

PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED AT HIGHLANDS  
COUNCIL MEETING ON AUGUST 21, 2014

**Subject:** Report  
**From:** Carol Barkin <cbarkin@morristourism.org>  
**Date:** 8/20/2014 1:52 PM  
**To:** Julia <julia@njhighlandscoalition.org>

This info comes from "The Economic Impact of Tourism in New Jersey"  
Tourism Satellite Account  
Calendar Year 2013  
by Tourism Economics

**Definition:**  
**Tourism Economic Impact:** Includes the tourism industry plus government spending and capital investment in support of tourism. This is the basis of the total economic impact analysis, including direct, indirect and induced impacts.  
Carol Barkin  
Morris County Tourism Bureau  
6 Court Street  
Morristown, New Jersey 07960  
973-631-5151  
morristourism.org

# Tourism spending by county

Tourism Direct Sales					
(Millions of dollars)					
County	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percent Change
New Jersey	\$34,577	\$36,753	\$37,884	\$38,370	1.3%
Atlantic County	\$7,698	\$7,802	\$7,559	\$7,319	-3.2%
Bergen County	\$2,231	\$2,461	\$2,526	\$2,613	3.4%
Burlington County	\$1,110	\$1,218	\$1,302	\$1,344	3.3%
Camden County	\$633	\$681	\$704	\$723	2.6%
Cape May County	\$4,809	\$5,168	\$5,383	\$5,508	2.3%
Cumberland County	\$263	\$295	\$316	\$317	0.4%
Essex County	\$2,633	\$2,886	\$2,953	\$2,907	-1.6%
Gloucester County	\$320	\$343	\$347	\$355	2.2%
Hudson County	\$1,534	\$1,613	\$1,685	\$1,768	4.9%
Hunterdon County	\$249	\$274	\$282	\$288	2.2%
Mercer County	\$970	\$1,069	\$1,114	\$1,154	3.6%
Middlesex County	\$1,681	\$1,855	\$1,998	\$2,090	4.6%
Monmouth County	\$1,889	\$1,976	\$2,105	\$2,209	4.9%
Morris County	\$1,607	\$1,763	\$1,830	\$1,957	6.9%
Ocean County	\$3,510	\$4,014	\$4,289	\$4,192	-2.3%
Passaic County	\$425	\$471	\$483	\$495	2.4%
Salem County	\$126	\$163	\$178	\$177	-1.1%
Somerset County	\$943	\$1,005	\$1,047	\$1,094	4.5%
Sussex County	\$448	\$487	\$508	\$534	5.1%
Union County	\$975	\$1,064	\$1,118	\$1,170	4.6%
Warren County	\$136	\$145	\$158	\$156	0.0%

# Tourism spending by county

Tourism Direct Sales (Millions of dollars)						
County	Lodging	Food & beverage	Retail	Recreation	Transport	Total
2013						
New Jersey	10,913.2	9,283.1	7,130.5	4,701.5	6,341.3	38,369.6
Atlantic County	4,038.0	1,323.6	1,044.1	393.7	519.6	7,319.0
Bergen County	427.9	766.6	513.0	375.0	530.3	2,612.7
Burlington County	178.9	355.2	293.2	167.2	349.8	1,344.4
Camden County	75.9	193.3	150.6	119.5	183.2	722.6
Cape May County	2,249.0	1,212.8	1,044.9	637.9	363.5	5,508.0
Cumberland County	43.0	79.6	74.7	33.9	86.0	317.2
Essex County	307.5	534.8	342.6	251.9	1,470.0	2,906.7
Gloucester County	34.0	113.8	71.6	49.3	85.9	354.7
Hudson County	369.4	528.7	373.3	249.9	246.8	1,768.0
Hunterdon County	31.7	70.7	61.3	46.7	77.9	288.4
Mercer County	192.3	327.9	252.7	164.4	217.0	1,154.3
Middlesex County	315.9	596.4	459.9	268.2	449.7	2,090.1
Monmouth County	433.2	573.3	417.0	489.9	295.5	2,208.8
Morris County	393.6	515.9	384.7	321.9	360.9	1,957.0
Ocean County	1,216.5	1,028.1	894.1	583.4	469.6	4,191.6
Passaic County	59.3	173.5	101.3	73.9	86.9	494.9
Salem County	17.9	36.7	42.6	17.1	63.0	177.2
Somerset County	206.6	328.4	232.0	184.8	142.3	1,094.1
Sussex County	119.4	136.9	115.4	80.2	82.3	534.2
Union County	179.4	351.5	251.9	172.2	214.9	1,169.9
Warren County	23.7	35.8	29.6	20.3	46.2	155.6

