

NEW JERSEY HIGHLANDS WATER PROTECTION
AND PLANNING COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 1, 2007

PRESENT

JOHN WEINGART)	CHAIRMAN
KURT ALSTED)	COUNCIL MEMBERS
ELIZABETH CALABRESE)	
TRACY CARLUCCIO)	
BILL COGGER)	
TIM DILLINGHAM)	
JANICE KOVACH)	
MIMI LETTS)	
ERIK PETERSON)	
JACK SCHRIER)	
GLEN VETRANO)	
TAHESHA WAY)	
SCOTT WHITENACK)	

VIA TELECONFERENCE

DEBBIE PASQUARELLI

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman of the Council, John Weingart, called the 57th meeting of the New Jersey Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council to order at 4:03 pm.

ROLL CALL

The members introduced themselves. Debbie Pasquarelli participated by telephone.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

Chairman Weingart announced that the meeting was called in accordance with the Open Public meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, and that the Highlands Council had sent written notice of the time, date, and location of this meeting to pertinent newspapers or circulation throughout the State and posted on the Highlands Council website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was then recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2007

Mr. Schrier introduced a motion to approve the October 18, 2007 minutes. Ms. Kovach seconded it. All members present voted to approve with two abstentions - Elizabeth Calabrese and Debbie Pasquarelli. The minutes were APPROVED.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Weingart asked if there were any reports from Council Members. There were none. He asked Ms. Swan to give her Executive Director's report.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Swan discussed the ongoing work with staff and Siemon and Larson, the specifics of which would be covered in the discussion on the Regional Master Plan. She noted that she had attended the Smart Growth Retreat on October 19th hosted by OSG and Debbie Mans from the Governor's Office who also serves as the Smart Growth Ombudsman. The day long retreat focused on how state agencies could coordinate their work to ensure that the goals of Smart Growth are met. She also commented that she, Nancy Benecki (the Council's new Manager of Communications) and Tom Borden had attended the Plan Implementation Committee of the State Planning Commission on October 24th. Highlands staff had asked for waivers for the Highlands RMP from some of the standards under the proposed Plan Endorsement guidelines.. The following requests were accepted by the committee as amendments to the MOU:

1. The Plan Development Committee of the Highlands Council, or similarly composed Committee of the Council, shall satisfy the requirement of Plan Endorsement to create a Plan Endorsement Advisory Committee. This Committee shall guide the Highlands Council through the plan endorsement process, and shall serve as liaison with OSG and the other state agencies as it prepares the RMP for endorsement.
2. The Highlands Council has conducted the equivalent of a self-assessment through the preparation of the Regional Master Plan and as a result, the requirement for a self-assessment is waived under Plan Endorsement with the exception of the requirement to perform an assessment of the consistency of petitioner's plans and implementation mechanisms with the goals, policies and strategies of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.
3. The Highlands Task Force engaged the communities of the Highlands Region in preparing a vision for the future development of the Highlands Region as reflect in the Highlands Act. The Highlands Council has taken additional steps necessary to ensure broad interactive public participation including municipal and county outreach. As a result, the requirement for additional visioning is waived under Plan Endorsement.

The MOU with OSG, SPC and the Highlands Council was forwarded with unanimous approval to the SPC by the Committee. No changes were proposed.

Ms. Swan then introduced two new staff members – Laura Forrest who has joined the staff as a part-time Administrative Assistant. Laura has experience in administration and has Environmental Education Certificates from Cook College at Rutgers.

She also introduced Nancy Benecki as the new Manager of Communications. She noted that Nancy was the Public Relations Officer for the Meadowlands Commission and has also worked for newspapers. She has a degree in English Literature with a minor in Communications.

She continued her report indicating that Municipal, County and Constituent Outreach is continuing. A meeting had been held on October 22nd with Morris County MUA where water supply issues were discussed. She commented that there had been continuing coordination with other state agencies regarding the proposed TDR Expansion Bill.

Chairman Weingart announced the next two meetings would be held on November 8th at 10 am and November 19 at 4 pm. He also noted that the TDR Committee Chair Report was available.

