance and that would be about 8.6 acres. Then we have to look at what happened to the soil inside the greenhouse that doesn't have concrete on it. We are talking about a pretty substantial cut and fill operation so we get back to the Sassafras soil that is there now. You pull back the topsoil and you excavate out the subsoil and then use it to fill elsewhere. Do we still have that Sassafras soil anymore? Staff's sense is that we do not. She stated that everything they have learned going through the litigation is that soils have layers and they have functions and you just cannot remove massive amounts of subsoil and expect that soil to continue to have the same productivity. Those are staff's assessments and concerns, based on information that has been submitted to the SADC to date.

Mr. Jansen stated that this property has already been mined back in the late 1960s, early 1970s, to construct I-195. The process of what he is trying to do by stripping the topsoil and putting that aside and leveling it was already done on this property, so it is proven that it did work because it is a farm today. Ms. Payne stated that the SADC doesn't have any information about what mining has occurred. Staff actually did look back at some topography maps and couldn't see any difference. She didn't know how far back those maps went. The Committee cannot rely on that kind of statement to support its finding of whether this would or wouldn't have a negative impact on this farm. Mr. Johnson stated that he agrees with Mr. Jansen because he has seen it done so many times where roadways come through. He stated that despite studies from the colleges that may say that it doesn't work, on the ground he has seen it work and this gentleman is telling you that it did work. He stated they have done soil conservation jobs on his farm where it requires you to do it in order to create grass waterways and there are lots of cuts and fills.

Chairman Fisher questioned what was growing on the farm now. Mr. Roohr stated that it is a hay operation and a grain operation but right now it is in hay. Mr. Jansen stated that it is also soybeans and they grow well. Ms. Reade stated that the question isn't whether you ruin the soil altogether; it is whether you diminish productivity. That is what she remembered from when Rutgers was commissioned to do the study. That is the concern, it is not that you cannot restore it to some extent. It is that you have permanently impaired yields at some measureable level. That is what we heard from many soil scientists. Chairman Fisher asked about the soil that will be in the greenhouse to grow the vegetables and herbs. He asked where that was coming from. Mr. Jansen responded from

the property. Mr. Roohr stated that the project entails no soil leaving the property and no soil is being brought in. The proposal is to strip the topsoil back, level out the 15 acres and then put up to 9 inches of topsoil back on. It wouldn't be all the 15 acres because you'll have some concrete pathways, but on about 12.5 acres it would have 9 inches of the topsoil replaced to it, the very same soil. Mr. Germano stated that then what is most significantly being disturbed is the subsoil.

Laurie Rue, partial owner of the property in question, addressed the Committee. She stated that she remembered when I-195 came through. That entire piece of land was totally mined. They pulled all the topsoil, however much they took off the top, they dug out gravel for I-195. It is not the same natural soil that it has been. That was done in the late 1960s, early 1970s. That entire field where Mr. Jansen is looking to do that project was done and put back on and then her father proceeded to farm after that. She stated that except for around the edges where the trees are, the whole area back in there was mined. That is the bedrock of I-195. Chairman Fisher asked what was grown all those years. Ms. Rue responded that it used to be their pasture for their cows but when I-195 went through they couldn't do that anymore because they didn't want to make a road to go over there so then it became hay for a while, then they mined it out and it has always been soybeans and alfalfa since then and sometimes corn; they would rotate it around. She stated that it all happened before the farm went into preservation in 1996.

Mr. Waltman commented that it was said that Mr. Jansen was also looking at some land that is not preserved. He asked if his plans for that land were similar. Mr. Jansen stated no, it will just be open field for certain crops. Mr. Waltman felt that this proposal exceeds what is an appropriate amount of soil disturbance and impervious cover for a preserved farm. It looks in some ways similar to the project that the Committee was grappling with when he first joined the Committee back in 2008, which is the one that has been in litigation. He felt it was important for the subcommittee to get the rules completed as soon as it can. He understands Mr. Jansen's financial position and why he possibly would not want to wait.

Mr. Jansen reminded the Committee that the Quaker Valley Farms case is more of a topic of after effects. Here he is up-front telling the Committee that he is going to control earthwork, not just mix it up and destroy the farmland. He totally agrees that mixing subsoils and topsoil is not the right thing to do. He strongly feels this is a totally separate matter, indicating that the land was already mined and topsoil replaced.

Mr. Siegel asked Mr. Jansen if his project could be shrunk and whether his business plan would still be viable if the engineering on this has to be reduced. Mr. Jansen responded

not by 50 percent, it would be way too much. Earl Steeves addressed the Committee. He is the President of Max Spann Realty and is working with both the Rue family and Mr. Jansen on this project. He stated that he spent the past 40+ years financing farmland and working to preserve farmland and also selling preserved farms as the CEO of Farm Credit of North Central Jersey and Farm Credit for South Jersey. His role is with the real estate company now. He also is on the New Jersey Agricultural Land Trust and he is the Chairman of the Hunterdon County Parks Advisory Board. He stated that this project is going to be a state-of-the-art greenhouse that is going to be a model for not only for New Jersey but for the Northeast. It is going to be an increasingly important way of producing food because you can control environments, water and use of pesticides. He felt that it should be emphasized that the amount of cut, as he understands the plan, is a maximum of 30 inches. There is going to be some fill and regarding this stripping off of topsoil and moving some of the subsoil and replacing it with topsoil, he respectfully disagrees with the idea that this is harming the productivity of the soil. Mr. Jansen has a very sound soil management plan, which he will adhere to. Unfortunately, the case in litigation in Hunterdon County has poisoned the well. He stated that Mr. Jansen's project has no similarity to what this person did up in northern New Jersey. Mr. Jansen is coming in telling you exactly what he is doing, exactly the way he is going to conserve the soil and the productivity of the soil, and the productivity of his farm is going to be enhanced with what he is doing. He would ask the Committee to think about the positive aspects of this operation.

Chairman Fisher asked if all of the soil would be used in production of agricultural products. Mr. Jansen stated that all of the soils that are removed to build the structure would be returned and used for growing vegetables. Chairman Fisher stated that it was said that inside the greenhouse you are using a certain amount of the soil and bringing it back in. There is going to be more topsoil than what you are going to bring into that greenhouse. Mr. Jansen stated that there might be some surplus. He is not the earthworks analyst but it shows on the cut and fill that the fill is 1.08 cubic yards and the cut is also 1.08. Wherever the concrete is going to be is minus the topsoil. So other places will be increased in thickness. The parking areas will be all gravel. Mr. Germano asked whether the topsoil that comes off of that area will end up going inside the greenhouse. Mr. Jansen responded correct, and/or around the facility after they are done pushing with the machines, etc.. Mr. Roohr stated that Mr. Jansen's engineer did some topsoil borings around the site to figure out the depth of the topsoil now. NRCS documents indicate that Sassafras soil would be 0-9 inches thick of topsoil. There are plugs on here of 4 inches, 5 inches, 6 inches, 8-9 inches so what he is putting back is 9 inches on the 12 ½ acres that will be the growth area. There will probably be some amount of topsoil necessary on the berms around the facility to get the grass to grow to stabilize it. No topsoil will leave the

site. Most of it will be used within the greenhouses to get that 9-inch thickness and then the little bit that is left over will probably be used around the greenhouse for stabilization.

Ms. Brodhecker asked if that plan has been reviewed by the Soil Conservation District. Mr. Jansen stated that it would be part of the process but he hasn't gone down that road as yet. Ms. Reade asked if the Committee could hear from David Clapp, Resource Conservationist for the SADC. Ms. Reade stated that what everyone is struggling with is what, in Mr. Clapp's opinion, would be the impact of a project like what Mr. Jansen is proposing for the long-term health of this farm? Mr. Clapp stated that there are a few different ways that you can look at this. If you are to look at the area of actual agricultural production, he doesn't know if he could give an opinion on whether that land is going to be as productive because he doesn't know what the soil had done there before and he doesn't know about his production methods specifically. What he can say is that soil mapping is done on a large scale basis and that is what the Committee relies on when they purchase a property -- they map out the prime soils, the important soils and those sorts of things. Those maps are done on a large scale with one inch being 1,000 feet. That doesn't necessarily equate to what is 100 percent on site because when you get down to site-specific you are looking at smaller areas than that. The soil survey is a good overall reference but it is not site-specific. With that said, one of the things that you could look at is the specific definitions for what makes a soil prime farmland. That is a very defined thing through the USDA and their regulations. One of the very specific criteria as you work your way down there is that the soils are all assigned through this mapping process a K-factor, which is an erosion factor, so when you look at that factor that number is usually at .24 to up to about .4. One of the definitions says that the K-factor, the soil's erodibility times the percent slope, has to be less than 2 for the soil to be classified as prime farmland. In the areas where he is growing that would still be true. It would be zero because effectively you have no slope. But in the areas surrounding those disturbed areas, you would potentially lose the prime farmland classification because you increase the slope. Not all the soils in the area where the greenhouse is proposed are necessarily prime farmlands. There are Sassafras soils in different slope configurations, so not all of it, when it was preserved, would have been looked at as prime farmland.

Mr. Clapp stated that another way to look at it would be to look at continued agricultural viability/continued use of the areas within that greenhouse. You would be taking a larger field and then sort of breaking it up with these larger slopes. From his experience working with farmers, the steeper slopes are difficult to farm so that might change how you would farm on that field. He is not suggesting that is a negative but that is something to consider. To the point of the soils that are specifically in those areas, he doesn't think he could tell the Committee enough about how the production would go to tell you

whether the productivity is lost. What he is comfortable in saying is that the soils, once they have been disturbed to that level, would no longer be classified in a site-specific survey as the same soil type as what they are today.

Mr. Germano stated that at some point he would like to come back and talk about "diminish" as the standard. He doesn't know that any diminution of productivity is necessarily the death knell for this project. He wanted to ask about the subsoil because it seems to him that the topsoil is going to remain pretty much OK and what is really being disturbed here is the subsoil. That is what is getting hurt -- it is being torn up, mixed up, spread around and altered in a serious way. What kind of damage is that doing to productivity? Eventually the greenhouse goes away, all the cement is torn up, the parking areas, etc., and it becomes a farm field again. To what extent is damage done to the subsoil? Mr. Clapp stated that looking at it from a soil science perspective and from the regulatory end, you will have changed that soil from the natural Sassafras soil and it will no longer be considered Sassafras in a site-specific soil survey. In terms of potential for plant growth, you have the potential for compaction as you excavate and place that material back down. You may increase compaction, which may decrease rooting depth. So you could have a negative impact on that soil structure for the ability for it to grow crops. That said, he doesn't have anything specific for this farm that says compacting or removing that soil would decrease rooting depth. But that is the common concern, that as you disturb that soil, which is formed in place, every one of those layers has a specific makeup or characterization and that is not something where you could make that structure again as it was formed over thousands of years.

Mr. Germano stated that the danger of tearing up the subsoil is that it becomes compacted when it is leveled. Mr. Clapp stated or when it is placed or run over by equipment, there is potential for compaction. Mr. Germano stated that farm equipment is very heavy so what is the difference? Mr. Clapp stated that the difference for this kind of excavation is that when you are doing your normal field operations, ideally you are at soils that are field capacity so they are not super wet so that when you run over them you are not having as much of a concern with deep compaction. In this case, the landowner would be removing everything, replacing it back and then running over it with all the different equipment throughout the leveling process, and you could create compaction at layers deeper than you would normally.

Chairman Fisher stated that it has been described that this project is trail-blazing technology in terms of what Mr. Jansen is going to do because the floors of this greenhouse will be soil. He stated that this is something that we have not seen before that much. He asked Mr. Jansen to explain this. Mr. Jansen stated that every greenhouse is

level. There have been greenhouses built in the past couple of years on preserved land and the land was excavated -- maybe not to the scale of what he wants to do but this is also a three-phase step over time. He wants to start with 5 acres and expand to 15 acres. Other greenhouses, do they put the top soil back on, not that he is aware of they don't. He wants to put the topsoil back inside the greenhouses for the specific reasons that Mr. Roohr already explained. At the end of his plant season, when all his vegetables and herb plants are shipped out, he always has stock left over. He destroys it, throwing it all out. Greenhouses are typically empty during the summer. He wants to plant his leftover stock in the soil in the greenhouse and within a certain amount of time he can start harvesting produce. When the frost hits and the outdoor farmers are done, he will still be growing local produce. The interest in gardening is through the roof and increasing every year, as is demand for locally grown produce

Chairman Fisher stated that it must be economically viable if you are starting at 5 acres. Mr. Jansen responded absolutely. He is not doing this just for extra cash. He has business to fill the first five acres. Chairman Fisher stated that it was asked if he could scale down. Mr. Siegel asked what if you only did Phase 1, is that not economically viable enough to make this acquisition worthwhile? Mr. Jansen responded not with just the five acres because that is already filled. He can build on the five acres and it can be filled already.

Ms. Murphy stated that regarding staff's memo, it points out two different concerns -- soil disturbance and productivity, and the percentage of the property that would not be available for agriculture in the future. It talks about, when all is said and done with this project, 46 percent of the tillable acres would be gone. Mr. Jansen stated that it was questioned what would happen with the farm in the future if his proposal went forward. He stated that technology is changing from growing outdoors to greenhouses and hydroponics. Each 5-acre zone is almost a \$3 million investment, so this structure, in his opinion, would never come down. No one else is going to buy this place and take that structure down and make it open fields. They wouldn't be able to afford it.