# Tourism spending by county

Tourism Direct Sales (Millions of dollars)						
County	Lodging	Food & beverage	Retail	Recreation	Transport	Total
New Jersey	11,231.5	8,891.6	6,812.2	4,392.2	6,556.3	37,883.9
Atlantic County	4,307.0	1,278.7	1,040.3	382.9	551.8	7,558.7
Bergen County	416.2	734.4	487.9	349.2	538.1	2,525.7
Burlington County	179.0	341.6	277.5	155.2	348.5	1,301.8
Camden County	78.9	190.5	143.0	109.8	182.1	704.4
Cape May County	2,260.9	1,157.2	988.2	602.1	374.2	5,382.6
Cumberland County	44.6	79.0	71.5	31.7	89.3	316.0
Essex County	288.9	505.2	321.3	234.2	1,595.5	2,953.1
Gloucester County	34.0	108.1	87.8	45.6	91.6	347.0
Hudson County	357.3	504.2	353.6	231.5	238.6	1,685.2
Hunterdon County	32.2	67.0	57.9	43.0	82.0	282.1
Mercer County	189.3	310.8	237.7	150.9	225.0	1,113.7
Middlesex County	300.2	558.6	429.2	245.4	464.8	1,998.3
Monmouth County	434.4	539.4	388.3	450.5	292.1	2,104.8
Morris County	377.6	480.9	339.4	288.1	343.8	1,829.9
Ocean County	1,334.0	1,021.3	877.2	566.7	490.2	4,289.4
Passaic County	59.8	167.1	98.3	68.7	91.2	483.1
Salem County	18.2	36.3	41.8	16.5	85.6	179.2
Somerset County	205.2	311.3	217.2	169.0	143.9	1,046.7
Sussex County	108.0	131.8	110.8	74.8	82.8	508.1
Union County	174.5	335.1	238.8	157.2	214.7	1,118.3
Warren County	22.5	35.1	28.7	18.2	50.1	155.7

AUG-21-2014 01:35 From:

# Tourism employment by county

Direct Tourism Employment					
County	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percent Change
New Jersey	310,326	312,369	318,560	320,238	0.5%
Atlantic County	62,039	59,892	60,697	58,375	-3.8%
Bergen County	23,979	24,450	23,831	24,198	1.5%
Burlington County	14,045	14,205	14,691	14,888	1.3%
Camden County	8,060	8,079	8,045	8,111	0.8%
Cape May County	24,410	24,521	25,191	25,479	1.1%
Cumberland County	3,015	3,097	3,203	3,154	-1.5%
Essex County	20,530	20,891	21,002	21,130	0.6%
Gloucester County	4,341	4,389	4,493	4,622	2.9%
Hudson County	16,786	16,823	16,924	17,049	0.7%
Hunterdon County	2,614	2,698	2,751	2,828	2.8%
Mercer County	11,011	11,154	11,269	11,585	2.8%
Middlesex County	19,863	20,205	21,450	21,926	2.2%
Monmouth County	19,579	19,740	20,348	21,086	3.6%
Morris County	19,302	19,988	20,267	21,161	4.4%
Ocean County	24,320	24,993	26,187	25,644	-2.1%
Passaic County	5,229	5,349	5,309	5,375	1.3%
Salem County	1,448	1,523	1,569	1,530	-2.5%
Somerset County	10,771	10,940	11,282	11,633	3.1%
Sussex County	5,965	6,147	6,255	6,341	1.4%
Union County	11,427	11,682	12,157	12,484	2.7%
Warren County	1,594	1,591	1,637	1,641	0.2%

RECEIVED 08/20/2014 12:50

To: 919735887193

Page: 2/5

# Tourism impacts by county

Tourism Impacts by County				
County	Tourism Employment Direct Impact	Direct Share of Total Employment	Tourism Employment Total Impact	Total Share of Total Employment
<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>320,238</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>511,777</b>	<b>11.6%</b>
Atlantic County	58,375	39.6%	76,164	51.6%
Bergen County	24,196	4.3%	43,549	7.8%
Burlington County	14,888	6.3%	23,178	9.9%
Camden County	8,111	3.6%	15,288	6.8%
Cape May County	25,479	48.5%	35,801	68.2%
Cumberland County	3,154	5.7%	5,354	9.6%
Essex County	21,130	5.6%	38,360	10.2%
Gloucester County	4,622	4.4%	8,011	7.6%
Hudson County	17,049	6.2%	28,965	10.6%
Hunterdon County	2,828	4.3%	4,896	7.5%
Mercer County	11,585	5.2%	21,801	9.8%
Middlesex County	21,926	4.9%	38,440	8.6%
Monmouth County	21,086	6.7%	32,285	10.3%
Morris County	21,181	6.0%	34,998	9.8%
Ocean County	25,644	12.7%	36,870	18.3%
Passaic County	5,375	2.7%	11,501	5.8%
Salem County	1,530	6.8%	2,512	11.2%
Somerset County	11,833	5.4%	20,391	9.5%
Sussex County	6,341	11.9%	8,264	15.5%
Union County	12,484	4.8%	22,189	8.6%
Warren County	1,641	4.2%	2,959	7.6%

County employment shares are comparisons against total county private employment (BEA)

RECEIVED 08/20/2014 12:50  
To: 919735887193

Page: 3/5

AUG-21-2014 01:36 From:

RECEIVED 08/28/2014 12:50  
To: 919735887193

Page: 5/5

# Tourism impacts by county

Tourism Tax Impacts by County					
	State and Local Tax Receipts (millions)				
	2011	2012	2013	Percent Change	Share of State
<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>\$4,415.8</b>	<b>\$4,504.8</b>	<b>\$4,603.0</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Atlantic County	\$854.5	\$832.7	\$816.7	-1.9%	17.7%
Bergen County	\$345.1	\$351.6	\$364.2	3.6%	7.9%
Burlington County	\$153.6	\$161.7	\$166.7	3.1%	3.6%
Camden County	\$99.6	\$100.8	\$105.0	4.1%	2.3%
Cape May County	\$482.3	\$490.7	\$511.4	4.2%	11.1%
Cumberland County	\$37.0	\$38.3	\$38.6	0.8%	0.8%
Essex County	\$332.9	\$336.5	\$337.4	0.3%	7.3%
Gloucester County	\$52.9	\$52.4	\$54.2	3.3%	1.2%
Hudson County	\$205.9	\$214.1	\$224.4	4.8%	4.9%
Hunterdon County	\$38.5	\$38.8	\$40.5	4.4%	0.9%
Mercer County	\$143.9	\$145.6	\$151.8	4.2%	3.3%
Middlesex County	\$259.7	\$277.4	\$289.0	4.2%	6.3%
Monmouth County	\$257.0	\$270.3	\$280.5	3.8%	6.1%
Morris County	\$243.7	\$250.8	\$272.4	8.6%	5.9%
Ocean County	\$429.8	\$438.8	\$425.0	-3.4%	9.2%
Passaic County	\$81.8	\$81.1	\$84.0	3.5%	1.8%
Salem County	\$18.6	\$19.6	\$19.7	0.5%	0.4%
Somerset County	\$147.0	\$152.9	\$159.9	4.6%	3.5%
Sussex County	\$58.4	\$59.2	\$64.3	8.6%	1.4%
Union County	\$152.0	\$158.1	\$165.0	4.4%	3.6%
Warren County	\$21.7	\$22.3	\$22.6	1.4%	0.5%



# Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report Morris County, New Jersey

## Data Gathering

### Interviews

- Program Managers
- Municipalities
- Non-Profits
- Participants – Farms, Businesses, Historic Sites

### Questionnaires

- 39 Municipalities
- 9 Land Trust Non-Profits
- 27 Historic Preservation Non-Profits

### What the Municipalities and Non-Profits Said

- 82% of municipalities and all land trust non-profits have preserved land with funding from Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Program.
- Top reasons for open space acquisition are recreational fields (94% of municipalities) and natural resource protection (100% of non-profits).
- 79% of municipalities want to work with MCPC for trail connectivity, 51% do not connect to MCPC trails.
- 72% of municipalities and 59% of non-profits know of historic structures that should be preserved.
- 18 municipalities want the Flood Mitigation Program to cover additional costs.
- Want smaller farms to qualify for Farmland program.
- 62% of municipalities and all land trust non-profits have post-preservation plans requiring additional funds.
- Municipal and non-profits responses overwhelmingly indicated improved quality of life and increased property values as a result of Trust Fund Programs.

### Inventory / Mapping

- Public Open Space Inventory (POSI)

## Analysis

### Previous Program Summary

- 24,144 acres preserved
- 80 Historic Preservation projects
- 43 flood-prone homes purchased (117 committed)
- \$391.6 million cost to Morris County
- \$13,687 average per acre acquisition cost

### Economic Impact Analysis

- Property values - \$150 per square foot of home size per 1% increase of open space
- \$18 million annual positive impact on municipal budgets
- Green open space annual benefit of \$7,853 per acre or \$37,493 per acre in riparian areas
- Tourism at peak levels in Morris County, employs over 21,000 people
- Preserved farms generate revenue and provide employment
- Access to open space attracts businesses
- Quality of life - Morris County ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in New Jersey

### Potential Future Projects

- 38 municipalities with potential projects
- 13,982 acres to preserve
- 155 Historic Preservation projects
- 2,275 flood-prone properties to acquire
- \$52 million cost for 10 year PIT funding needs

## Recommendations

### Annual Funding Levels - 10 Year Estimate

- Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space - \$7.2 million
- Farmland Preservation - \$4.6 million
- Historic Preservation - \$5.5 million
- Flood Mitigation - \$10.5 million
- MCMUA - \$1.6 million
- MCPC Land Acquisition - \$3.0 million
- MCPC Park Improvements (PIT) - \$5.2 million
- Open Space Improvement Program - \$3.0 million

### Strategies

1. Establish a periodic review of Preservation Trust Fund Programs funding needs and priorities.
2. Establish new allowable funding uses for post preservation improvements (trails, recreation, site/habitat restoration) in all programs.
3. Eliminate maximum allocations per program.
4. Increase the number of application opportunities in the Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Program.
5. Lower the minimum farm size criteria in the Farmland Preservation Program to match State minimum criteria.
6. Allow Flood Mitigation Program funds for demolition and post-preservation site restoration.
7. Raise municipal and non-profit awareness of all Preservation Trust Fund programs and funding opportunities.







## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

### Executive Summary

#### Project Purpose

The purpose of this Report is to review the projects completed since the voter approved enactment of the Morris County Preservation Trust Fund ("Trust Fund") in 1992 and to determine what future investment in land acquisition, historic resource preservation, park development, and farmland preservation is needed based on current inventories, anticipated needs and municipal and non-profit input. The Report will also delineate the parameters of a possible new voter referendum that could address evolving preservation priorities, program requirements and funding needs.

The four main tasks were as follows:

1. Assess the current state of the Trust Fund and meet with program managers to identify individual program trends.
2. Assess present and future Trust Fund needs of all 39 Morris County municipalities, nine (9) land trusts, and 27 historic preservation non-profit organizations, and map existing preserved land.
3. Evaluate and analyze observed trends
4. Present findings to the Morris County Board of Chosen Freeholders

#### The Preservation Trust Fund

On December 22, 1992, the Morris County Board of Chosen Freeholders established the Morris County Open Space & Farmland Preservation Trust Fund and collection of funds began in 1993. The County Freeholders annually review and set the current year's tax rate anywhere from \$0.00 to \$0.0525 per \$100 of equalized property valuation. The levy for 2014 is currently set at 1.00 cent per \$100 of equalized assessed value. The Trust Fund is currently allocated as follows:

- Historic Preservation (HP) – ¼ cent
- Morris County Park Commission Park Improvement Trust (PIT) – ¼ cent

With the remaining funds:

- Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Preservation Program (OS) – 35%
- Flood Mitigation Program (FMP) – 25%
- Farmland Preservation (FP) – 20%
- Morris County Park Commission Open Space Acquisition (MCPC) – 15%
- Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority (MCMUA) – 5%

#### Summary of Outreach

A detailed questionnaire was prepared and submitted to the aforementioned municipalities, land trust non-profits, and historic preservation non-profits to help determine local preservation needs. Additionally, in-person interviews were conducted with representatives of each







## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

### Executive Summary

municipality and land trust non-profit organization. The findings of these questionnaires and interviews were then analyzed to find trends and determine the needs of these groups as it pertains to the Trust Fund.