Scott Whitenack, Chair of the TDR Committee, apologized for not being at the last meeting, but was unable to attend as he was involved in work on the Prudential Arena in Newark. He had no additions or changes to the Chair report.

Chairman Weingart welcomed Council Member Alstede who joined the meeting. Mr. Weingart then asked Ms. Swan and Mr. Siemon to begin the discussion of Regional Master Plan issues.

DISCUSSION OF REGIONAL MASTER PLAN ISSUES

Ms. Swan reviewed the progress on the Land Use Analysis Support System (LANDS model) in particular the output of the model in the form of zones. She acknowledged the tremendous contribution of the staff led by Roger Keren and the LANDS team consisting of the GIS, Planning and Science staff to accomplish the current output that responded to comments received from Council members, state agencies and the public. She characterized the indicators as follows:

Twenty-one (21) indicators were used to characterize the Highlands Region and to assign the most appropriate overlay designations. Indicators can be categorized into three types:

- (1) feature based indicators - location and extent of geographic objects
- (2) intensity indicators – density mapping, the magnitude to which an area in question included a particular feature
- (3) integrity-based indicators -the relative degree of quality of a particular resource

The result was the creation of Three Primary Zones within the Highlands Region. She noted that the previous Planned Community Zone was essentially what is now the Existing Community Zone. She described the zones as:

- The **Protection Zone (PZ)** which consists of high resource value lands that are important to maintaining water quality, quantity, and sensitive ecological resources. Land acquisition is a priority in the Protection Zone and development activities will be extremely limited.
- The **Conservation Zone (CZ)** which consists of areas with significant agricultural use lands interspersed with associated woodlands and environmental features that should be preserved when possible. Non-agricultural development activities will be limited.

- The **Existing Community Zone (ECZ)** which consists of areas with regionally significant concentrated development signifying existing communities. These areas may have existing infrastructure that may support development and redevelopment provided that it is compatible with the protection and character of the Highlands environment, at levels that are appropriate to maintain the character of established communities.

The LANDS model utilized a 75 acre minimum mapping threshold for the delineation of the three Primary Zones though the level of detail of the map was at a 50ft by 50 ft grid cell of 2,500 sq. feet.

Ms. Swan also reminded the Council and public that any growth was voluntary. She then continued with a discussion of the three new sub-zones with their definitions.

- The **Conservation Zone – Environmental Constrained Sub-Zone (CZ-EC)** consisting of significant environmental features within the Conservation Zone that should be preserved and protected from non-agricultural development.
- The **Existing Community Zone – Environmental Constrained Sub-Zone (ECZ-EC)** which consists of significant contiguous critical habitat, steep slopes and forested lands within the Existing Community Zone that should be protected from further fragmentation.
- The **Lake Community Sub-Zone (LCZ)** consisting of existing community development around lakes within the Existing Community Zone. This sub-zone is where the Existing Community Zone overlaps the Lake Management Area. This zone has unique policies to prevent degradation of water quality and watershed pollution, harm to lake ecosystems, and to protect the community character of lake communities. She mentioned that these overlaps were a direct result of comments that had been received and that the shape files were still being evaluated.

She noted that the current LANDS layers are not RASTAR based as in the 2006 draft plan but GIS based and that the LANDS mapping can be replicated and shared with State, County and Municipal governments to assist them in their planning efforts. She then showed several slides to visually demonstrate the zones and sub-zones as they currently exist in the model.

Mr. Schrier spoke in support of the change in approach and thought that clarifying and changing the Planned Community Zone to Existing Community Zone would be helpful to municipalities and was more representative of the areas. Ms. Pasquarelli asked about the number of criteria and why they were changed. Mr. Siemon responded to her question discussing the refinement of the map that had been done by looking at the gross indicators. He reviewed the issue that had been addressed by this new approach, namely that there had been overlapping criteria that had been masking other features that were important for the analysis. He confirmed his opinion that there was more accuracy and more reliability with this new approach, particularly within the constrained zones that were such an important part of this Regional Master Plan. He also added that this map is more consistent with what is actually on the ground.

Ms. Pasquarelli asked about the zone name change for Planned Community Zone as she was having difficulty hearing. It was clarified by Chairman Weingart that the new zone was the Existing Community Zone.