Chairman Fisher stated that there has been much discussion but the question is that the applicant has come in and asked for a preapproval. Mr. Siegel stated that there is a memo from staff and he believes that as a board we can take a vote on a motion to accept this memo or not accept it and that is as much of an answer that we can give the gentleman. If the board votes to accept this memo then he has his answer. We can vote as a board to say we accept this memo or we don't accept it. Chairman Fisher stated that the Committee could also modify it. Mr. Waltman stated that the Committee could vote to accept the conclusions of the memo because he has heard a couple of the members say they don't necessarily agree with every argument made in the memo.



Mr. Stypinski stated that if the Committee is going to discuss any litigation as it relates to this project, it needs to be in Closed Session. Chairman Fisher felt that the Committee does need to go into Closed Session to discuss that and proposed that the Committee discuss this further in Closed Session after the conclusion of the Open Session agenda items.

Mayor Moslowski stated that any farmer needs infrastructure, needs to construct buildings, to run his farm. Ms. Reade stated this would be 46 percent of the farm that would eventually be affected; there would be slopes of 12-15 percent. Mr. Moslowski stated that regarding production, Mr. Jansen would be doubling the production of the land because he could grow all winter long and that would be a benefit for everyone who lives in the community. He just doesn't see the detriment to the property if Mr. Jansen is taking the soil off, putting it to the side, moving the subsoil and putting it back on.

Mr. Jansen stated that if it helps, he is willing to put the second lot that he is trying to purchase, the 13 acres, into preservation.

#### **Division of the Premises Request**

##### **1. Killdee Farm LLC, Manalapan and Marlboro Townships, Monmouth County**

Mr. Roohr referred the Committee to Resolution FY2014R5(3) for a request for a division of the premises on the property known as the Killdee Farm LLC, Block 4.01, Lot 11.01; Block 5, Lot 24; Block 12, Lot 12.03 in Manalapan Township, Monmouth County, and Block 299, Lots 114 and 115, in Marlboro Township, Monmouth County.

The Deed of Easement references three existing residences, no agricultural labor residences, no residual dwelling site opportunities and no exception areas. The property totals approximately 217.99 acres. The owner proposes to divide the premises and transfer ownership of Parcel "B" to James Wikoff, the only member of the Killdee Farm LLC who is an active farmer, and his wife Maryann. The Wikoffs have farmed the property for the past 38 years. The property is run as a family operation that includes James and Maryann Wikoff and their two adult daughters. Mr. Wikoff proposes to secure separate ownership of Parcel "B" so that he can invest in making improvements to the infrastructure, including an enlarged farm market, expanded vegetable production facilities and high tunnel growing areas, and be able to recoup that investment. However, he cannot afford to purchase the entire property outright so he is seeking to purchase the area identified as Parcel "B."

The proposed Parcel "A" would result in a 132+/- acre property and would include two existing single-family residential units, one of which is used as an approved pre-existing professional office, a barn and several smaller outbuildings. The resulting Parcel "B" would result in an 87+/- acre property and would include one existing single-family residential unit, two barns, a farm stand and underground irrigation mains. Staff recommendation is to approve the request for a division of premises.

It was moved by Mr. Germano and seconded by Mr. Danser to approve Resolution FY2014R5(3) granting approval to a request for a division of the premises on the property known as the Killdee Farm LLC, Block 4.01, Lot 11.01; Block 5, Lot 24; Block 12, Lot 12.03, in Manalapan Township, Monmouth County, and Block 299, Lots 114 and 115, in Marlboro Township, Monmouth County, as follows, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

Parcel "A" – 132+/- acres including two existing single-family residential units, one of which is used as an approved pre-existing professional office, a barn and several smaller outbuildings

Parcel "B" - 87+/- acre property and would include one existing single-family residential unit, two barns, a farm stand and underground irrigation mains

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(3) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

**B. Resolutions for Final Approval: County Planning Incentive Grant Program**

Ms. Winzinger referred the Committee to one request for final approval under the County Planning Incentive Grant Program. She 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. Waltman and seconded by Mr. Danser to approve Resolution FY2014R5(4) 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. Amwell Chase, Inc., SADC # 10-0350-PG  
Block 5, Lots 24 and 24.01, West Amwell Township, Hunterdon County, 205 Net  
Easement Acres

State cost share of \$5,350 per acre for a total grant need of \$1,129,652.50, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11 and the conditions contained in Schedule "C." The County will utilize FY2011 and FY2013 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share. The property includes a 4-acre nonseverable exception area limited to two single-family residences, zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no pre-existing nonagricultural uses outside of the exception area.

Discussion: The property includes a 4-acre nonseverable exception area limited to two single-family residences. The County has requested an additional 3% buffer for possible final surveyed acreage increases; therefore, 211.150 acres will be utilized to calculate the SADC grant need.

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(4) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

**C. Resolutions of Amended Preliminary Approval: Nonprofit Grant Program**

1. Montgomery Friends of Open Space/Firmenich Family, Montgomery Township, Somerset County

Ms. Winzinger referred the Committee to one request for amended preliminary approval under the Nonprofit Grant Program. She stated that the property received preliminary approval in April 2011 and that the SADC was advised that Elizabeth Webster sold the property to Johan and Emily Firmenich, who wished to continue with the farmland preservation application process with some changes to the original application. The revised application includes a 7.4-acre severable exception surrounding the existing residence, two apartments and other outbuildings. The property also includes a 2-acre nonseverable exception limited to one future single-family residence, resulting in a net of approximately 31 acres to be preserved. The landowner agreed to limit the size of the future single-family residence on the nonseverable exception to 2,500 square feet of heated living space. The landowner is also aware that a portion of the property is currently being considered for a Transco Gas Line. The exact delineation of the line is yet to be determined.

It was moved by Mr. Germano and seconded by Mr. Waltman to approve Resolution FY2014R5(5) granting amended preliminary approval to the following application under the Nonprofit Grant Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

1. Montgomery Friends of Open Space/Firmenich Family, SADC # 18-0007-NP Block 33001, Lots 22.01 and 22, Montgomery Township, Somerset County, 39 Net Easement Acres. The application includes an approximately 7.4 acre severable exception, which will have right to farm language; a 2-acre nonseverable exception, which will be limited to one future single-family residence with a house size limitation of 2,500 square feet of heated living space and right to farm language; and zero agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing nonagricultural uses on the area to be preserved. **The SADC will not provide a cost share grant until the Transco Gas Line easement is in place, a non-severable exception area is taken for the future line or it is shown that this farm is no longer needed for the proposed gas line.**

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(5) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

#### **D. Resolutions for Final Approval – State Acquisition Program**

SADC staff referred the Committee to two requests for final approval under the State Acquisition Program. Staff reviewed the specifics with the Committee and stated that staff recommendation is to grant final approval as presented and discussed.

It was moved by Ms. Brodhecker and seconded by Mr. Danser to approve Resolution FY2014R5(6) granting final approval to the following application under the State Acquisition Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

1. George and Joseph Gerickont, SADC #03-0028-DE (Resolution FY2014R5(6)) Block 701, Lot 1, South Hampton Township, Burlington County, 143 Net Easement Acres  
Acquisition of the development easement at a value of \$4,640 per acre for a total of approximately \$663,520 based on 143 acres and subject to the conditions in Schedule "B." The property includes a 4.8-acre nonseverable exception area limited to one single-family residence, zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no pre-existing nonagricultural uses on the area outside of the exception area. The landowner has agreed to limit impervious coverage on the property to a maximum of 10% of the total property acreage, outside of the exception area.

Discussion: The property is located within the Pinelands Agricultural Production Area and has been allocated 6.75 Pinelands Development Credits (PDCs). The landowner may choose to receive a higher base value pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.4(c) by placing a deed restriction on his or her property that limits impervious coverage on the property to 10% of the total acreage. The Pinelands Formula Valuations for the property are: \$4,150 without 10% impervious coverage limitations and \$4,669 with 10% impervious coverage limitations. The owner accepted the SADC's offer to purchase the development easement on the property at the formula value. Through the sale of the development easement to the SADC, the 6.75 PDCs will be retired.

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R5(6) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

It was moved by Mr. Requa and seconded by Mr. Siegel to approve Resolution FY2014R5(7) granting final approval to the following application under the State Acquisition Program, as presented and discussed, subject to any conditions of said Resolution:

2. Steven Hall, SADC #17-0271-DE (Resolution FY2014R5(7))  
Block 701, Lot 9.01; Block 903, Lots 1 and 2, Pittsgrove Township, Salem County, 120 Net Easement Acres  
Acquisition of the development easement at a value of \$6,400 per acre for a total of approximately \$768,000, subject to the conditions contained in Schedule "B." The property includes a 3-acre nonseverable exception area limited to one single-family residence, zero single-family residences, zero agricultural labor units and no preexisting nonagricultural uses on the area outside of the exception area. As a result of the possible subdivision of the severable exception prior to closing, the remaining parcel may be re-designated with new lot numbers with the re-designation being reflected in the subsequent closing documents and deed of easement.

The motion was unanimously approved. (A copy of Resolution FY2014R6(7) is attached to and is a part of these minutes.)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

1) Harriet Honigfeld from the Monmouth County Agriculture Development Board stated that in listening to the Holland Greenhouse/Rue discussion, she realizes the renderings are very daunting but she would really like the Committee to give some careful consideration to the future of agriculture and agricultural viability. You have a cutting-edge farmer coming in trying to do things with the most environmentally sensitive methods possible for the kind of business that he wants to do and frankly, he is his own control because he wants to use this soil to produce future crops, not necessarily the crops that are there now but very intensive crops that need good soils. Economically, he said that removing the greenhouses would probably not be feasible but you can grow many kinds of things on this kind of soils in the future. She thought the Committee has to be very careful not to add language to the deed that isn't there. If he is conserving the soil, obviously moving it, but conserving it and if he is making sure that the farm is agriculturally viable, she thought those were the big tests. You really have to think hard about what would be here. Is it really preferable to leave this as a field with people in an estate situation? This is a good business that moves our industry forward.

2) Nicole Kavanaugh from the New Jersey Farm Bureau stated that she would echo Ms. Honigfeld's statements. You have a young farmer with a proposal for a viable agricultural business and it sounds like the discussion is toward adding provisions in the deed of easement that aren't already there. It sounds to her like Mr. Jansen has a plan to preserve and protect the soil and that is your main concern, and he is going to build an agricultural building for a viable agricultural business. The other thing she has been hearing is the term "continued agricultural use" that is being translated into meaning that all types of agriculture have to be viable on that piece of land. She thinks that one type of agriculture is automatically going to preclude another type. If you are going to build a winery facility and a marketing facility for the winery, you are not going to grow grain there someday. You have to be very careful with that. It sounds like this project would support not just one type of agriculture. It would support a variety of them but certainly not all. She hopes that the Committee will be very careful in its deliberations and support viable agriculture in the state as opposed to hindering it.

#### **TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

SADC Regular Meeting: Thursday, June 26, 2014, beginning at 9 a.m. Location: Health/Agriculture Building, First Floor Auditorium.

## CLOSED SESSION

At 12:14 p.m., Mr. Danser moved the following resolution to go into Closed Session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Requa 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

**Mr. Johnson recused himself from any discussion/action pertaining to the certification of values for farms 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. Danser to certify the following development easement values for Burlington County as presented and discussed in Closed Session:

1. Douglas A. and Constance Cramer, SADC # 03-0376-PG  
Block 902, Lot 6, Tabernacle Township, Burlington County, 45 Acres
2. Whalen Home Farm, SADC # 03-0393-PG  
Block 33, Lots 21 and 22; Block 34, Lots 11, 12.01, 12.02, 13, 20, Shamong Township, Burlington County, 145 Acres
3. Whalen Home Farm South, SADC # 03-0394-PG  
Block 33, Lots 10, 11.01, 11.02, 13.02, 16.01, 16.02, 17, 18.01, 18.02, Shamong Township, Burlington County, 113 Acres
4. Alloway-Prickett Farm, SADC # 03-0392-PG  
Block 1602, Lot 9, Southampton Township, Burlington County, 129 Acres

5. Alloway-Hall Farm, SADC # 03-0391-PG  
Block 1601, Lot 10, 10.03, Southampton Township, Burlington County, 65 Acres
6. Thomas R. Haines, SADC # 03-0395-PG  
Block 841, Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 31; Block 842, Lot 59, Pemberton Township,  
Burlington County, 158 Acres net/gross

The motion was approved. (Mr. Johnson recused himself from the vote.) (Copies of the Certification of Value Reports are attached to and are a part of the Closed Session minutes.)