### What Morris County Municipalities and Non-Profits Said

1. Most municipalities do not plan to make changes to the uses and rates of their municipal open space trust funds and have limited funds for acquisitions.
2. Municipalities believe Farmland Preservation has benefited their communities and want more farms to qualify for the program.
3. Eighteen municipalities reported frequent flooding and would like the Flood Mitigation Program to cover more than just acquisition costs.
4. Most municipalities<sup>1</sup> (81%) and all historic preservation non-profits<sup>2</sup> believed Historic Preservation benefited their community, and most (72%) municipalities<sup>3</sup> and non-profits<sup>4</sup> (59%) know of structures that should be preserved.
5. Most municipalities<sup>3</sup> (79%) want to work with Morris County Park Commission (MCPC) for trail connectivity, but a majority of municipal trail systems<sup>3</sup> (51%) do not connect to MCPC trails.
6. The top reasons municipalities and non-profits acquire open space are for recreational fields and natural resource protection.
7. Most municipalities<sup>3</sup> (82%) and all interviewed land trust non-profits have preserved land with funding assistance from the Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Program.
8. Most municipalities<sup>3</sup> (62%) and all interviewed land trust non-profits have post-preservation plans that require additional funding.
9. Municipal and non-profits responses overwhelmingly<sup>5</sup> indicated improved quality of life and increased property values in Morris County as a result of Preservation Trust Fund Programs.

### Current Preserved Lands

The analysis of the Preservation Trust Fund reviewed the projects and properties funded through the Preservation Trust Fund to date based on program records. The total number of properties and acreage with the County costs are listed in the following table.<sup>6</sup>

To date, the total expenditures for the seven programs of the Preservation Trust Fund<sup>1</sup> is \$391.6 million for 690 preservation projects covering 24,144 acres, plus numerous park

<sup>1</sup> Of 37 responding municipalities.

<sup>2</sup> Of 26 responding historic preservation non-profits.

<sup>3</sup> Of all 39 municipalities.

<sup>4</sup> Of all 27 historic preservation non-profits.

<sup>5</sup> Open-ended comments – one respondent suggested no impact. All other comments were positive.

<sup>6</sup> See Table 6 for more detailed numbers and Chapter IV for full descriptions.







## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

### Executive Summary

improvements. The table below provides a summary of the Preservation Trust Fund by program. An additional \$94 million<sup>2</sup> was provided by match funding from other sources (State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) for farmland, and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for flood mitigation).

Preservation Trust Fund Program <sup>1</sup>	Municipalities <sup>11</sup>	Projects <sup>2</sup>	Acres <sup>3</sup>	County Cost <sup>10</sup>
Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space <sup>3</sup>	35	228	11,731	\$176,554,828
Farmland Preservation <sup>4</sup>	14	125	7,709	\$71,385,088
Historic Preservation <sup>5</sup>	32	80		\$20,256,302
Flood Mitigation Program <sup>6</sup>	7	117		\$16,454,519
Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority <sup>7</sup>	18	47	1,114	\$19,770,581
Morris County Park Commission Land Acquisition <sup>8</sup>	22	93	3,590	\$62,754,641
Morris County Park Commission Park Improvement Trust <sup>9</sup>				\$24,447,170
<b>Total<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>38</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>24,144</b>	<b>\$391,623,129</b>

1. Data provided in this table is current through 5/31/2014.

2. These values represent the number of preserved properties/projects located wholly or in part in a municipality, and do not necessarily correspond to applicant to the program. Non-profit projects are included in this total. "Total" values reflect the total number of projects rather than a sum of these numbers because some properties are located in more than one municipality. Projects may contain multiple properties/parcels and may extend beyond municipal boundaries.

3. Municipal/Non-Profit acreage totals are derived from Morris County Public Open Space Inventory (POSI). Total values are from the "Total" row in Table 6. Previous Projects Funded Through the Preservation Trust Fund.

4. Farmland Preservation totals are derived from Easement Values sheet prepared by Morris County Agriculture Development Board (MCADB). Acreage reflects Not Preserved acreage rather than GIS measurements.

5. Historic Preservation totals are derived from Historic Preservation Cost Analysis table prepared by Morris County staff.

6. Flood Mitigation Program totals are calculated from closed projects to date.

7. Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority totals are derived from Morris County POSI.

8. Morris County Park Commission (MCPC) totals are derived from Morris County POSI. County Cost from report of Park Commission Land Acquisition projects.

9. MCPC Park Improvement Trust (PIT) totals are derived from PIT Allocation/Disbursement table prepared by Morris County Park Commission (MCPC) staff.

10. County Cost values other than Park Improvement Trust are from the "Total" row in Table 6. Previous Projects Funded Through the Preservation Trust Fund.

11. This column represents a count of the number of municipalities that received funding in each program as represented in Table 6. Previous Projects Funded Through the Preservation Trust Fund.