There was additional discussion about the application of the standards applying to the Environmentally Constrained zones. Mr. Siemon commented on this subject to the extent that there are different protections in place depending on the subject matter.

There was another discussion with respect to septic density and how it would be applied in the zones. Ms. Swan commented that the septic density would not be applied by zone specifically, but by the primary zone in HUC14. She reviewed the strategy was to have each municipality have the option of making its own determination where the septic systems should be located, but having the local governments adhere to the number of systems as a limit. Ms. Swan also commented that Plan Conformance would be critical in having a consistent approach to septic density. Mr. Dillingham noted that Plan Conformance could require rezoning to accomplish these goals.

Mr. Siemon introduced the next section of future land use goals, policies and objectives. The two primary goals are:

- Guidance of development away from environmentally sensitive and agricultural lands and promote development and redevelopment in or adjacent to existing developed lands.
- Utilization of the highlands land use capability map as a framework for the character, location, and magnitude of new growth and development in the Highlands Region.

He emphasized that the LANDS model is not a local zoning map. He continued by adding that the relationship between the Land Use Capability Map to the ground will have to some extent be determined by municipalities during Plan Conformance. He also noted that he believed the Council should consider allowing Map Adjustments to boundaries by local government. He continued with the comment that for local governments to participate there has to be an opportunity for a merit based discussion for sound planning and smart growth to be implemented at the local level. He noted that for the Policy 6B3 it was important to define the criteria that would govern the Map Adjustments where appropriate.

Mr. Dillingham and Ms. Carluccio expressed their concern about allowing any deviation from the plan to the local municipalities and that County government should not have the authority to dictate to municipalities to make changes at the local level. Ms. Swan clarified that in the program on this matter is made clear that these adjustments require a municipal resolution and the language in the Goals, Policies and Objectives would be changed to reflect this. Mr. Schrier noted that the County Planning Act does not provide authority for the County to dictate this in any case. He spoke in support of allowing some choices for local government in order to encourage Plan Conformance. Ms. Letts also spoke in support of allowing what she characterized as flexibility and emphasized the importance of encouraging the creation of TDR receiving zones.

There was additional discussion on this policy and Chairman Weingart noted that there were not a majority of members who wanted to delete the Policy 6B3 and that additional discussion of the criteria of this program would take place on November 8th.

Ms. Swan continued the discussion commenting that the next sections were updates on matters already brought before the Council. The next section was water supply and wastewater utility capacity. She reviewed the methodology used by staff as follows:

- Identified facilities that serve any portion of the Highlands Region, regardless of whether the treatment facility itself is located within the Region, and their permit or Wastewater Management Plan limitations for flow. The facilities were limited to those serving more than a single property, eliminating non-community, commercial and industrial systems.
- Identify the Existing Area Served, both within and outside of the Highlands Region, to determine what portion of the service area is within the Region.
- Determine the maximum three-month discharges for each facility for the years 2002-2004, and pro-rate that amount to the Highlands Region depending on Step 2. The process of pro-rating discharges is necessary in the absence of facility-specific information on wastewater flows from each portion of their service area. More detailed information could modify the results.
- Compare the Highlands portion of the discharge flow against the Highlands portion of the permitted capacity and determine whether the facility is in deficit or has remaining capacity.

Ms. Swan also noted that these changes were undertaken to update information including that given to the staff as a result of public comment. Dr. Van Abs commented that further updates would be part of the current science agenda to procure and maintain updated information.

Ms. Swan reviewed the next agenda item: calculating septic system density and yield. She noted that there were a number of considerations to review:

- NJDEP Highlands Rules will apply in Preservation Area
- Septic system yield calculations are not included for the Existing Community Zone
- The computed median nitrate concentrations for the Protection and Conservation Zones within the Planning Area are 0.72 mg/l and 1.87 mg/l, respectively.
- For ground water recharge, the annual drought recharge was estimated for each HUC14 subwatershed by using GSR-32
- In the first table, excluding preserved lands, the total septic system yield for the Conservation and Protection Zones of the Planning Area is 6928 units

- In the second table, including preserved lands, the total septic system yield is 8160 units.
- Proposed alternative approach with special conditions for the Highlands.