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

7. Bridgeton Farms Association LLC, SADC # 06-0151-PG  
Block 2705, Lot 52; Block 2801, Lot 5, Upper Deerfield Township  
Block 2, Lot 1, Fairfield Township  
Cumberland County, 102 Acres (per owner's application – 103 acres (SADC))
8. Donald and Diane Garrison, SADC # 06-0153-PG  
Block 602, Lot 1, Upper Deerfield Township, Cumberland County, 65 Acres  
(Appraisal Order Checklist)
9. Joseph, Victoria and Anna Musumeci, SADC # 08-0176-PG  
Block 1004, Lots 4, 4.03, Logan Township, Gloucester County, 30 Net Acres
10. Sandra Schregenberger (Ex. Of Estate), SADC # 18-0207-PG  
Block 8, Lot 18, Hillsborough Township, Somerset County, 38 Acres (SADC),  
Gross Acreage 66.48+/-)

**Direct Easement Purchase Program**

1. David and Elizabeth Stothoff, SADC # 10-0218-DE  
Block 28, Lot 23, Union Township, Hunterdon County, 57.50 Acres
2. EVK Realty Associates, LP, SADC # 17-0264-DE  
Block 239, Lots 17, 19, Carneys Point Township, Salem County, 225 Acres  
(SADC Estimate)



3. F. Sickler and Sons, LLC, SADC # 17-0272-DE  
Block 39, Lots 5, 6; Block 40, Lot 7, Upper Pittsgrove Township, Salem County,  
153 Acres (SADC)

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

**B. Stewardship**

**1. Review of Activities – Holland Greenhouses Project**

- a. Rue Farm, Upper Freehold Township, Monmouth County

It was moved by Mr. Siegel and seconded by Ms. Reade to accept and make public the memo from Jeffrey Everett dated May 15, 2014 regarding the Rue Farm. The motion is to accept the memo and, therefore, accept staff's findings. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

Douglas H. Fisher, Chairperson	Oppose
Alan A. Danser, Vice Chairman	Oppose
Cecile Murphy	Yes
James Requa	Abstain
Ralph Siegel	Yes
Denis C. Germano	Yes
Jane Brodhecker	Yes
James Waltman	Yes
Peter Johnson	Oppose
Torrey Reade	Yes
Brian Schilling	Absent

The motion carries: 6 Yes Votes; 3 Oppose Votes; 1 Abstention Vote; 1 Absentee

**C. Approval of Settlement, Right to Farm Complaints, Borough of Closter v. Metropolitan Farm, LLC; Concerned Residents of Closter v. Metropolitan Farm LLC**

It was moved by Mr. Danser and seconded by Mr. Siegel to accept the Hearing Officer's findings regarding the settlement in the Right to Farm case involving the Borough of Closter v. Metropolitan Farm, LLC; concerned Residents of Closter v. Metropolitan Farm, LLC, as presented and discussed in Closed Session. The motion was unanimously

approved. (A copy of the SADC Hearing Officer's Findings is attached to and is 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. Requa and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**Attachments**

S:\MINUTES\2014\Reg MAY 22 2014.doc

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R5(1)

FINAL APPROVAL

Of

BURLINGTON, CAMDEN, CAPE MAY, CUMBERLAND, GLOUCESTER,  
HUNTERDON, MERCER, MIDDLESEX, MONMOUTH, MORRIS, OCEAN, PASSAIC,  
SALEM, SOMERSET, SUSSEX AND WARREN COUNTIES' PLANNING INCENTIVE  
GRANT ("PIG")  
APPLICATIONS  
INCLUDING COMPREHENSIVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANS AND  
PROJECT AREA SUMMARIES

FY 2015 PIG PROGRAM

May 22, 2014

WHEREAS, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") is authorized under the Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant Act, P.L. 1999, c.180 (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1), to provide a grant to eligible counties and municipalities for farmland preservation purposes based on whether the identified project area provides an opportunity to preserve a significant area of reasonably contiguous farmland that will promote the long term viability of agriculture as an industry in the municipality or county; and

WHEREAS, to be eligible for a grant, a county shall:

1. Identify project areas of multiple farms that are reasonably contiguous and located in an agriculture development area authorized pursuant to the "Agriculture Retention and Development Act," P.L. 1983, c.32 (C.4:1C-11 et seq.);
2. Establish a county agriculture development board (CADB), pursuant to N.J.S.A. 4:1C-14, to serve as the agricultural advisory committee;
3. Prepare a comprehensive farmland preservation plan; and
4. Establish and maintain a dedicated source of funding for farmland preservation pursuant to P.L. 1997, c.24 (C.40:12-15.1 et seq.), or an alternative means of funding for farmland preservation, including, but not limited to, a dedicated tax, repeated annual appropriations or repeated issuance of bonded indebtedness; and

WHEREAS, a county, in submitting an application to the SADC shall outline a multi-year

plan for the purchase of multiple targeted farms in a project area and indicate its annual share of the estimated purchase price; and

WHEREAS, the application shall include a copy of the comprehensive farmland preservation plan element; an estimate of the cost of purchasing development easements on all the farms in a designated project area, to be determined in consultation with the CADB or through an appraisal for the entire project area; and an inventory showing the characteristics of each farm in the project area which may included, but not be limited to, size, soils and agricultural use; and

WHEREAS, the SADC adopted amended rules, effective July 2, 2007, under Subchapter 17 (N.J.A.C. 2:76-17) to implement the Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant Act, P.L. 1999, c.180 (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1) by establishing a county farmland preservation planning incentive grant program; and

WHEREAS, a county, applying for a grant to the SADC shall submit a copy of the county comprehensive farmland preservation plan and a project area summary for each project area designated within the plan, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6; and

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2006, the SADC adopted *Guidelines for Developing County Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plans* to supplement the new rules at N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 and provide uniform, detailed plan standards, update previous planning standards, and incorporate recommendations from the 2006 edition of the Agricultural Smart Growth Plan for New Jersey, the Planning Incentive Grant Statute (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1) and the New Jersey Department of Agriculture Guidelines for Plan Endorsement under the State Development and Redevelopment Plan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6(a), the SADC received 15 county planning incentive grant applications for the 2009 County Planning Incentive Grant round, consisting of a copy of the county's draft comprehensive farmland preservation plan and all applicable project area summaries; and

WHEREAS, between June 2008 and January 2009 the SADC granted Final Approval to all 15 county planning incentive grant applications for the 2009 County Planning Incentive Grant round; and

WHEREAS, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Salem, Somerset, Sussex and Warren Counties were included among the 15 aforementioned applicants for the 2009 County Planning Incentive Grant; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the 15 applications submitted for the 2009 County Planning Incentive Grant Program the SADC received an additional 2 county planning incentive grant applications from Bergen and Cumberland Counties for the 2010 County Planning Incentive Grant round and 1 county planning incentive grant application from Atlantic

County for the 2013 County Planning Incentive Grant round, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6(a); and

WHEREAS, the SADC granted Final Approval to the Cumberland County planning incentive grant application and comprehensive farmland preservation plan on December 10, 2009; and

WHEREAS, SADC staff are actively working with Bergen and Atlantic Counties to complete their comprehensive farmland preservation plans; and

WHEREAS, the 18 total applications for the County Planning Incentive Grant Program identified 133 project areas targeted 4,844 farms and 221,135 acres at an estimated total cost of \$2,517,000,000, with a ten-year preservation goal of 155,116 acres, as summarized in the attached Schedule A; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6(b)1 and N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.6(b)2, in order to improve county and municipal farmland preservation coordination, the counties notified all municipalities in which targeted farms are located within a project area and provided evidence of municipal review and comment and, if appropriate, the level of funding the municipality is willing to provide to assist in the purchase of development easements on targeted farms; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.7, SADC staff reviewed and evaluated the counties' applications to determine whether all the components of the comprehensive farmland preservation plans are fully addressed and complete and whether the project area summaries are complete and technically accurate, and that the application is designed to preserve a significant area of reasonably contiguous farmland that will promote the long-term economic viability of agriculture as an industry.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval of the Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Salem, Somerset, Sussex and Warren Counties' Planning Incentive Grant applications as summarized in the attached Schedule B.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding eligibility shall be established pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.8(a), and that the SADC's approval of State funding is subject to the Garden State Preservation Trust approval, the Legislative appropriation of funds and the Governor signing the respective appropriation bills; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC will monitor each county's funding plan pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.17 and adjust the eligibility of funds based on the county's progress in implementing the proposed funding plan. Each Planning Incentive Grant county should expend its grant funds within two years of the date the funds are appropriated. To be considered expended a closing must have been completed with the

SADC. Any funds that are not expended within two years are subject to reappropriation and may no longer be available to the county; and

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

5-22-14

Date



\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

Douglas H. Fisher, Chairperson	YES
Cecile Murphy (rep. DEP Commissioner Martin)	YES
James Requa (rep. DCA Commissioner Constable)	YES
Ralph Siegel (rep. State Treasurer Sidamon-Erstoff)	YES
Brian Schilling (rep. Executive Dean Goodman)	ABSENT
Jane R. Brodhecker	RECUSE-SUSSEX PORTION
Alan A. Danser, Vice Chair	RECUSE-MIDDLESEX PORTION
James Waltman	YES
Peter Johnson	RECUSE-BURLINGTON PORTION
Denis C. Germano	YES
Torrey Reade	YES

NOTE: THE MEETING MINUTES REFLECT THAT SEPARATE VOTES WERE TAKEN ON THIS RESOLUTION TO REFLECT CERTAIN MEMBERS' RECUSALS ON THOSE PORTIONS OF THE RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO BURLINGTON, MIDDLESEX AND SUSSEX COUNTIES.

COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
APPLICATION SUMMARY

County / Municipality	# of Project Areas	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost in Millions	Project Area Acreage	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 / \$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farmland Preservation in Millions
<b>Atlantic</b>	15	10	423	\$2.162	27,724	423	1,500	2,500	5.0	\$2.700	No Set Amount
<b>Bergen</b>	8	37	501	\$66.717	10,887	30	150	300	0.25	\$4.136	No Set Amount
<b>Burlington</b>	4	149	15,995	\$100.774	111,985	1,000	5,000	10,000	1.5	\$7.000	No Set Amount
<b>Camden</b>	5	57	3,469	\$30.843	15,071	762	2,369	3,470	2.0	\$6.800	No Set Amount
<b>Cape May</b>	6	189	12,312	\$221.766	15,982	151	936	1,207	1.0	\$4.933	No Set Amount
<b>Cumberland</b>	16	513	20,335	\$121.542	65,301	2,102	10,512	21,024	1.0	\$0.926	No Set Amount
Hopewell	1	45	1,576	\$9.420	5,689	158	788	1,576	0.0	\$0.000	No Set Amount
Upper Deerfield	1	51	3,418	\$20.536	9,233	396	1,979	3,958	0.0	\$0.050	\$0.050
<b>Gloucester</b>	11	900	19,958	\$265.200	115,875	750	3,500	6,800	4.0	\$11.000	\$5.000
Elk	2	29	953	\$10.482	3,520	75	377	754	1.0	\$0.038	\$0.038
Franklin	5	125	4,870	\$29.061	10,106	598	1,799	3,290	1.0	\$0.081	No Set Amount
Woolwich	3	72	3,403	\$51.048	5,183	265	1,920	3,984	5.0	\$0.323	No Set Amount
<b>Hunterdon</b>	7	149	8,313	\$106.727	178,126	1,500	7,500	15,000	3.0	\$7.000	\$2.000
Alexandria	4	67	3,649	\$36.488	16,912	524	1,348	2,090	4.0	\$0.328	\$0.164
Delaware	2	21	1,684	\$23.581	23,707	300	1,500	3,000	6.0	\$0.472	No Set Amount
East Amwell	1	21	1,848	\$24.024	13,515	185	925	1,848	4.0	\$0.268	\$0.268
Franklin	1	17	1,386	\$12.473	10,644	296	331	760	5.0	\$0.270	No Set Amount
Holland	4	34	2,106	\$21.095	11,335	703	1,700	2,222	2.0	\$0.079	\$0.079
Kingwood	1	26	1,571	\$15.714	12,645	157	628	785	3.0	\$0.183	No Set Amount
Raritan	4	23	1,554	\$31.079	6,111	100	300	600	1.5	\$0.602	No Set Amount
Readington	1	41	2,317	\$41.706	15,759	100	600	1,100	2.0	\$0.569	No Set Amount
Tewksbury	3	3	409	\$9.700	4,557	100	300	1,000	5.0	\$0.425	No Set Amount
Union	3	20	618	\$6.100	4,189	70	325	600	2.0	\$0.137	No Set Amount
West Amwell	1	9	802	\$9.620	10,440	58	500	780	6.0	\$0.280	No Set Amount
<b>Mercer</b>	7	31	2,448	\$39.853	14,570	50	250	500	3.0	\$8.432	No Set Amount
Hopewell	1	10	819	\$24.569	10,761	96	383	479	3.0	\$1.217	No Set Amount
<b>Middlesex</b>	5	122	4,747	\$185.991	20,983	225	1,125	2,250	2.0	\$28.624	No Set Amount
<b>Monmouth</b>	6	116	10,062	\$254.242	60,623	1,200	3,000	6,000	1.5	\$17.900	\$1.100
Colts Neck	1	6	318	\$11.140	9,321	17	104	199	1.2	\$0.366	No Set Amount
Holmdel	1	14	587	\$27.182	2,572	10	70	338	2.5	\$0.960	No Set Amount
Howell	3	13	560	\$12.846	12,666	127	370	453	2.0	\$1.396	\$0.700
Manalapan	1	38	1,318	\$26.343	9,223	131	659	1,318	2.0	\$1.161	No Set Amount
Marlboro	3	20	719	\$35.950	19,690	42	202	387	2.0	\$0.625	No Set Amount
Millstone	4	52	3,204	\$96.120	14,024	30	150	300	6.0	\$0.940	No Set Amount
Upper Freehold	1	167	5,042	\$75.630	27,368	550	1,000	1,500	6.0	\$0.715	\$0.477
<b>Morris</b>	3	79	5,887	\$176.610	169,342	610	2,974	5,962	1.1	\$10.40	\$1.20
<b>Ocean</b>	7	152	2,540	\$84.287	21,975	200	901	1,623	1.2	\$10.000	No Set Amount

COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
APPLICATION SUMMARY

County / Municipality	# of Project Areas	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost in Millions	Project Area Acreage	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 / \$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farmland Preservation in Millions
<b>Passaic</b>	1	10	191	\$5.977	6,415	100	500	1,000	1.0	\$5.000	\$0.750
<b>Salem</b>	3	429	35,029	\$280.736	80,424	2,600	13,000	26,000	2.0	\$1.091	\$1.091
Alloway	1	5	291	\$3.000	5,465	200	400	600	2.0	\$0.028	No Set Amount
Pilesgrove	4	58	4,011	\$38.046	9,089	250	1,250	2,500	3.0	\$0.145	\$0.145
Pittsgrove	2	138	1,890	\$14.722	7,200	186	932	1,864	1.0	\$0.067	No Set Amount
Upper Pittsgrove	1	256	11,240	\$84.299	24,167	700	3,500	7,000	2.0	\$0.070	\$0.070
<b>Somerset</b>	12	365	14,104	\$223.201	87,623	1,000	4,000	5,000	3.0	\$17.000	No Set Amount
Bedminster	1	120	5,863	\$175.899	10,111	500	2,706	2,706	2.0	\$0.342	No Set Amount
Bernards	1	25	538	\$40.323	3,798	165	165	200	4.0	\$3.030	No Set Amount
Branchburg	1	23	737	\$40.535	1,873	154	266	737	5.0	\$1.500	No Set Amount
Franklin	2	19	855	\$16.584	18,931	508	644	830	5.0	\$4.480	No Set Amount
Hillsborough	3	22	1,510	\$30.193	3,471	100	500	1,000	2.8	\$1.560	No Set Amount
Montgomery	1	18	804	\$21.708	20,646	50	300	454	4.0	\$1.486	No Set Amount
Peapack & Gladstone	2	11	315	\$11.031	1,932	20	85	160	2.9	\$0.204	No Set Amount
<b>Sussex</b>	10	998	33,105	\$183.226	176,195	2,648	13,240	26,480	0.34	\$0.677	\$0.677
Frankford	4	95	4,089	\$27.745	10,142	75	350	700	3.0	\$0.080	\$0.080
Green	3	53	1,831	\$11.908	7,632	150	675	1,300	1.5	\$0.063	\$0.063
<b>Warren</b>	7	538	31,716	\$166.701	154,278	2,000	10,000	20,000	6.0	\$7.400	\$3.707
Blairstown	4	72	2,065	\$14.450	12,307	100	500	1,000	1.5	\$0.107	\$0.107
Franklin	4	150	5,700	\$37.052	11,542	225	1,000	1,900	6.5	\$0.271	No Set Amount
Freylinghuysen	7	77	2,753	\$17.895	11,029	100	500	1,000	2.0	\$0.055	\$0.055
Greenwich	1	21	1,792	\$14.337	3,453	174	1,092	1,573	4.0	\$0.239	\$0.239
Harmony	3	87	4,097	\$24.580	12,409	220	1,000	1,800	5.0	\$0.247	\$0.241
Hope	4	66	3,292	\$18.108	6,298	65	300	600	2.0	\$0.052	\$0.052
Knowlton	2	34	2,985	\$14.923	13,355	100	500	1,000	2.0	\$0.052	\$0.052
Pohatcong	4	58	1,672	\$10.029	7,510	160	760	1,500	0.5	\$0.174	\$0.174
White	4	116	4,513	\$22.673	13,599	150	700	1,300	2.0	\$0.126	No Set Amount
<b>County Totals (18)</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>4,844</b>	<b>221,135</b>	<b>\$2,517</b>	<b>1,333,379</b>	<b>17,350</b>	<b>80,457</b>	<b>155,116</b>		<b>\$151.019</b>	
<b>Municipal Totals (46)</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>2,448</b>	<b>107,572</b>	<b>\$1,352</b>	<b>485,129</b>	<b>9,439</b>	<b>36,384</b>	<b>65,045</b>		<b>\$25.862</b>	

Note: In some cases County and Municipal project areas overlap. Identified farms may appear on both County and Municipal target farm lists.  
 Note: Data in red reflect 2009/2010 data. These are applications that did not submit 2011 round applications.  
 Date: 5/14/14



2015 COUNTY PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
Burlington	North	70	8,465	\$67,716,320	\$8,000						
	West	14	1,495	\$14,951,800	\$10,000						
	East	26	2,290	\$6,870,660	\$3,000						
	South	39	3,745	\$11,235,720	\$3,000						
	<b>4</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>15,995</b>	<b>\$100,774,500</b>	<b>\$6,300</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>\$7.00</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Camden	Mullica River	2	317	\$1,111,085	\$3,505						
	Great Egg Harbor	9	316	\$6,459,966	\$20,430						
	Farm Belt	20	541	\$2,126,130	\$3,930						
	Winslow WMA Expansion	10	262	\$4,058,069	\$15,477						
	Great Swamp	20	1,252	\$8,309,960	\$6,640						
	<b>5</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>2,688</b>	<b>\$22,065,210</b>	<b>\$8,209</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>1,393</b>	<b>3,147</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>\$6.80</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Cape May	Lower	35	1,283	\$46,368,000	\$36,142						
	Middle	33	2,606	\$37,492,001	\$14,387						
	Upper	36	3,265	\$40,560,000	\$12,422						
	West Cape May	2	181	\$15,876,001	\$87,713						
	Dennis	67	3,348	\$59,766,018	\$17,851						
	Woodbine	16	1,629	\$21,703,500	\$13,323						
	<b>6</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>12,312</b>	<b>\$221,765,520</b>	<b>\$18,012</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>1,207</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>\$4.93</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Cumberland	Deerfield-Upper Deerfield North	99	3,223	\$19,261,779	\$5,977						
	Deerfield-Upper Deerfield South	31	935	\$5,589,451	\$5,977						
	Downe	7	221	\$1,322,591	\$5,977						
	Fairfield East	0	0	\$0	\$5,977						
	Fairfield-Lawrence	53	3,095	\$18,500,548	\$5,977						
	Fairfield-Milville	7	624	\$3,731,919	\$5,977						
	Greenwich	36	1,555	\$9,295,371	\$5,977						
	Hopewell South	45	1,576	\$9,420,290	\$5,977						
	Lawrence Central	2	96	\$573,792	\$5,977						
	Lawrence East	6	211	\$1,263,717	\$5,977						
	Lawrence West	9	285	\$1,701,353	\$5,977						
	Shiloh-Hopewell Central	25	1,274	\$7,616,431	\$5,977						
	Shiloh-Hopewell North	69	2,601	\$15,544,743	\$5,977						
	Stow Creek	89	3,554	\$21,239,509	\$5,977						
	Stow Creek North	8	603	\$3,606,223	\$5,977						
Vineford	27	481	\$2,874,040	\$5,977							

2015 COUNTY PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.00/\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
	16	513	20,335	\$121,541,757	\$5,977	2,102	10,512	21,024	1.0	\$0.93	\$0.93
Gloucester	Chapel Heights	0	0	\$0	\$13,288						
	Delaware River	72	2,828	\$37,584,045	\$13,288						
	New Brookdyn	2	24	\$321,304	\$13,288						
	Oldmans Creek	103	3,288	\$43,691,343	\$13,288						
	Pinelands North	25	642	\$8,524,584	\$13,288						
	Pinelands South	76	1,070	\$14,215,502	\$13,288						
	Pitman Downer	3	77	\$1,026,631	\$13,288						
	Raccoon Creek	176	4,081	\$54,226,468	\$13,288						
	Repaupo-Mantua Creek	173	2,851	\$37,869,270	\$13,288						
	Still Run	130	3,154	\$41,906,631	\$13,288						
	Washington North	1	10	\$129,159	\$13,288						
	11	761	18,025	\$239,514,938	\$13,288	750	3,500	6,800	4.0	\$11.00	\$5.00
Hunterdon	Bethlehem East	0	0	\$0							
	Bethlehem West	0	0	\$0							
	Lebanon	0	0	\$0							
	North	3	90	\$1,798,000	\$20,000						
	East	4	601	\$10,824,120	\$18,000						
	South	67	3,577	\$53,655,000	\$15,000						
	West	75	4,045	\$40,450,000	\$10,000						
	7	149	8,313	\$106,727,120	\$12,838	1,500	7,500	15,000	3.0	\$7.00	\$2.00
Mercer	Hamilton	5	257	\$4,070,880	\$15,840						
	Robbinsville/West Windsor	4	223	\$3,947,100	\$17,700						
	Robbinsville/East Windsor	9	445	\$4,049,500	\$9,100						
	Lawrence	4	366	\$10,431,000	\$28,500						
	Hopewell East	4	447	\$6,705,000	\$15,000						
	Hopewell West	3	257	\$3,855,000	\$15,000						
	Hopewell South	2	453	\$6,795,000	\$15,000						
	7	31	2,448	\$39,853,480	\$16,280	50	250	500	3.0	\$8.43	No Set Amount
Middlesex	Southwestern	26	1,066	\$29,966,683	\$28,100						
	Southeastern	26	1,217	\$21,784,300	\$17,900						
	Northwestern	39	922	\$31,901,200	\$34,600						
	Northeastern	9	953	\$71,475,000	\$75,000						

Schedule B

2015 COUNTY PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
	Matchaponix	22	589	\$30,863,600	\$52,400						
	5	122	4,747	\$185,990,763	\$39,177	225	1,125	2,250	2.0	\$28.62	No Set Amount
Monmouth	Colts Neck-Marlboro-Holmdel	23	1,991	\$93,624,784	\$47,024						
	Northern Howell-Eastern Freehold	14	917	\$27,510,000	\$30,000						
	Roosevelt-Northern Millstone	4	318	\$6,360,000	\$20,000						
	Millstone-Manalapan-Freehold	33	2,630	\$52,600,000	\$20,000						
	Upper Freehold-Western Millstone	37	3,989	\$69,807,500	\$17,500						
	Wall	5	217	\$4,340,000	\$20,000						
	6	116	10,062	\$254,242,284	\$25,268	1,200	3,000	6,000	1.5	\$17.90	\$1.10
Morris	Northeast	11	380	\$11,400,000	\$30,000						
	Central	19	1,153	\$34,590,000	\$30,000						
	West	49	4,354	\$130,620,000	\$30,000						
	3	79	5,887	\$176,610,000	\$30,000	610	2,974	5,962	1.1	\$10.40	\$1.20
Ocean	Plumsted Farm Belt	89	1,788	\$27,977,082	\$15,646						
	Central Jackson	13	202	\$5,685,113	\$28,179						
	Southern Jackson/Lakewood	18	173	\$6,817,873	\$39,453						
	North East Jackson	14	167	\$3,028,722	\$18,083						
	Toms River	13	147	\$16,863,600	\$115,000						
	Eastern Lakewood	3	20	\$2,197,300	\$107,500						
	Western Jackson	2	43	\$1,158,030	\$27,000						
	7	152	2,540	\$63,727,720	\$25,088	200	901	1,623	1.2	\$10.00	No Set Amount
Passaic	Passaic County North	9	182	\$5,676,740	\$31,000						
	1	9	182	\$5,676,740	\$31,000	100	500	1,000	1.0	\$5.00	\$0.75
Salem	PA 1: Cohansey-Pole Tavern-Pine Hill	170	14,318	\$114,544,000	\$8,000						
	PA2: Mannington Meadows-Seven Stars-Algonkin Lake	107	9,169	\$73,352,000	\$8,000						
	PA 3: Maskells Mill-Hagerville-Mannington Meadows	148	11,605	\$92,840,000	\$8,000						
	3	425	35,092	\$280,736,000	\$8,000	2,600	13,000	26,000	2.0	\$1.09	\$1.09
Somerset	Millstone Valley East	61	1,720	\$27,219,409	\$15,825						
	Millstone Valley West	22	935	\$14,801,115	\$15,825						
	Eastern Montgomery	0	0	\$0	\$15,825						
	Pike Run	2	71	\$1,117,110	\$15,825						

2015 COUNTY PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
	Bedens Brook	8	97	\$1,530,784	\$15,825						
	Bedens Brook East	7	219	\$3,465,906	\$15,825						
	Neshanic Valley North	83	4,161	\$65,843,976	\$15,825						
	Neshanic Valley South	11	404	\$6,393,433	\$15,825						
	Upper Raritan East	33	848	\$13,426,526	\$15,825						
	Upper Raritan West	129	5,484	\$86,785,477	\$15,825						
	Warren	2	25	\$402,755	\$15,825						
	Bernards Dead River	7	140	\$2,214,280	\$15,825						
	<b>12</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>14,104</b>	<b>\$223,200,771</b>	<b>\$15,825</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>\$17.00</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
<b>Sussex</b>	<b>Central Kittatinny Valley</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>10,699</b>	<b>\$61,327,929</b>	<b>\$5,732</b>						
	Eastern Highlands 1	46	1,613	\$5,000,300	\$3,100						
	Eastern Highlands 2	38	1,410	\$7,879,080	\$5,588						
	Kittatinny Valley East	198	5,770	\$30,150,706	\$5,225						
	Kittatinny Valley West 1	127	3,198	\$16,376,958	\$5,121						
	Kittatinny Valley West 2	155	4,774	\$26,032,622	\$5,453						
	Upper Delaware 1	9	501	\$1,039,575	\$2,075						
	Upper Delaware 2	30	866	\$4,681,596	\$5,406						
	Western Highlands 1	72	2,947	\$23,045,540	\$7,820						
	Western Highlands 2	33	1,326	\$7,692,126	\$5,801						
	<b>10</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>33,105</b>	<b>\$183,226,432</b>	<b>\$5,535</b>	<b>2,648</b>	<b>13,240</b>	<b>26,480</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>\$0.68</b>	<b>\$0.68</b>
<b>Warren</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2,286</b>	<b>\$12,013,955</b>	<b>\$5,256</b>						
	Northwest	65	4,635	\$24,359,773	\$5,256						
	Northeast	82	4,665	\$24,519,135	\$5,256						
	Central	75	3,707	\$19,481,627	\$5,256						
	West	115	6,672	\$35,070,555	\$5,256						
	Southeast	150	8,266	\$43,444,519	\$5,256						
	South	22	1,486	\$7,811,467	\$5,256						
	<b>7</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>31,716</b>	<b>\$166,701,030</b>	<b>\$5,256</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>\$7.40</b>	<b>\$3.71</b>
<b>2015 County PIG Totals</b>											
<b>16</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>4,657</b>	<b>217,552</b>	<b>\$2,392,354,285</b>	<b>\$10,997</b>	<b>16,394</b>	<b>77,831</b>	<b>151,993</b>		<b>\$144.19</b>	<b>\$16.45</b>