12. Total for "Municipalities" column refers to the total number of municipalities with Preservation Trust Fund projects, not a sum of the numbers for each program.

Farmland and Historic Preservation participants indicated they would not be operating without the funds they received and believed Preservation Trust Fund programs positively impacted Morris County businesses and residents.

### Economic Impact

The Morris County Preservation Trust Fund yields a variety of positive economic impacts for the citizens, businesses, and municipalities of Morris County. These positive impacts are generated as a direct result of the Preservation Trust Fund's activities; there are also indirect/secondary beneficial impacts that ripple through the Morris County economy.

Positive economic impacts associated with the Preservation Trust Fund's activities include:

<sup>1</sup> As of May 31, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> This number does not include Green Acres contributions or project matches.







---

## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

---

### Executive Summary

---

- The Morris County Preservation Trust Fund has a significant and positive impact on home property values on average, all else held constant.
- A 1% increase in the number of preserved acres in a given Morris County zip code will increase home property values by \$1.50 per square foot in that zip code, all else constant.
- The Preservation Trust Fund has had a positive budgetary impact on Morris County and its municipalities estimated at more than \$18 million direct budgetary impact each year.
- The Preservation Trust Fund has a positive impact on the economy of Morris County by preserving open space, farmland, and historic attractions that draw thousands of visitors each year.
- Parcels preserved through the Preservation Trust Fund assist in driving tourism to peak levels in Morris County. Tourism in Morris County has been estimated to generate spending of \$1.95 billion and employ over 21,000 people annually.
- In 2013, Morris County led the state of New Jersey with 6.9% year-over-year growth in tourism direct sales, generating 4.4% growth in tourism employment.
- Morris County ranked first in quality of life throughout all of New Jersey, according to the Garden State Quality of Life study. It is safe to conclude that the Morris County Preservation Trust Fund has played a key role in building and maintaining this scenic, appealing, and healthy environment for its residents, businesses, and tourists.
- According to FEMA's cost-benefit analysis computer model, Morris County's Flood Mitigation Program has generated an estimated \$23.2 million in benefits from the \$3.6 million in grant funds provided by the Preservation Trust Fund for an overall benefit-cost ratio (BCR) of 7.33 (\$7.33 in benefits for every \$1.00 invested). Pending projects have an estimated overall BCR of 4.67.
- Availability of open space often weighs into the quantitative and qualitative decision making process when a business is deciding where to locate or relocate its operations.
- Revenue enterprises occurring on lands preserved through the Preservation Trust Fund often generate revenue and provide direct employment to members of the community (i.e. tour guides, farming jobs, concessions, security and maintenance, etc.).
- The Preservation Trust Fund's investment in farmland has a positive economic impact on the local economy as it maintains local farm activity that otherwise would not be feasible. The ability of farmers to continue operating allows for dollars to circulate through the local economy in many ways including: localizing food purchases, employing farming staff, attracting agri-tourists, etc.
- Conservation lands provide benefits to both the environment and human health including: improved air and water quality, healthier and increased biodiversity, cooler air temperatures in the summer, reduction of greenhouse gases, habitat protection, noise reduction, sediment and erosion reduction, and water resource protection.







## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

### Executive Summary

#### Potential Preservation Trust Fund Projects

To analyze the future funding potential of the programs, a list of potential preservation properties and projects was developed and reviewed for each Trust Fund program. Funding for each program was projected using many sources<sup>1</sup> to produce an *estimate* for the County cost for the completion of preservation projects currently in the preservation process and additional projects desired by the municipalities and non-profits over the next ten years. The total number of municipal participants, properties, and acreage with the estimated County costs are listed in the following table.<sup>2</sup> Thirty-eight (38) municipalities have potential projects in at least one Trust Fund program plus six (6) of the nine (9) land trust non-profits for a total of 13,982 acres at the cost to Morris County of approximately \$617.4 million.

Preservation Trust Fund Program <sup>1</sup>	Municipalities <sup>3</sup>	Land Trust Non-Profits <sup>4</sup>	Properties/Projects	Acres	County Cost
Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space <sup>5</sup>	29	6	441	7,180	\$143,266,698
Farmland Preservation	18		95	5,080	\$70,582,088
Historic Preservation <sup>2</sup>	36	2	155		\$109,585,402
Flood Mitigation Program	28		2,275		\$210,509,795
Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority			40	542	\$16,000,000
Morris County Park Commission Land Acquisition	16		57	1,181	\$30,447,142
Morris County Park Commission Park Improvements (PIT)					\$51,981,500
MCMUA Partnerships <sup>2</sup>					(\$15,004,000)
<b>Total<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3,063</b>	<b>13,982</b>	<b>\$617,368,624</b>

1. Program Projects/Properties, Acres, and County Cost sums are from Table 27: Potential Preservation Trust Fund Projects. See that table for more details.
2. Partnerships represent projects Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority (MCMUA) expects to be collaborations with other Preservation Trust Fund programs.
3. This column represents a count of the number of municipalities that may receive funding in each program as represented in Table 27: Potential Preservation Trust Fund Projects.
4. This column list the number of land trust non-profits with potential projects.
5. Program Projects, Acres, and County Costs include Land Trust Non-Profit totals from Table 27: Potential Preservation Trust Fund Projects.
6. Total for "Municipalities" and "Land Trust Non-Profits" columns refers to the total number of municipalities or land trust non-profits with Preservation Trust Fund projects, not a sum of the numbers for each program.