A fundamental policy decision that the Council must make relates to the question of whether land dedicated as open space and farmland should be included in the analysis. Yield calculations were presented both ways, with preserved lands included and with them excluded, to give a comparison of the results. In many subwatersheds there is little difference, while in others the differences are significant. Ms. Swan explained that the staff recommendation is that the default approach is not to include preserved land but that municipalities may choose to include preserved lands in the analysis of septic system yields for the Conservation and Protection Zone as an alternative approach providing they meet certain conditions.

The first requirement for the alternate approach is that it must be consistent with NJDEP Water Quality Management Planning Rules. Further Dr. VanAbs explained that the municipality would have to demonstrate that including the septic system yields from the preserved lands results in a development density and pattern that is not greater than that allowed by existing zoning and is compatible with the pattern of development associated with the affected Zone; and also the municipality implements or causes to be implemented (by development applicants benefiting from the increased septic system yields either directly or through contribution to an implementation fund) agricultural management practices that will reduce nitrate loadings to the same HUC14 subwatershed by: at least the same amount as the estimated septic system loadings from the additional density where the HUC14 subwatershed median nitrate concentration is lower than the relevant Conservation or Protection Zone median concentration, or at least equal to double the estimated septic system loadings from the additional density where the HUC14 subwatershed median nitrate concentration is higher than the relevant Conservation or Protection Zone median concentration.

Ms. Carluccio asked about the monitoring of offsets and how that would be accomplished. Dr. Van Abs commented that monitoring of this type of non-point source pollution was difficult and that the approach would be to select a target and monitor to that target. He also noted in response to other comments that additional work was ongoing to create layout and design options for new septic systems. Ms. Carluccio said that she was writing up some changes for possible adoption on the septic density issues.

Mr. Siemon continued with calculation of net water availability. He began with the three important components that were used in the analysis of net water availability at a HUC14 subwatershed level :

- the sustainability of water resources (ground water capacity);
- the water that is “available” for human use (ground water availability); and

- the remaining water after current consumptive and depletive uses are deducted (net water availability).

Mr. Siemon also reviewed the thresholds by zones:

- In the Protection and Conservation Zones, the allowable threshold is 5% for potable or non-agricultural uses. For agricultural uses within a Conservation Zone, the threshold is 10%. In the Existing Community Zone, the threshold is 20%.
- Consumptive/depletive uses are those uses that are not returned to the subwatershed by a discharge back into ground or a stream. The analysis compared these consumptive/depletive uses against ground water availability. This difference is called net water availability.
- The RMP restricts additional uses in deficit subwatershed. The RMP conditionally allows an additional 1% of ground water availability in the Protection Zone and Conservation Zone, and 2% in the Existing Community Zone. However, these uses are conditional upon applicants providing demonstration of 125% mitigation.

Dr. Van Abs then reviewed the significance with slides demonstrating the areas that were in deficit and those with availability. He also noted that for the areas in deficit, they were also in deficit by the less stringent state standards. There was a further discussion about allowing any development in deficit areas. Mr. Dillingham reiterated his position that mitigation should be implemented before allowing additional uses and Ms. Letts commented that perhaps the Council should take a position with NJDEP that the allocations should be reviewed. Chairman Weingart asked is there would be any more information before the November 19th meeting on this subject and Dr. Van Abs noted that he is continuing with research and having ongoing conversations with NJDEP. He gave an example highlighting that conservation measures can be effective. Dr. Van Abs also mentioned a pilot program that the staff is working on with Clinton on their water management plan. There were some additional comments about the effectiveness of these studies on water availability for agriculture.

The next topic outlined was RMP program: Highlands restoration: water deficits

- The Highlands Council will continually update and verify the data utilized in its capacity assessments. Through the Plan Conformance process with municipalities and counties, the Council will obtain local-scale information about water use and water supply from local governments and utilities.
- Where water deficits within a subwatershed are identified and validated, affected stakeholders will develop a strategic approach to addressing these shortages. All of these strategies must be detailed and implemented as appropriate and feasible through a Water Management Plan.
- Development of HUC14 Water Management Strategies

- Coordination with NJDEP Water Allocation Program

Ms. Letts commented that staff should look at conservation plans State wide and seek to have them adopted more broadly.