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #2014R5(2)

FINAL APPROVAL

Of

MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT ("PIG")  
APPLICATIONS  
INCLUDING COMPREHENSIVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANS AND PROJECT AREA  
SUMMARIES

FY2015 PIG PROGRAM

May 22, 2014

WHEREAS, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") is authorized under the Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant Act, P.L. 1999, c.180 (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1), to provide a grant to eligible counties and municipalities for farmland preservation purposes based on whether the identified project area provides an opportunity to preserve a significant area of reasonably contiguous farmland that will promote the long term viability of agriculture as an industry in the municipality or county; and

WHEREAS, to be eligible for a grant, a municipality shall:

1. Identify project areas of multiple farms that are reasonably contiguous and located in an agricultural development area ("ADA") authorized pursuant to the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, P.L. 1983, c.32 (C.4:1C-11 et seq.);
2. Establish an agricultural advisory committee composed of at least three, but not more than five, residents with a majority of the members actively engaged in farming and owning a portion of the land they farm;
3. Establish and maintain a dedicated source of funding for farmland preservation pursuant to P.L. 1997, c.24 (C.40:12-15.1 et seq.), or an alternative means of funding for farmland preservation, such as, but not limited to, repeated annual appropriations or repeated issuance of bonded indebtedness, which the SADC deems to be, in effect, a dedicated source of funding; and
4. Prepare a farmland preservation plan element pursuant to paragraph (13) of section 19 of P.L. 1975, c.291 (C.40:55D-28) in consultation with the agricultural advisory committee; and

WHEREAS, the SADC adopted amended rules, effective July 2, 2007, under Subchapter 17A (N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A) to implement the Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant Act, P.L. 1999, c.180 (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1) by establishing a municipal farmland preservation planning incentive grant program; and

WHEREAS, a municipality applying for a grant to the SADC shall submit a copy of the municipal comprehensive farmland preservation plan and a project area summary for each project area

designated within the plan, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6; and

WHEREAS, on May 24, 2007, the SADC adopted *Guidelines for Developing Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plans* to supplement the new rules at N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A and provide uniform, detailed plan standards, update previous planning standards, and incorporate recommendations from the 2006 edition of the Agricultural Smart Growth Plan for New Jersey, the Planning Incentive Grant Statute (N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1) and the New Jersey Department of Agriculture Guidelines for Plan Endorsement under the State Development and Redevelopment Plan; and

WHEREAS, the SADC received 37 initial municipal planning incentive grant applications for the 2009 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant round, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6(a); and

WHEREAS, in addition to the 37 initial municipal planning incentive grant applications the SADC received 5 municipal planning incentive grant applications for the 2010 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant round, one municipal planning incentive grant applications for the 2011 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant round, one municipal planning incentive grant applications for the 2012 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant round and two municipal planning incentive grant applications for the 2013 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant round, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6(a); and

WHEREAS, in total, these 46 municipal planning incentive grant applications identified 111 project areas in 9 counties and targeted 2,448 farms and 107,572 acres at an estimated total cost of \$1,352,000,000, with a ten-year preservation goal of 64,400 acres as summarized in the attached Schedule A; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6(b)1 and N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6(b)2, in order to improve municipal and county farmland preservation coordination, the municipalities forwarded their applications to the county for review and provided evidence of county review and comment and, if appropriate, the level of funding the county is willing to provide to assist in the purchase of development easements on targeted farms; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.7, SADC staff reviewed and evaluated the municipalities' applications to determine whether all the components of the comprehensive farmland preservation plans are fully addressed and complete and whether the project area summaries are complete and technically accurate, and that the application is designed to preserve a significant area of reasonably contiguous farmland that will promote the long-term economic viability of agriculture as an industry; and

WHEREAS, to date, 37 of the municipal planning incentive grant applications have received SADC Final Approval; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC grants final approval of the following municipal Planning Incentive Grant applications submitted under the FY13 program funding round as summarized in the attached Schedule B:

1. Upper Deerfield, Cumberland County
2. Elk Township, Gloucester County
3. Franklin Township, Gloucester County

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 4. Woolwich Township, Gloucester County    | 21. Upper Freehold Township, Monmouth County   |
| 5. Alexandria Township, Hunterdon County   | 22. Alloway Township, Salem County             |
| 6. Delaware Township, Hunterdon County     | 23. Pilesgrove Township, Salem County          |
| 7. East Amwell Township, Hunterdon County  | 24. Pittsgrove Township, Salem County          |
| 8. Franklin Township, Hunterdon County     | 25. Upper Pittsgrove Township, Salem County    |
| 9. Holland Township, Hunterdon County      | 26. Bedminster Township, Somerset County       |
| 10. Kingwood Township, Hunterdon County    | 27. Hillsborough Township, Somerset County     |
| 11. Readington Township, Hunterdon County  | 28. Montgomery Township, Somerset County       |
| 12. Union Township, Hunterdon County       | 29. Peapack-Gladstone Borough, Somerset County |
| 13. West Amwell Township, Hunterdon County | 30. Blairstown Township, Warren County         |
| 14. Hopewell Township, Mercer County       | 31. Franklin Township, Warren County           |
| 15. Colts Neck Township, Monmouth County   | 32. Frelinghuysen Township, Warren County      |
| 16. Holmdel Township, Monmouth County      | 33. Greenwich Township, Warren County          |
| 17. Howell Township, Monmouth County       | 34. Harmony Township, Warren County            |
| 18. Manalapan Township, Monmouth County    | 35. Hope Township, Warren County               |
| 19. Marlboro Township, Monmouth County     | 36. Knowlton Township, Warren County           |
| 20. Millstone Township, Monmouth County    | 37. White Township, Warren County              |

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding eligibility shall be established pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.8(a), and that the SADC's approval of State funding is subject to Legislative appropriation of funds and the Governor signing the respective appropriation bills; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC will monitor the municipality's funding plan pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.17 and adjust the eligibility of funds based on the municipality's progress in

implementing the proposed funding plan. Each Planning Incentive Grant municipality should expend its grant funds within three years of the date the funds are appropriated. To be considered expended a closing must have been completed with the SADC. Any funds that are not expended within three years are subject to reappropriation and may no longer be available to the municipality; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC will continue to assist municipalities with planning for agricultural retention, the promotion of natural resource conservation efforts, county and municipal coordination, and agricultural economic development and in strengthening of Right to Farm protections; and

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



5-22-14

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

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



COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
APPLICATION SUMMARY

County / Municipality	# of Project Areas	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost in Millions	Project Area Acreage	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0/\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farmland Preservation in Millions
<b>Atlantic</b>	15	10	423	\$2.162	27,724	423	1,500	2,500	5.0	\$2.700	No Set Amount
<b>Bergen</b>	8	37	501	\$66.717	10,887	30	150	300	0.25	\$4.136	No Set Amount
<b>Burlington</b>	4	149	15,995	\$100.774	111,985	1,000	5,000	10,000	1.5	\$7.000	No Set Amount
<b>Camden</b>	5	57	3,469	\$30.843	15,071	762	2,369	3,470	2.0	\$6.800	No Set Amount
<b>Cape May</b>	6	189	12,312	\$221.766	15,982	151	936	1,207	1.0	\$4.933	No Set Amount
<b>Cumberland</b>	16	513	20,335	\$121.542	65,301	2,102	10,512	21,024	1.0	\$0.926	No Set Amount
Hopewell	1	45	1,576	\$9.420	5,689	158	788	1,576	0.0	\$0.000	No Set Amount
Upper Deerfield	1	51	3,418	\$20.536	9,233	396	1,979	3,958	0.0	\$0.050	\$0.050
<b>Gloucester</b>	11	900	19,958	\$265.200	115,875	750	3,500	6,800	4.0	\$11.000	\$5.000
Elk	2	29	953	\$10.482	3,520	75	377	754	1.0	\$0.038	\$0.038
Franklin	5	125	4,870	\$29.061	10,106	598	1,799	3,290	1.0	\$0.081	No Set Amount
Woolwich	3	72	3,403	\$51.048	5,183	265	1,920	3,984	5.0	\$0.323	No Set Amount
<b>Hunterdon</b>	7	149	8,313	\$106.727	178,126	1,500	7,500	15,000	3.0	\$7.000	\$2.000
Alexandria	4	67	3,649	\$36.488	16,912	524	1,348	2,090	4.0	\$0.328	\$0.164
Delaware	2	21	1,684	\$23.581	23,707	300	1,500	3,000	6.0	\$0.472	No Set Amount
East Amwell	1	21	1,848	\$24.024	13,515	185	925	1,848	4.0	\$0.268	\$0.268
Franklin	1	17	1,386	\$12.473	10,644	296	331	760	5.0	\$0.270	No Set Amount
Holland	4	34	2,106	\$21.095	11,335	703	1,700	2,222	2.0	\$0.079	\$0.079
Kingwood	1	26	1,571	\$15.714	12,645	157	628	785	3.0	\$0.183	No Set Amount
Raritan	4	23	1,554	\$31.079	6,111	100	300	600	1.5	\$0.602	No Set Amount
Readington	1	41	2,317	\$41.706	15,759	100	600	1,100	2.0	\$0.569	No Set Amount
Tewksbury	3	3	409	\$9.700	4,557	100	300	1,000	5.0	\$0.425	No Set Amount
Union	3	20	618	\$6.100	4,189	70	325	600	2.0	\$0.137	No Set Amount
West Amwell	1	9	802	\$9.620	10,440	58	500	780	6.0	\$0.280	No Set Amount
<b>Mercer</b>	7	31	2,448	\$39.853	14,570	50	250	500	3.0	\$8.432	No Set Amount
Hopewell	1	10	819	\$24.569	10,761	96	383	479	3.0	\$1.217	No Set Amount
<b>Middlesex</b>	5	122	4,747	\$185.991	20,983	225	1,125	2,250	2.0	\$28.624	No Set Amount
<b>Monmouth</b>	6	116	10,062	\$254.242	60,623	1,200	3,000	6,000	1.5	\$17.900	\$1.100
Cotts Neck	1	6	318	\$11.140	9,321	17	104	199	1.2	\$0.366	No Set Amount
Holmdel	1	14	587	\$27.182	2,572	10	70	338	2.5	\$0.960	No Set Amount
Howell	3	13	560	\$12.846	12,666	127	370	453	2.0	\$1.396	\$0.700
Manalapan	1	38	1,318	\$26.343	9,223	131	659	1,318	2.0	\$1.161	No Set Amount
Marlboro	3	20	719	\$35.950	19,690	42	202	387	2.0	\$0.625	No Set Amount
Millstone	4	52	3,204	\$96.120	14,024	30	150	300	6.0	\$0.940	No Set Amount
Upper Freehold	1	167	5,042	\$75.630	27,368	550	1,000	1,500	6.0	\$0.715	\$0.477
<b>Morris</b>	3	79	5,887	\$176.610	169,342	610	2,974	5,962	1.1	\$10.40	\$1.20
<b>Ocean</b>	7	152	2,540	\$84.287	21,975	200	901	1,623	1.2	\$10.000	No Set Amount

COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
APPLICATION SUMMARY

County / Municipality	# of Project Areas	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost in Millions	Project Area Acreage	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.00/\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farmland Preservation in Millions
<b>Passaic</b>	1	10	191	\$5.977	6,415	100	500	1,000	1.0	\$5.000	\$0.750
<b>Salem</b>	3	429	35,029	\$280.736	80,424	2,600	13,000	26,000	2.0	\$1.091	\$1.091
Alloway	1	5	291	\$3.000	5,465	200	400	600	2.0	\$0.028	No Set Amount
Piles Grove	4	58	4,011	\$38.046	9,089	250	1,250	2,500	3.0	\$0.145	\$0.145
Pittsgrove	2	138	1,890	\$14.722	7,200	186	932	1,864	1.0	\$0.067	No Set Amount
Upper Pittsgrove	1	256	11,240	\$84.299	24,167	700	3,500	7,000	2.0	\$0.070	\$0.070
<b>Somerset</b>	12	365	14,104	\$223.201	87,623	1,000	4,000	5,000	3.0	\$17.000	No Set Amount
Bedminster	1	120	5,863	\$175.899	10,111	500	2,706	2,706	2.0	\$0.342	No Set Amount
Bernards	1	25	538	\$40.323	3,798	165	165	200	4.0	\$3.030	No Set Amount
Branchburg	1	23	737	\$40.535	1,873	154	266	737	5.0	\$1.500	No Set Amount
Franklin	2	19	855	\$16.584	18,931	508	644	830	5.0	\$4.480	No Set Amount
Hillsborough	3	22	1,510	\$30.193	3,471	100	500	1,000	2.8	\$1.560	No Set Amount
Montgomery	1	18	804	\$21.708	20,646	50	300	454	4.0	\$1.486	No Set Amount
Peapack & Gladstone	2	11	315	\$11.031	1,932	20	85	160	2.9	\$0.204	No Set Amount
<b>Sussex</b>	10	998	33,105	\$183.226	176,195	2,648	13,240	26,480	0.34	\$0.677	\$0.677
Frankford	4	95	4,089	\$27.745	10,142	75	350	700	3.0	\$0.080	\$0.080
Green	3	53	1,831	\$11.908	7,632	150	675	1,300	1.5	\$0.063	\$0.063
<b>Warren</b>	7	538	31,716	\$166.701	154,278	2,000	10,000	20,000	6.0	\$7.400	\$3.707
Blairstown	4	72	2,065	\$14.450	12,307	100	500	1,000	1.5	\$0.107	\$0.107
Franklin	4	150	5,700	\$37.052	11,542	225	1,000	1,900	6.5	\$0.271	No Set Amount
Freylinghuysen	7	77	2,753	\$17.895	11,029	100	500	1,000	2.0	\$0.055	\$0.055
Greenwich	1	21	1,792	\$14.337	3,453	174	1,092	1,573	4.0	\$0.239	\$0.239
Harmony	3	87	4,097	\$24.580	12,409	220	1,000	1,800	5.0	\$0.247	\$0.241
Hope	4	66	3,292	\$18.108	6,298	65	300	600	2.0	\$0.052	\$0.052
Knowlton	2	34	2,985	\$14.923	13,355	100	500	1,000	2.0	\$0.052	\$0.052
Pohatcong	4	58	1,672	\$10.029	7,510	160	760	1,500	0.5	\$0.174	\$0.174
White	4	116	4,513	\$22.673	13,599	150	700	1,300	2.0	\$0.126	No Set Amount
<b>County Totals (18)</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>4,844</b>	<b>221,135</b>	<b>\$2,517</b>	<b>1,333,379</b>	<b>17,350</b>	<b>80,457</b>	<b>155,116</b>		<b>\$151.019</b>	
<b>Municipal Totals (46)</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>2,448</b>	<b>107,572</b>	<b>\$1,352</b>	<b>485,129</b>	<b>9,439</b>	<b>36,384</b>	<b>65,045</b>		<b>\$25.862</b>	

Note: In some cases County and Municipal project areas overlap. Identified farms may appear on both County and Municipal target farm lists.