#### Recommendations

Based on the potential future projects outlined for each of the programs by municipalities, land trust non-profits, and historic preservation non-profits, the primary recommendation of this report is to continue the funding for the Morris County Preservation Trust Fund. The total of these potential projects for the Trust Fund is \$617.4 million. Please note that potential additional uses of the Trust Fund are not included in these figures.

This total cost is very substantial when compared to the most recent annual Trust Fund tax collection of \$8.94 million (2014). In addition, these needs are distributed throughout Morris County municipalities.

<sup>1</sup> Questionnaires, interview summaries, program targets, Municipal Open Space Plans.

<sup>2</sup> See Table 27 for more detailed figures and Chapter VI for full descriptions.







## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

### Executive Summary

Potential program projects were analyzed to determine the funding level required to meet municipal and non-profit expectations of the Preservation Trust Fund for a ten year period. The ten year forecast for each of the seven Preservation Trust Fund programs can be seen in the table below including a suggested new program<sup>1</sup> (Open Space Improvement Program) for post-preservation improvements.

These numbers consider the existing Preservation Trust Fund balances and estimate the annual collection rate over the next ten years to meet these program estimates. An estimated collection rate of 3.84 cents would meet funding requirements of the eight (8) programs. The table also shows the average allocation required for each of the programs over ten years to meet that program's funding forecast.

These values *do not* represent a specific allocation recommendation, but rather, the average, estimated allocation required over the next ten years. The allocations should be adjusted annually to reflect program demand and trends rather than annual expenditures. All Preservation Trust Fund programs have greater potential project estimates than will be supplied by their current funding levels.

Trust Fund Programs with 10 Year Program Estimates <sup>1,6</sup>	Current Funding (2014)	Annual Funding Needs <sup>4</sup>	Difference (Potential - Current)	10 Year Average Allocation <sup>1</sup>
Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Acquisition 50% of Potential Projects	\$1,560,000	\$7,163,335	(\$5,603,335)	20%
Farmland Preservation 65% of Potential Projects	\$890,000	\$4,587,836	(\$3,697,836)	13%
Historic Preservation 50% of Potential Projects	\$2,230,000	\$5,479,270	(\$3,249,270)	15%
Flood Mitigation Program 50% of Potential Projects	\$1,120,000	\$10,525,490	(\$9,405,490)	29%
Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority <sup>2</sup> 10 Year Program Targets	\$220,000	\$1,600,000	(\$1,380,000)	4%
Morris County Park Commission Land Acquisition <sup>2</sup> 10 Year Program Targets	\$670,000	\$3,044,714	(\$2,374,714)	8%
Morris County Park Commission Park Improvement Trust <sup>2</sup> 10 Year Program Targets	\$2,230,000	\$5,198,150	(\$2,968,150)	0.57 Cents
Open Space Improvement Program (New Program) <sup>3</sup> 10% of Collection Rate	N/A	\$3,600,072	(\$3,600,072)	10%
<b>Preservation Trust Fund Total</b> 100% of Collection Rate	<b>\$8,920,000</b>	<b>\$41,198,866</b>	<b>(\$32,278,866)</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Collection Rate Needed to Meet Funding Estimates: 3.84 cents<sup>5</sup></b>				

1. From Table 27: Potential Preservation Trust Fund Projects with estimated completion of stated percentage under (10 Year Funding Estimates) of Potential Projects.

2. Targets provided by these programs were based on 10 year projections.

3. Estimated at 10% Allocation of Total Preservation Trust Fund Collections (not including PIT).

4. Costs in this table are calculated in 2014 dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.

5. This Collection Rate considers an expansion of the Preservation Trust Fund for Open Space Improvements funded at 10% but not other expanded uses.

6. See Table 30 for more detailed calculations.

7. These values represent the average allocation needed over a 10 year period to fund all program estimates and are not a recommendation for annual allocations.

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of program funding estimates, the allocation of this new program is estimated at 10% of the collection rate after the allocation for the Park Improvement Trust.







---

## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

---

### Executive Summary

---

It is recommended that the Morris County Board of Chosen Freeholders maintain funding for the Preservation Trust Fund and consider gradually increasing the collection rate from the current one (1) cent rate if application levels increase or in response to changing needs in Morris County with regard to Trust Fund programs. Also, increased funding will be needed if additional uses for the Preservation Trust Fund are allowed. These changes to the Trust Fund received strong support from municipalities. Recommended Strategies include:

1. Establish a periodic review of the Preservation Trust Fund in order to determine municipal and non-profit funding needs and priorities for all Programs and establish a procedure for making adjustments to address these evolving needs.
2. Establish a new allowable funding use, or separate fund, for post-preservation improvements to preserved properties, particularly trail and recreation development and habitat restoration.
3. Allow post-preservation funding for Preservation Trust Fund programs, including funds from the Flood Mitigation Program for demolition and post-preservation site restoration, and site restoration funds for MCMUA, both of which would enhance flood capture and storage abilities of preserved lands.
4. Allow Freeholders to set allotments of the Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Program, Farmland Preservation Program, Historic Preservation Program, Flood Mitigation Program, MCMUA program, and MCPC Land Acquisition Program without maximum allotments per program to best meet the changing needs of Morris County.
5. Increase the maximum allocation for the Park Improvement Trust from  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent to  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent and allow this program to benefit from fund reallocations. It is recommended that the annual allocation for this program increase only if the collection rate is increased from one (1) cent.
6. Increase the number of application opportunities in the Municipal/Non-Profit Open Space Program to allow more than one application cycle per year.
7. Allow preservation of farms smaller than ten (10) acres to match state minimum criteria.<sup>1</sup>
8. Maintain and consider increasing the existing collection rate for the Morris County Preservation Trust Fund based on application levels and in response to changing needs in regard to Trust Fund programs.
9. Establish an outreach program to municipalities to raise awareness of Trust Fund programs and funding opportunities available.