Ms. Swan continued with the RMP program on redevelopment

The Regional Master Plan strives to accommodate regional growth and development needs primarily through the reuse and redevelopment of previously developed areas. The Highlands Redevelopment Program helps interested parties, municipalities, counties, state, and federal agencies understand where redevelopment opportunities are targeted by the RMP through the following:

- Site development standards will be provided
- The Highlands Council will seek to streamline the redevelopment process by establishing a Highlands Interagency Team.
- The Council will also provide technical assistance and grants.

The Highlands Council staff has analyzed developed areas and characterized them by their potential for enhanced growth opportunities and developed a redevelopment potential tool for use during Plan Conformance. She emphasized that it was a starting point for municipalities to identify where they should first look for redevelopment opportunities.

Ms. Swan showed several slides indicating how the tool could work.. Several members commented that developers would have to be involved in order to get these projects started. Ms. Swan spoke about an interagency team, BRIT, approach that had been effective at the Office of Smart Growth and that this approach could work effectively in redevelopment and revitalization working with municipalities. She also noted that there were municipal grant funds available that the Highlands Council can award to help planning for these projects. Mr. Schrier again noted the spelling of greyfields vs. grayfields.

Carbonate Rock or Karst was the next program subject introduced by Ms. Swan. The following are the major program issues:

- The Highlands Council will identify critical requirements for development ordinances.
- The Highlands Council will develop a technical guidance manual for use by municipalities that have land areas that are within or drain to the Carbonate Rock Area.
- The Highlands Council, working with municipalities during the site plan and subdivision approval process, will establish and maintain an inventory of karst features that are found in the Highlands Region.

Ms. Swan continued with the RMP Program: Restoration of Streams and Riparian Areas noting that staff continues to look for existing guidance and not create new programs where adequate ones already exist. The following are the major program issues:

- The Highlands Council will develop technical guidance for use by municipalities for the restoration of impaired streams. Existing guidance manuals, *Stream Restoration Design*, developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and *Stream Corridor Restoration*, developed by the Federal Interagency Stream Corridor Restoration Working Group, will be used as two examples for the Council's work.
- The Highlands Council will develop or adapt technical guidance for use by municipalities for the restoration of impaired riparian areas. *Stream Corridor Restoration*, developed by the Federal Interagency Stream Corridor Restoration Working Group will be used as one example for the Council's work.

Mr. Siemon mentioned that he and Lane Kendig are still working with staff to strengthen the programs. He then reviewed the RMP Program: Historic Preservation Resource Protection. Municipalities will be encouraged to:

- establish a Historic Preservation Commission;
- adopt ordinances, zoning rules, development regulations and programs that protect these resources and to address their potential reuse and rehabilitation;
- adopt guidelines and/or regulations , where appropriate to address the issue of teardowns; and
- The Highlands Council will develop a historic preservation manual to provide guidance, technical assistance and potential funding information.

There were comments about several counties that offered grants for historic preservation – among them, Morris and Bergen

The last program presented was Scenic Resource Protection. This program establishes a procedure for identifying regionally significant scenic resources within the Highlands Region and provides methods to preserve these vistas through the following:

- Baseline Inventory
- The Council will establish procedures for nomination, evaluation and inventory of Highlands regionally significant scenic resources.
- Encourage municipalities and counties to work jointly with neighboring municipalities and counties to conduct the scenic resource inventories on a regional or sub-regional scale.
- Encourage municipalities and counties to include scenic resources in the open space and recreation plan elements of the municipal and county master plan.
- The Council will develop strategies to protect scenic resources including ordinances and review procedures.

Mr. Siemon commented that the steep slope regulations will help to preserve scenic vistas as will protection of the environmentally sensitive areas. Mr. Borden will provide the Council

with the Highlands Act protections for scenic vistas. There was additional discussion about the public comment received, in particular, from Helen Heinrich on this subject and that the nomination procedures were out for public comment currently. Mr. Schrier asked for a revised copy of those procedures. Mr. Alstede commented that this component is subjective and will be difficult to manage.