Note: Data in red reflect 2009/2010 data. These are applications that did not submit 2011 round applications.

Date: 5/14/14

2015 MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

Municipality	County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
Upper Deerfield	Cumberland	Upper Deerfield PA	51	3,418	\$20,535,644	\$6,008				0.0	0.050	\$0.050
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3,418</b>	<b>\$20,535,644</b>	<b>\$6,008</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>1,979</b>	<b>3,958</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.050</b>	<b>\$0.050</b>
Elk	Gloucester	Project Area 1	16	542	\$5,967,280	\$11,000						
		Project Area 2	13	410	\$4,514,950	\$11,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>\$10,482,230</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.038</b>	<b>\$0.038</b>
Franklin	Gloucester	Northern	17	930	\$6,975,000	\$7,500						
		Central	29	800	\$6,000,000	\$7,500						
		Forest Grove	23	652	\$4,890,000	\$7,500						
		Janvier	1	297	\$1,336,500	\$4,500						
		Main Rd-Piney Hollow	55	2,191	\$9,859,500	\$4,500						
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>5,036</b>	<b>\$29,061,000</b>	<b>\$5,771</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>1,799</b>	<b>3,290</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.081</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Woolwich	Gloucester	North	22	976	\$14,642,850	\$15,000						
		East	37	1,309	\$19,635,000	\$15,000						
		Southwest	13	1,118	\$16,770,000	\$15,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>3,403</b>	<b>\$51,047,850</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>1,920</b>	<b>3,984</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.323</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Alexandria	Hunterdon	Sweet Hollow	6	399	\$3,993,000	\$10,000						
		The Hickory	12	509	\$5,085,300	\$10,000						
		Pittstown	31	1,843	\$18,428,600	\$10,000						
		Delaware River	18	898	\$8,980,900	\$10,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>\$36,487,800</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>1,348</b>	<b>2,090</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>0.328</b>	<b>\$0.164</b>
Delaware	Hunterdon	PIG I: Sandbrook Headquarters / Locktown	8	775	\$10,850,000	\$14,000						
		PIG II: Covered Bridge / Dilts Park	13	909	\$12,731,320	\$14,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,684</b>	<b>\$23,581,320</b>	<b>\$14,000</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.472</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
East Amwell	Hunterdon	East Amwell	21	1,848	\$24,024,000	\$13,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,848</b>	<b>\$24,024,000</b>	<b>\$13,000</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>925</b>	<b>1,848</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>0.268</b>	<b>\$0.268</b>
Franklin	Hunterdon	Franklin Project Area	17	1,386	\$12,473,370	\$9,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1,386</b>	<b>\$12,473,370</b>	<b>\$9,000</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.271</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Holland	Hunterdon	Musconetcong	5	350	\$3,540,000	\$10,000						
		Hawks Schoolhouse	3	250	\$2,497,200	\$10,000						
		Bun Valley	17	1,282	\$12,820,900	\$10,000						
		Holland Station	9	224	\$2,236,900	\$10,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>2,106</b>	<b>\$21,095,000</b>	<b>\$10,017</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>2,222</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.079</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Kingwood	Hunterdon	Kingwood	26	1,571	\$15,713,600	\$10,000						

2015 MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

Municipality	County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1,571</b>	<b>\$15,713,600</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Readington	Hunterdon	Primary	41	2,317	\$41,706,000	\$18,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>2,317</b>	<b>\$41,706,000</b>	<b>\$18,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.569</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Union	Hunterdon	Hoffman	1	68	\$680,000	\$10,000						
		Pattenburg	3	80	\$800,000	\$10,000						
		Pittstown	16	470	\$4,700,000	\$10,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>\$6,180,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.137</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
West Amwell	Hunterdon	West Amwell	9	802	\$9,619,920	\$12,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>\$9,619,920</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.280</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Hopewell	Mercer	Central Project Area	10	819	\$24,568,500	\$30,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>\$24,568,500</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.217</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Colts Neck	Monmouth	Colts Neck Project Area	6	318	\$11,140,150	\$35,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>\$11,140,150</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.366</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Holmdel	Monmouth	Holmdel Project Area	14	587	\$27,182,209	\$46,307						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>\$27,182,209</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.960</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Howell	Monmouth	North Central	6	228	\$6,641,050	\$31,078						
		Manasquan Reservoir South	3	138	\$1,798,160	\$12,982						
		Manasquan Reservoir West	2	114	\$1,480,000	\$13,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>\$9,919,210</b>	<b>\$20,665</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.396</b>	<b>\$0.700</b>
Manalapan	Monmouth	Manalapan Project Area	38	1,318	\$26,342,650	\$19,986						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1,318</b>	<b>\$26,342,650</b>	<b>\$19,987</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>1,318</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.161</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Marlboro	Monmouth	North	1	84	\$4,200,000	\$50,000						
		Central	13	466	\$23,300,000	\$50,000						
		Southeast	5	127	\$6,350,000	\$50,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>\$33,850,000</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.689</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Millstone	Monmouth	Perrineville East	18	786	\$23,580,000	\$30,000						
		Perrineville West	14	988	\$29,640,000	\$30,000						
		Clarksburg East	11	687	\$20,610,000	\$30,000						
		Clarksburg West	9	743	\$22,290,000	\$30,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>3,204</b>	<b>\$96,120,000</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.941</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Upper Freehold	Monmouth	Upper Freehold Project Area	167	5,042	\$75,630,000	\$15,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>5,042</b>	<b>\$75,630,000</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.715</b>	<b>\$0.477</b>

2015 MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

Municipality	County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.6 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
Alloway	Salem	North-Central	5	291	\$3,000,407	\$10,327						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>\$3,000,407</b>	<b>\$10,327</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Pilesgrove	Salem	Northern Pilesgrove	35	2,711	\$29,137,875	\$10,750						
		U.S. Route 40	10	680	\$6,664,000	\$9,800						
		Commissioners Pike	4	240	\$2,244,000	\$9,350						
		Woodstown-Daretown Road	9	380	\$3,192,000	\$8,400						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>4,011</b>	<b>\$38,045,875</b>	<b>\$9,487</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.145</b>	<b>\$0.145</b>
Pittsgrove	Salem	North	39	718	\$5,385,000	\$7,500						
		East	99	1,172	\$8,787,600	\$7,500						
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>1,890</b>	<b>\$14,172,600</b>	<b>\$7,500</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>1,864</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.061</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Upper Pittsgrove	Salem	UP Project Area	256	11,240	\$84,299,400	\$7,500						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>11,240</b>	<b>\$84,299,400</b>	<b>\$7,500</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>
Bedminster	Somerset	Bedminster PA	120	5,863	\$175,898,700	\$30,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>5,863</b>	<b>\$175,898,700</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>2,706</b>	<b>2,706</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.342</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Hillsborough	Somerset	Amwell Valley	11	1,111	\$22,212,800	\$20,000						
		Mill Lane	6	407	\$8,140,000	\$20,000						
		South	0	0	\$0							
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>\$30,352,800</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.555</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Montgomery	Somerset	Montgomery Twp. PA	18	804	\$21,708,000	\$27,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>804</b>	<b>\$21,708,000</b>	<b>\$27,000</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>1.486</b>	<b>No Set Amount</b>
Peapack/Gladstone	Somerset	Essex Hunt Club	3	119	\$4,165,000	\$35,000						
		Raritan Valley	8	196	\$6,866,300	\$35,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>\$11,031,300</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.204</b>	<b>\$0.204</b>
Blairstown	Warren	North	10	127	\$889,770	\$7,000						
		Route 94 North	12	209	\$1,460,690	\$7,000						
		Central	11	494	\$3,455,130	\$7,000						
		South	39	1,235	\$8,645,000	\$7,000						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>2,065</b>	<b>\$14,450,590</b>	<b>\$6,998</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.107</b>	<b>\$0.107</b>
Franklin	Warren	Musconetcong Valley	54	1,960	12,740,000	\$6,500						
		Pohatcong Ridge	25	1,027	6,675,500	\$6,500						
		Pohatcong Valley East	47	1,738	11,297,000	\$6,500						
		Pohatcong Valley West	24	975	6,337,500	\$6,500						

2015 MUNICIPAL PLANNING INCENTIVE GRANT  
Final Approval Applications

Municipality	County	Project Area	# of Targeted Farms	Targeted Farms Acreage	Estimated Total Cost	Estimated Cost per Acre	1-Year Acreage Goal	5-Year Acreage Goal	10-Year Acreage Goal	Dedicated Tax \$0.0 /\$100	Annual Tax Revenue in Millions	Annual Tax for Farm Preservation in Millions
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>5,700</b>	<b>\$37,050,000</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>0.270</b>	<b>Undetermined</b>
<b>Freylinghuysen</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Paulins Kill Valley</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>870,285</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Martinsburg Ridge</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1,704</b>	<b>11,079,120</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Hope Preservation Area</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>1,268,800</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Limestone Valley Trout Brook</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>1,254,500</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Allamuchy Farmland Belt</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>2,425,930</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Limestone Valley Bear Brook</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>995,150</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
		<b>Johnsonburg Center</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>2,753</b>	<b>17,893,785</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.055</b>	<b>\$0.055</b>
<b>Greenwich</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Greenwich Project Area</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,792</b>	<b>14,337,360</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,792</b>	<b>14,337,360</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1,092</b>	<b>1,573</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>\$0.239</b>
<b>Harmony</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Project Area 1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1,190</b>	<b>\$7,141,500</b>	<b>\$6,000</b>						
		<b>Project Area 2</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>\$10,590,240</b>	<b>\$6,000</b>						
		<b>Project Area 3</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1,141</b>	<b>\$6,846,000</b>	<b>\$6,000</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>4,096</b>	<b>24,577,740</b>	<b>\$6,000</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>0.241</b>	<b>\$0.241</b>
<b>Hope</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Project Area 1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1,819</b>	<b>\$10,004,500</b>	<b>\$5,500</b>						
		<b>Project Area 2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>555</b>	<b>\$3,050,960</b>	<b>\$5,500</b>						
		<b>Project Area 3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>\$2,633,235</b>	<b>\$5,500</b>						
		<b>Project Area 4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>\$2,419,505</b>	<b>\$5,500</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3,292</b>	<b>\$18,108,200</b>	<b>\$5,500</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.052</b>	<b>\$0.052</b>
<b>Knowlton</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Project Area 1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1,045</b>	<b>\$5,225,700</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>						
		<b>Project Area 2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1,939</b>	<b>\$9,696,950</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>2,985</b>	<b>\$14,922,650</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.052</b>	<b>\$0.052</b>
<b>White</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1,228</b>	<b>\$6,169,472</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>						
		<b>South</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>\$2,517,024</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>						
		<b>East</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>\$889,248</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>						
		<b>West</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2,607</b>	<b>\$13,097,568</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>4,513</b>	<b>\$22,673,312</b>	<b>\$5,024</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.116</b>	<b>\$0.116</b>
<b>2015 MUN. PIG FINAL APPROVAL TOTALS</b>												
<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>2,087</b>	<b>94,045</b>	<b>\$1,138,143,022</b>	<b>\$12,102</b>	<b>7,858</b>	<b>32,045</b>	<b>56,313</b>			

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY14R5(3)

Request for Division of Premises  
Killdee Farm LLC

April 22, 2014

**Subject Property:**

**Killdee Farm LLC**

**Block 4.01, Lot 11.01; Block 5, Lot 24; Block 12, Lot 12.03**

**Manalapan Township, Monmouth County**

**Block 299, Lots 114 & 115**

**Marlboro Township, Monmouth County**

WHEREAS, Killdee Farm LLC, hereinafter "Owner" is the record owner of Block 4.01, Lot 11.01, Block 5, Lot 24 and Block 12, Lot 12.03 in Manalapan Township, Monmouth County, and Block 299, Lots 114 & 115, in Marlboro Township, Monmouth County, hereinafter referred to as the "Premises", by deed dated May 10, 2000; and recorded in the Monmouth County Clerk's Office in Deed Book 5940, Page 910; and