---

<sup>1</sup> The County program currently allows for a waiver of the minimum criteria on a case-by-case basis.







---

## Morris County Preservation Trust Fund Analysis and Strategy Report

---

### Executive Summary

---

This page intentionally blank.



## **Morristown National Historical Park News Release**

### **Tourism to Morristown National Historical Park Creates \$16,808,100 in Economic Benefit**

#### ***Report shows visitor spending supports 197 jobs in local economy***

Morristown, NJ – A new National Park Service (NPS) report shows that 304,940 visitors to Morristown National Historical Park in 2013 spent more than \$16 million in communities near the park. That spending supported 197 jobs in the local area.

“Morristown National Historical Park is proud to welcome visitors from across the country and around the world,” said Superintendent Tom Ross. “We are delighted to share the Morristown story and the experiences it provides, and to use the park as a way to introduce our visitors to this part of the country and all that it offers. National park tourism is a significant driver in the national economy - returning \$10 for every \$1 invested in the National Park Service - and it’s a big factor in our local economy as well. We appreciate the partnership and support of our neighbors and are glad to be able to give back by helping to sustain local communities.”

“We look forward to continuing to work with our local partners,” Ross elaborated, “who support Morristown National Historical Park. Without the help of organizations such as the Washington Association of New Jersey, the Morris County Tourism Bureau, the Morris County Park Commission, the Town of Morristown, the Great Swamp Watershed Association and the Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area, we would not be able to attract as many visitors as we do or provide the same level of preservation, visitor services and programs.”

The peer-reviewed visitor spending analysis was conducted by U.S. Geological Survey economists Catherine Cullinane Thomas and Christopher Huber and Lynne Koontz for the National Park Service. The report shows \$14.6 billion of direct spending by 273.6 million park visitors in communities within 60 miles of a national park. This spending supported more than 237,000 jobs nationally, with more than 197,000 jobs found in these gateway communities, and had a cumulative benefit to the U.S. economy of \$26.5 billion.

According to the 2013 economic analysis, most visitor spending was for lodging (30.3 percent) followed by food and beverages (27.3 percent), gas and oil (12.1 percent), admissions and fees (10.3 percent) and souvenirs and other expenses (10 percent).

The largest jobs categories supported by visitor spending were restaurants and bars (50,000 jobs) and lodging (38,000 jobs).

To download the report visit <http://www.nature.nps.gov/socialscience/economics.cfm>

The report includes information for visitor spending at individual parks and by state.

To learn more about national parks in New Jersey and how the National Park Service works with New Jersey communities to help preserve local history, conserve the environment, and provide outdoor recreation, go to [www.nps.gov/newjersey](http://www.nps.gov/newjersey).

Release Date: Immediately  
Contact: Anne DeGraaf  
Email: [anne.degraaf@nps.gov](mailto:anne.degraaf@nps.gov)

-www.nps.gov-

① My name is Hank Klumpp. I own 150 acres in the Highlands Preservation Area which was put into preservation by politicians and not scientific study. I have asked to see the study - no one can find it.

The Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act is ten years old. Should the people who have had their property values stolen be celebrating? I am told that the people in the state's most populous cities like Newark, Jersey City, Paterson and Elizabeth depend on Highlands water. Are they paying for anything? If the Highlands Act is undergoing a mandated review maybe the review can tell me why I am still paying the price. I am told that I can apply for compensation through open space and farmland preservation programs, however, these programs are currently depleted but it is possible that new funding in the future may be welcome news to me and other landowners.

(2)

This is nothing but a joke. Landowners who have had their property values stolen are being asked to accept pennies on the dollar <sup>with these programs.</sup> Gov. Christie is being criticized for trying to weaken the Highlands rules but all he really wants is fairness. He knows the value of the property that was taken. Any one who believes one word that comes out of the mouth of State Senator Bob Smith, the Senate sponsor, will believe anything. He sings the praises of the Act passed 10 years ago and now wants to pass the open space question. He stood up and promised that landowners would be totally compensated for their losses and no one would be financially hurt. I guess people can say anything to get what they want. Gov. Christie has

③

actually said to me — "Hank, I feel your pain — I hope I will be able to help you." Jeff Tittel — is the word fairness even in his vocabulary?

He gave Gov. Christie an F on his annual report card. Who cares what ~~he~~ thinks — when push comes to shove, Tittel, the whole Sierra Club, Smith, and anyone with half a brain knows that the Highlands Act is based on a lie — providing no compensation for landowners and that as much water that is used — is wasted. Tittel.

claims water resources belong to all of us — I know the price my family is paying — How much is Tittel or Smith paying? Tittel does not

(4)

Speak highly of Highlands Council members.

He is upset because the majority of the Council's members are now Christie

appointees. Is it too much for me to

even hope that fairness could be on

the horizon? Please teach Tittel a

lesson on fairness.

Hank Klumpp

24 Longview Road  
Lebanon, NJ 08833

**Comments of Patrick Moffitt at the August 21, 2014 Highlands Council Meeting**

Mr. Davis represented he reviewed over 20 pages of scientific misconduct evidence and found not the slightest misdoing. He refuses, however, to provide explanation or any refutation.