WHEREAS, a development easement on the Premises was conveyed to the Monmouth County Agriculture Development Board pursuant to the Agriculture Retention and Development Act, N.J.S.A. 4:1C-1, et seq. by Deed of Easement dated February 8, 2002, and recorded in the Monmouth County Clerk's Office in Deed Book 8082, Page 8256; and

WHEREAS, the Killdee Farm LLC is made up of three siblings of the Wikoff family which has owned the farm for generations; and

WHEREAS, the Premises totals approximately 217.99 acres, as shown in Schedule "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Deed of Easement references three existing residences, no agricultural labor residences, no residual dwelling site opportunities (RDSO) and no exception areas; and

WHEREAS, the Owner proposes to divide the Premises as shown in Schedule "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Owner intends to transfer ownership of the Parcel-B to James Wikoff, the only member of the Killdee Farm LLC who is an active farmer, and his wife Maryann; and

WHEREAS, the Wikoff's have farmed the Premises for the last 38 years in a mixture of grains, sweet corn and vegetables; and

WHEREAS, the Premises is run as family operation which includes James and Maryann Wikoff and their two adult daughters; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Wikoff proposes to secure separate ownership of Parcel-B so that he can invest in making improvements to the infrastructure including an enlarged farm market, expanded vegetable production facilities and high tunnel growing areas on this parcel, and be able to recoup that investment. However, he cannot afford to purchase the entire Premises outright, so he seeks to purchase the area identified as Parcel-B; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 15 of the Deed of Easement states that no division of the Premises shall be permitted without the approval in writing of the SADC; and

WHEREAS, in order to grant approval, the SADC must find that the division is for an agricultural purpose and will result in agriculturally viable parcels such that each parcel is capable of sustaining a variety of agricultural operations that yield a reasonable economic return under normal conditions, solely from the parcel's agricultural output; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Parcel-A would result in a 132+/- acre property that is approximately 58% (77 acres) tillable with 53% (71 acres) prime and statewide important soils; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Parcel-A would include two (2) existing single family residential units, one of which is used as an approved pre-existing professional office, a barn and several smaller outbuildings; and

WHEREAS, the resulting Parcel-B would result in a 87+/- acre property that is approximately 69% (60 acres) tillable with 97% (84 acres) prime and statewide important soils; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Parcel-B would include one (1) existing single family residential unit, two barns, a farmstand and underground irrigation mains; and

WHEREAS, the SADC makes the following findings related to its determination of whether the division will result in agriculturally viable parcels, such that each parcel is capable of sustaining a variety of agricultural operations that yield a reasonable economic return under normal conditions, solely from the parcel's agricultural output:



- 1) Each parcel contains a significant acreage of high quality, tillable soils, as follows:
  - Parcel-A, at 132 acres, has 77 tillable acres with approximately 71 acres of prime and statewide important soils;
  - Parcel-B, at 87 acres, has 60 tillable acres with approximately 84 acres of prime and statewide important soils;
- 2) Parcel-B is improved with underground irrigation mains and access to water for irrigation purposes;

WHEREAS, the SADC makes the following findings related to its determination of whether this application meets the agricultural purpose test:

- 1) The division is being undertaken for the purpose of transferring title of a portion of the Premises to James and Maryann Wikoff, the longtime farmer and part owner of the Premises;
- 2) The transfer of ownership of Parcel-B to the Wikoff's will facilitate their ability to invest in infrastructure improvements as described above, and thereby allowing them to recoup that investment; and
- 3) The division will enable the Wikoff's to increase the agricultural productivity of the farm as a result of investments made in agricultural improvements on proposed Parcel-B; and

WHEREAS, on May 6, 2014, the Monmouth CADB approved the request for the division of Premises;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SADC finds that the division is for an agricultural purpose and results in agriculturally viable parcels such that each parcel is capable of sustaining a variety of agricultural operations that yield a reasonable economic return under normal conditions, solely from the parcel's agricultural output due to the size of the two proposed parcels and the quality of the soils present on both parcels; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this approval is subject to the conditions set forth in this resolution and is not transferrable to a proposed purchaser of Parcel-B other than James and Maryann Wykoff; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC's approval of the division of the premises is subject to, and shall be effective upon, the recording of the SADC's approval resolution; 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 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.

5-22-14  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

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

# Schedule "A"

## Killdee Farm

Parcel B @ 87 acres

Parcel- A 132-acres

u:/county\_folder/project\_name.mxd

### FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM NJ State Agriculture Development Committee

Killdee Farm  
Block 4.01, Lot 11.01; Block 5, Lot 24; Block 12, Lot 12.03  
Manalapan Township, Monmouth County  
Block 299, Lots 114 & 115  
Marlboro Township, Monmouth County  
218 - acres

0 365 730 1,460 2,190 2,920 Feet



month/day/year

#### Farmland Preservation Program

	PRESERVED EASEMENT
	EXCEPTION AREA
	PRESERVED EASEMENT / NR
	EXCEPTION AREA / NR
	FINAL APPROVAL
	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
	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
	(PI1) PINISLANDS
	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	

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION FY2014R5(4)

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

On the Property of  
Amwell Chase, Inc. ("Owner")  
West Amwell Township, Hunterdon County

N.J.A.C. 2:76-17 et seq.  
SADC ID# 10-0350-PG

May 22, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2007, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Planning Incentive Grant ("PIG") application from Hunterdon 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, Hunterdon County received SADC approval of its FY2015 PIG Plan application annual update on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2013 the SADC received an individual application for the sale of a development easement from Hunterdon County for the Property identified as Block 5, Lots 24 & 24.01, West Amwell Township, Hunterdon County, totaling approximately 205 net easement acres hereinafter referred to as "Property" (Schedule A); and

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

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 4-acre non-severable exception area limited to two single family residences; and

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

WHEREAS, at the time of application the Property was in field crops; 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 has a quality score of 66.83, which is at least 70% of the County's average quality score of 45 as determined by the SADC on September 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.9(b) on April 3, 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, February 27, 2014, the SADC certified a value of \$8,900/acre based on the "current value" date of May 2013 for the development easement for the Property; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.12, the Owner accepted the County's offer of \$8,900 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, 211.150 acres will be utilized to calculate the SADC grant need; and

WHEREAS, currently the County has \$0 of base grant funding and is eligible for up to \$3,000,000 in FY11 competitive funding and \$5,000,000 in FY13 competitive grant funding, subject to available funds (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the statewide balance of FY11 competitive funding is \$745,033.31; and

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2014, the County submitted a request 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 sufficient funds available in a county's base grant, the county may request additional funds from the competitive grant fund; and

WHEREAS, the Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board is requesting the remaining \$745,033.31 in the FY11 competitive funding and \$384,619.19 from the FY13 competitive grant funding, leaving a FY13 balance of approximately \$4,615,380.81 (Schedule B); and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost share breakdown is as follows (based on 211.150 acres):

	<u>Cost Share</u>	
SADC	\$1,129,652.50	(\$5,350 per acre; 60.11%)
Hunterdon County	\$ 374,791.25	(\$1,775 per acre; 19.945%)
<u>West Amwell Township</u>	<u>\$ 374,791.25</u>	<u>(\$1,775 per acre; 19.945%)</u>
Purchase Price	\$1,879,235.00	(\$8,900 per acre); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.13, West Amwell Township approved the application on March 26, 2014 with a funding commitment of \$1,775/acre; the Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board approved the application on May 8, 2014 and the Hunterdon County Board of Chosen Freeholders approved the required local match (\$1,775/acre) on May 20, 2014; 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 Hunterdon County for the purchase of a development easement on the Property, comprising approximately 211.150 net easement acres at a State cost share of \$5,350 per acre for a total grant need of \$1,129,652.50 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 FY11 and FY13 competitive grant funding to cover the SADC cost share; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if additional funds are needed due to an increase in acreage base grant funding, if available, may be utilized 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) 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 Property includes a 4-acre non-severable exception area limited to two single family residences, 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 all survey, title and all additional documents required for closing shall 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.

5-22-14

Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**


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

x:\counties\hunco\projects\amwell\_chase\_fw.w mxd




**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM  
NJ State Agriculture Development Committee**

Amwell Chase, Inc.  
Block 5 Lots-P/O 24 (17.1 ac);  
P/O 24-EN (non-severable exception - 3.0 ac);  
P/O 24.01 (188.6 ac)  
& P/O 24.01-EN (non-severable exception - 1.0 ac)  
Gross Total = 209.6 ac  
West Amwell Twp., Hunterdon County



**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 2007/2008 Digital Aerial Image

February 25, 2013



# Schedule B

Hunterdon County

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

FY2011/FY2013 funding

														BASE GRANT		COMPETITIVE GRANT		STATEWIDE TOTAL	COMPETITIVE GRANT ELIGIBILITY (Subject to available funds statewide)		
														FY11	1,500,000	FY11 Balance		0.00	3,000,000		
														FY13	1,000,000	FY13 Balance		14,619,109.48	5,000,000		
														SADC		Total:					
														Total		2,500,000					
Farm	Municipality	App Acres	Plus 3 Percent Acres	SADC Certified Per Acre	Negotiated & Approved Per Acre	SADC Grant Per Acre	Easement Consideration	Cost Basis	Cost Share	Total Federal Grant	SADC Federal Grant	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	Balance	Encumbered at Final	Voucher	Expend	FY11 Balance subject to availability	FY13 Balance subject to availability	
Rothpletz #2 (lot 1.06)	Tewksbury	43.000	44.290	15,000	15,000.00	9,000.00	656,520.00	656,520.00	393,912.00	196,956.00	0.00	398,610.00	393,912.00	393,912.00	2,106,088.00						
Peterson, Linda	Franklin	34.000	35.020	6,200	6,200.00	4,000.00	217,049.60		140,032.00			140,080.00	140,032.00	140,032.00	1,966,056.00						
Cooper, Gail	Holland	43.000	44.290	7,100	7,100.00	4,450.00	314,459.00		197,090.50			197,090.50	189,249.60	189,249.60	1,776,806.40						
Snyder, Doris	Flaritan	50.000	51.500	15,800	15,800.00	9,480.00	744,290.60	744,290.60	446,574.36			428,542.92	386,897.28		1,389,909.12						
Balance \$59,677.08 paid with FY09 (2007) Base grant funds																					
Hill & Dale #1 (lot 1.04)	Tewksbury	91.000	93.730	17,000	17,000.00	10,200.00	1,593,410.00		956,046.00	281,190.00	0.00	340,374.58			1,049,534.54						
Gross, Joel and Rosemary	Kingwood	58.000	59.740	7,700	7,700.00	4,750.00	459,998.00	459,998.00	283,765.00	377,000.00	200,767.00	283,765.00			433,863.12						
Readington Lot 19 Little Hills	Readington	81.981		12,000	12,000.00	7,200.00	983,772.00	983,772.00	590,263.20			100,563.58			49,534.54	489,699.62			2,510,300.38		
Associated Tree Movers	Alexandria	48.000	49.440	8,200	8,200.00	5,000.00	405,408.00	405,408.00	247,200.00						247,200.00				2,263,100.38		
Papazian, Aram	Alexandria	44.000	45.320	9,300	9,300.00	5,580.00	421,476.00	421,476.00	252,885.60						252,885.60				2,010,214.78		
KJA Holdings/Alexis	Holland	68.000	70.040	9,000	9,000.00	5,400.00	630,360.00	630,360.00	378,216.00						378,216.00				1,631,998.78		
Helmer	Kingwood	50.000	51.500	7,800	7,800.00	4,800.00	401,700.00	401,700.00	247,200.00	211,150.00					247,200.00				1,384,798.78		
Zander I	Alexandria	27.000	27.810	7,400	7,400.00	4,600.00	205,794.00	205,794.00	127,926.00						127,926.00				1,256,872.78		
Armwell Chase, Inc.	W. Armwell	205.000	211.150	8,900	8,900.00	\$5,350.00	1,879,235.00	1,879,235.00	1,129,652.50						745,033.31				511,839.47		
															384,619.19					4,615,380.8	
Pending Final Approval																					
Zander II	Kingwood	24.000	24.720	7,950	7,950.00	4,875.00		196,524.00	120,510.00												
Encumbered/Expended FY11	11											727,271.86		723,193.60	49,534.54	2,488,160.53		0.00	511,839.47		
Encumbered/Expended FY13	3											1,000,000.00		0.00	0.00	384,619.19		0.00		4,615,380.81	
Total	14		784				8,913,472.20	6,788,553.60	5,390,763.16			1,727,271.86		723,193.60	49,534.54	2,872,779.72		0.00			
Reprogram Out																					

State Agriculture Development Committee  
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Amwell Chase, Inc (Toll North)  
10- 0350-PG  
County PIG Program  
205 Acres

Block 5	Lot 24	West Amwell Twp.	Hunterdon County		
Block 5	Lot 24.01	West Amwell Twp.	Hunterdon County		
<b>SOILS:</b>		Other	27% * 0	=	.00
		Prime	8% * .15	=	1.20
		Statewide	65% * .1	=	6.50
				<b>SOIL SCORE:</b>	<b>7.70</b>
<b>TILLABLE SOILS:</b>		Cropland Harvested	67% * .15	=	10.05
		Wetlands	5% * 0	=	.00
		Woodlands	28% * 0	=	.00
				<b>TILLABLE SOILS SCORE:</b>	<b>10.05</b>
<b>FARM USE:</b>		Wheat-Cash Grain	25 acres		
		Ornament Nursery Products	112 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 four (4) acres for existing house/outbuildings
    - Exception is not to be severed from Premises
    - Exception is to be restricted to two existing 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
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 FY2014R5(5)

AMENDED PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO  
MONTGOMERY FRIENDS OF OPEN SPACE  
for the  
PURCHASE OF A DEVELOPMENT EASEMENT

On the Property of  
Firmenich Family ("Owner")  
Montgomery Township, Somerset County

SADC ID# 18-0007-NP

May 22, 2014

WHEREAS, on December 20, 2010, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-13, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a Nonprofit Grant Easement Application from the Montgomery Friends of Open Space ("Friends") for the Elizabeth Webster farm identified as Block 33001, Lots 22.01 and 22, Montgomery Township, Somerset County totaling approximately 39 net easement acres (Schedule A); and

WHEREAS, the Property had one (1) existing single family residence, zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved; and

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

WHEREAS, by Resolution #FY2011R4(7) dated April 28, 2011 the SADC granted preliminary approval to the Friends/Webster application and allocated \$500,000 to the project; and

WHEREAS, on January 19, 2013 Friends advised the SADC that Elizabeth Webster sold the property to Johan and Emily Firmenich who wished to continue with the farmland preservation application process with some changes to the original application; and

WHEREAS, the revised application removes the main house and buildings by utilizing a 7.4 acres severable exception surrounding the existing residence, two apartments and other outbuildings; and

WHEREAS, the Property also includes a 2 acre non-severable exception limited to one future single family residence (Schedule B), resulting in a net of approximately 31 acres to be preserved; and

WHEREAS, the landowner agreed to limit the size of the future single family residence, on the non-severable exception to 2,500 square feet of heated living space; and

WHEREAS, the landowner is aware that a portion of this property is currently being considered for a Transco Gas Line as shown on (Schedule B). The exact delineation of the line is yet to be determined; and

WHEREAS, the SADC will not provide a cost share grant until the Transco Gas Line easement is in place; or a non-severable exception area is taken for the future line; or it is shown that this farm is no longer needed for the proposed gas line; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery Township and Somerset County have submitted letters in support of the application;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, staff's recommendation is to grant amended preliminary approval to the Friends/Firmerich application, and to advise Friends that it can proceed with appraisals; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the application includes an approximate 7.4 acre severable exception which will have right to farm language; a 2 acre non-severable exception which will be limited to one future single family residence with a house size limitation of 2,500 square feet of heated living space and right to farm language; and zero (0) agricultural labor housing and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area to be preserved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SADC will not provide a cost share grant until the Transco Gas Line easement is in place; or a non-severable exception area is taken for the future line; or it shown that this farm is no longer needed for the proposed gas line; and

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

5-22-14

Date



Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

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


\\ag.state.nj.us\agrdata\SADC\NONPROFITS\2011 round\Montgomery Friends\Firmenich\amended preliminary approval final.docx



x:\counties\somco\projects\webster1\_sol.mxd

**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM  
NJ State Agriculture Development Committee**

Elizabeth Webster/Montgomery Friends of Open Space, Inc.  
Block 33001 Lots 22 (29.8 ac) & 22.01 (9.5 ac)  
Gross Total = 39.3 ac  
Montgomery Twp., Somerset County




**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 2008 Soil Data  
Green Acres Conservation Easement Data  
NJGIT/OGIS 2007/2008 Digital Aerial Image

February 28, 2011

# Firmenich Farm

X:\counties\comco\projects\webster\_firmenich\_aerial3.mxd



**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM**  
**NJ State Agriculture Development Committee**

Firmenich/Montgomery Friends of Open Space, Inc.  
 Block 33001 Lots P/O 22 (26.6 ac); P/O 22-EN (non-severable exception - 2.0 ac);  
 P/O 22.01 (3.4 ac) & P/O 22.01-ES (severable exception - 7.4 ac)  
 Gross Total = 39.3 ac  
 Montgomery Twp., Somerset County



	Property in Question
	EN - (Non-Severable) Exception
	ES - (Severable) Exception
	Primary - Limited Access
	Federal or State Highways
	County Roads
	Municipal/Local Roads
	Municipal, County and Non-Profit Preserved Open Space
	State Owned Conservation Easement
	State Owned O/S & Recreation Easement

**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:  
 Green Acres Conservation Easement Data  
 NJGIT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

April 14, 2014

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION #FY2014R5(6)

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

On the Property of  
George and Joseph Gerickont ("Owners")

May 22, 2014

Subject Property: Gerickont Farm  
Block 701, Lot 1, South Hampton Township  
Burlington County  
SADC ID#: 03-0028-DE  
Approximately 143 Net Easement Acres

WHEREAS, on August 21, 2013, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a development easement sale application from George and Joseph Gerickont hereinafter "Owner," identified as Block 701, Lot 1, South Hampton Township, Burlington County, hereinafter "Property," totaling approximately 143 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 July 25, 2013, which categorized applications into "Priority", "Alternate" and "Other" groups; and

WHEREAS, SADC staff determined that the Property meets the SADC's "Priority" category for Burlington County (minimum acreage of 69 and minimum quality score of 61) because it is 143 acres and has a quality score of 81.86; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 4.8-acre non-severable exception area limited to one single family residence; and

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



WHEREAS, at the time of application, the Property was devoted to 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, the Property is located within the Pinelands Agriculture Production (PAP) Area; and

WHEREAS, according to a July 31, 2013 Letter of Interpretation from the Pinelands Commission, the Property has been allocated 6.75 Pinelands Development Credits (PDCs); and

WHEREAS, on January 23, 2014, the SADC certified the development easement value of the entire Property at \$1,800 per acre based on current zoning and environmental conditions and a fee simple value of \$5,800 per acre; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19 the Property is eligible for valuation based upon the Pinelands Formula; and

WHEREAS, the Formula takes into consideration the PDCs for a particular parcel and the presence of important agricultural and environmental features. The Formula provides for certain base values to be adjusted upward in varying percentages depending on factors such as site-specific environmental quality, access to highways, septic suitability and agricultural viability; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.13 a landowner may choose to receive a higher base value pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.4(c) by placing a deed restriction on his or her property that limits impervious coverage on the property to 10% of the total property acreage; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.13, impervious coverage shall include, but is not limited to, houses, barns, stables, sheds, silos, outhouses, cabanas, and other buildings, swimming pools, docs or decks. Temporary greenhouses or other temporary coverings which do not have impervious floors are not included; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.3(a), the Pinelands Formula Valuations for the Property are as follows:

\$4,150 without 10% impervious coverage limitation  
\$4,669 with 10% impervious coverage limitation; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 2:76-19.14 in no instance shall the development easement value calculated exceed 80 percent of the fee simple market value of the property as determined by the Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Committee certified fee simple market value was \$5,800 and 80 percent of that is \$4,640, which is the maximum development easement value; and

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2014, the Owner accepted the SADC's offer to purchase the development easement on the Property at the formula value of \$4,640 per acre; and

WHEREAS, through the sale of the development easement to the SADC, the 6.75 PDCs will be retired; 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 the acquisition of the development easement at a value of \$4,640 per acre for a total of approximately \$663,520 based on 143 acres and subject to the conditions (Schedule B); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Property includes a 4.8-acre non-severable exception area limited to one single family residence, zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area outside of the exception area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the landowner has agreed to limit impervious coverage on the property to a maximum of 10% of the total property acreage, outside of the exception area; 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 to execute all necessary

documents required to acquire the development easement on the Property; 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.

5-22-14

Date




Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

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

Application within the Pinelands Ag Production Area



X:\counties\burco\projects\gerickont2014\_fwv.mxd

**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM  
NJ State Agriculture Development Committee**

George and Rosemary Gerickont  
Block 701 Lots P/O 1 (142.6ac)  
& P/O 1-EN (non-severable exception - 4.9 ac)  
Gross Total = 147.5 ac  
Southampton Twp., Burlington 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.

- Property in Question
- ES - (Non-Severable) Exception
- EB - (Severable) Exception
- Wetlands Boundary
- 300 & Buffered Wetlands
- Primary - Limited Access
- Federal or State Hwy
- County Road
- Municipal, et al Road
- Municipal Boundary
- Burlington County and Non-Profit Property Owner
- State Owned Conservation Easement
- State Owned GIS & Recreation Easement



- Wetlands Legend:**
- F - Freshwater Wetlands
  - L - Lumber 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  
NJGIT/OGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image

March 24, 2014

State Agriculture Development Committee  
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Gerickont, Joseph, Rosemary & George  
State Acquisition  
Easement Purchase - SADC  
143 Acres

Block 701	Lot 1	Southampton Twp.	Burlington County		
<b>SOILS:</b>		Prime	94% * .15	=	14.10
		Statewide	6% * .1	=	.60
					<b>SOIL SCORE: 14.70</b>
<b>TILLABLE SOILS:</b>		Cropland Harvested	93% * .15	=	13.95
		Other	1% * 0	=	.00
		Wetlands	1% * 0	=	.00
		Woodlands	5% * 0	=	.00
					<b>TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 13.95</b>
<b>FARM USE:</b>	Hay		131 acres		

**This final approval is subject to the following:**

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation of 0 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 (4.8) acres for existing dwelling and farm buildings  
Exception is not to be severable from Premises  
Exception is to be restricted to one existing single family residential unit(s)
  - c. Additional Restrictions:
 

The landowner, in exchange for the higher pinelands formula valuation agreed to a limit of 10% impervious coverage on the total acreage to be preserved.
  - d. Additional Conditions: No Additional Conditions
  - e. Dwelling Units on Premises: No Dwelling Units
  - 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 #FY2014R5(7)

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

On the Property of  
Steven Hall ("Owner")

May 22, 2014

Subject Property: Steven Hall ("Owner")  
Block 701, Lot 9.01; Block 903, Lots 1 & 2  
Pittsgrove Township, Salem County  
SADC ID#: 17-0271-DE  
Approximately 120 Net Easement Acres

WHEREAS, on October 21, 2013, the State Agriculture Development Committee ("SADC") received a development easement sale application from Steven Hall, hereinafter "Owner," identified as Block 701, Lot 9.01; Block 903, Lots 1 & 2, Pittsgrove Township, Salem County, hereinafter "Property," totaling approximately 120 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 July 25, 2013, 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 120 acres and has a quality score of 68.17; and

WHEREAS, the Property includes a 3-acre severable exception area limited to one single family residence; and

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

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

WHEREAS, at the time of application, the Property was devoted to 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 April 25, 2014, the SADC certified the development easement value of the Property at \$6,400 per acre based on current zoning and environmental conditions as of February 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Owner accepted the SADC's offer to purchase the development easement on the Property for \$6,400 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 \$6,400 per acre for a total of approximately \$768,000 subject to the conditions contained in (Schedule B); 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 Property includes a 3-acre non-severable exception area limited to one single family residence, zero (0) single family residences, zero (0) agricultural labor units, and no pre-existing non-agricultural uses on the area outside of the exception area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as a result of the possible subdivision of the severable exception prior to closing, the remaining parcel may be re-designated with new lot numbers with the re-designation being reflected in the subsequent closing documents and deed of easement; 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 to execute all necessary documents required to acquire the development easement on the Property; 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.

5-22-14



Date

Susan E. Payne, Executive Director  
State Agriculture Development Committee

**VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS**

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





X:\countless\salco\projectshill\_fm.mxd

**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM**  
**NJ State Agriculture Development Committee**

Steven Hall  
 Block 701 Lot 9.01 (72.9 ac) and Block 903 Lots 1 (23.3 ac); P/O 2 (19.4 ac)  
 & P/O 2-ES (severable exception - 3.0 ac)  
 Gross Total = 118.5 ac  
 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 and geo-referenced location of parcel polygons in this data layer are approximate and were developed primarily for planning purposes. The geospatial 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. Professional Land Surveyor.

Application within the both the (PA4b)  
 Rural Env Sens and the (PA5)  
 Env Sens Areas

- Property in Question**
- ES - (Non-Severable) Exception
  - ES - (Severable) Exception
  - Wetlands Boundaries
  - Property - Unsubd. Access
  - Federal or State Highways
  - County Roads
  - Municipal Local Roads
  - Unsubdivided Open Space
  - State Owned Conservation Easement
  - State Owned OS & Recreation Easement



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

**Source:**  
 NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Data  
 Great Acres Conservation Easement Data  
 NJOTFGIS 2012 Digital Aerial Image  
 November 20, 2013

State Agriculture Development Committee  
SADC Final Review: Development Easement Purchase

Steven Hall  
State Acquisition  
Easement Purchase - SADC  
120 Acres

Block 701	Lot 9.01	Pittsgrove Twp.	Salem County
Block 903	Lot 1	Pittsgrove Twp.	Salem County
Block 903	Lot 2	Pittsgrove Twp.	Salem County

<b>SOILS:</b>	Other	11% * 0	=	.00
	Prime	88% * .15	=	13.20
	Statewide	1% * .1	=	.10
				<b>SOIL SCORE: 13.30</b>

<b>TILLABLE SOILS:</b>	Cropland Harvested	73% * .15	=	10.95
	Wetlands	5% * 0	=	.00
	Woodlands	22% * 0	=	.00
				<b>TILLABLE SOILS SCORE: 10.95</b>

<b>FARM USE:</b>	Corn-Cash Grain	84 acres
------------------	-----------------	----------

**This final approval is subject to the following:**

1. Available funding.
2. The allocation of 0 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 three (3) acres for Future residence
    - Exception is severable
    - Exception is to be restricted to one 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.