The admissions made in OPRA replies and state documents, not my opinion, reveal the misconduct that includes systematically misrepresenting the essential claims made in support of the nitrate model, the need for nitrate restrictions and omitting the associated water supply risks.

Not that it should impact the Council's duty to investigate material matters but an OPRA obtained memo from Lisa Jackson to Governor Corzine shows the Council— not DEP- drove the nitrate regulations.

Have Ms. Danis provide you the validation for the nitrate model your staff called “proven”. She should be able to print in minutes the plot of the HUC 14 median nitrate and septic density data against the model predictions. In fact she should already have a copy.

Council can know whether the model is or is not valid before meeting's end.

My validation plot agrees with an OPRA extracted DEP study showing the model has zero predictive ability. Perhaps why the DEP study wasn't publicly released, you haven't seen the validation and no other state or federal agency uses a similar model.

I trust Council members are aware of this summer's Lake Erie bloom of toxic blue-green algae that forced National Guard mobilization to distribute drinking water.

Blue greens produce some of Nature's most powerful toxins that have caused the deaths of wildlife and humans and been linked to liver disease and neuro-degenerative disorders.

These blooms occur under low nitrate conditions.

NJDWSC and DEP studies -for this reason- warn any nitrate restrictions risk inducing these harmful blooms in Highlands reservoirs.

Despite the serious public health consequences - these studies were omitted from your reports. Outrageously, your staff then claimed without any supporting study or citation that restrictions were required to prevent these blooms.

Perhaps the Council can prevail upon Mr. Davis to explain why suppressing State studies of known water supply and public health risks, making false claims and selecting a failed model is not “misdoing”.

The Act obliges the Council to investigate any threat to the water supply calling it your “duty and responsibility” and to this end empowers the Council to compel testimony under oath.

It is therefore difficult to understand why Mr. Davis has said to take this somewhere else. Where or why he does not say as the Council was created for this very purpose.

Before I take the evidence of misconduct and public health risks “elsewhere” I would like to know whether this is a decision shared by Council members as these matters relate directly to your mission and your oath of office.

I await your reply.



From: Pat Moffitt

The Council is aware its staff is guided by no enforceable code of scientific conduct nor are any of its technical documents signed.

The Council and staff have refused to answer in a straightforward and direct manner the following logical question given the absence of any enforceable code of scientific conduct: *"Are there ANY prohibitions against a Council employee who may "falsify, conceal or cover up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact; make a materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or make or use any false writing or fraudulent statement or representation; or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry" as part of the rule making process?"*

It would seem the public deserves a simple yes or no answer given the gravity of this question and yet it has received none.

The Council has further acknowledged it will not review the existing Highlands science in the RMP review. The Council must explain to the public why it will not require Mr. James Hutzelmann P.E. to certify that he is not aware of any misrepresentations, omissions of material facts and use of any invalid or improper scientific or engineering methods in the Council's Water Resources Technical Report for which he is the named water specialist.

The requested certification by Mr. Hutzelmann is far less than that demanded of the public as we are not asking him to even certify the truth but simply that he is not aware of untruths.

The Council forces the public and their professionals to certify the accuracy of all submitted information under threat of fines and imprisonment. However, there is no similar obligation for the Council's staff who are directly responsible for the science used to justifying these public obligations. The public has a right to know why.



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
ENGINEERS  
6065 1 NW  
(STANHOPE)

CHESTER QUADRANGLE  
NEW JERSEY—MORRIS CO.  
7.5 MINUTE SERIES (TOPOGRAPHIC)  
NET CONTOUR 3.6 MI  
EDGEWOOD (JUNG U.S. 46) 0.3 MI  
2010 000 FEET  
74°37'30"





**Known families with cancer:**

**Time span from roughly 8 years ago to one month ago:**

- 1/.Address. 104 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (1)  
age: 50's (The Italian) four years ago.
- 2/ Address.\_102 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (0)  
age: 50's (Bucky). Five years ago.
- 3/. Address 98 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (3): died from cancer (1)  
age: 30s ( Bobby), father and mother 60s
- 4/. Address 90 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (2): died from cancer (0)  
age: 20s ( The hitman son) (five years ago and it came back again a year ago) Age  
( 50s)that hit man's wife
- 5/.Address 89 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (1) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (1)  
age: ? ( squirrel )
- 6/ Address 88 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey  
Quantity in family (2) : number of cancer (1) died from cancer (1)  
age: 50s about four years ago
- 7/. water well
- 8/. Water well question
- 9/. Fenimore landfill Roxbury New Jersey
- 10/. Address. 14 Nalron Drive Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (2) : died from cancer (2)  
age: 50s (The Marine about three years ago), age 60 The Marines wife three months ago) The  
sun move the houses for sale.
- 11/. Address. 8 More street Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (1)  
age: 58 (The painters husband) one month ago
- 12/. Address. 4 Nalron Dr. Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (0)  
age: 59 ( me)
- 13/ Address. 3 Nalron Dr. Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (2) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer (0)  
age: 60s ( Chucky ) about two years ago
- 14/ Address 208a Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (2): died from cancer (1)  
age: 50s. ( Lefty and his wife )
- 15/. Address 208b Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family (3) : number of cancer (2): died from cancer (1)  
age: 50s (The pilot) The family moved three years ago
- 16/. Address 163 Emmans road Ledgewood New Jersey:  
Quantity in family ( ? ) : number of cancer (1): died from cancer ( ? )  
age: 40s ( The woman with no hear) six months ago

Total # of Cancer  
19

Died from Cancer  
8