Chairman Weingart returned to the agenda item with respect to the establishment of the comment period for the RMP. Council members concurred with the proposal to establish a sixty (60) day comment period. Mr. Weingart noted, for example, that assuming the draft is released on or about November 19th, the comment period would be open though approximately January 25th, 2008.

Chairman Weingart asked for other comments from members.

Debbie Pasquarelli expressed concerns about Council involvement in decisions relating to map changes; further she asked which factors were removed from the map and thought the Council needed to see a table indicating the changes from the first edition of the Lands Abstract.

Ms. Swan handed out a table indicating those changes. The Protection Zone in 2006 had 557,507 acres and now has 469,530 a difference of approximately 16%. The addition of the transportation indicators and updated sewer areas where pipes are in the ground would account for this capturing of areas where there is an existing pattern of development. The Existing Community showed 149,624 acres in 2006 and now shows 146,037 but the Existing Community Constrained Sub-zone in this map shows 32,175 acres and the Lake Community Sub-zone shows 20,698 acres. The total for Existing Community Zone in 2006 was 149,624 acres and is now 198,910 acres with a difference of 33%. The Conservation Zone showed 152,227 acres in 2006 and now 70,284 but shows 120,634 in the environmentally constrained conservation zone a total of 190,918 acres for difference of approximately 25%. Ms. Swan pointed out that the Council should focus on the fact that overall the zone mapping in 2006 showed constrained lands of 557,507 acres and now shows 643,037 acres which means that the environmentally constrained lands are now approximately 75% of the Region where they were shown as 65% in 2006.

Ms. Pasquarelli also commented that the Council had not had enough of a role in the approach staff took with respect to reviewing the public comments and deciding how they should be incorporated in the revised draft regional master plan. Ms. Swan responded that Council members had received a summary of the public comments and that the public comments were accessible both on the members-only website as well as the Highlands website. Further, she explained that a comment response document would be prepared for consideration after the release of the plan when it was clear what changes had been incorporated. Mr. Weingart asked if other members shared the concerns Ms. Pasquarelli had just expressed, and no one responded. Chairman Weingart also noted that the Council will provide a response document although there is no legal requirement for one because adoption of the plan is not a rulemaking.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Candy Ashmun

She noted that her appearance was personal and not representing the Pinelands Commission. She spoke in support of Policy 6B3 but clarified that it should not be characterized as providing municipal flexibility, but rather an adjustment at the local level that was necessary. She discussed the experience in the Pinelands with data having to be adjusted and noted that these adjustments usually had resulted in no net change or very little change.

She also commented on the difficulty of monitoring and testing septic systems and that there were few states that did have programs of that nature. She did mention that Massachusetts and Rhode Island did have those programs as well as the Pinelands area of New Jersey.

She also spoke about the use of “regular septic systems” and discussed the two approaches that the Pinelands had taken: 1) alternative systems, e.g. package plants for grandfathered small lots and villages, and 2) regular systems requiring 3 ½ acres of land. She also noted that there was research available and she thought it would be helpful for the Council to look into that.

Julia Somers, NJ Highlands Coalition

She spoke in support of the environmentally constrained sub-zones. She did not support Policy 6B3 believing that it could be difficult to manage. She did agree with Ms. Ashmun’s view that no net change would be an appropriate approach, but she asked the Council to not lose sight of the cumulative impact on resources.

With respect to Water Supply she advocated for having DEP’s Water Supply Master Plan consistent with the RMP. She continued to be troubled by the net water availability analysis and thought that agriculture had to be part of the solution.

Wilma Frey, NJCF

She asked if the capacity maps shown today would be available on the website. Mr. Borden responded that they would be available shortly. She advocated that the map colors be the same from the first set of capacity maps to the second generation for comparison purpose. She also urged that with respect to the Scenic Resource Protection, the Council look to add other resources, e.g. Highlands Trail, Municipal and Open Space on Green Acres ROSI’s and Preserved Farmland. Ms. Letts commented that not all recreational lands on ROSI’s are scenic.

Marion Harris, Morris County Trust for Historic Preservation

She noted that the riparian areas are the most likely to include archaeological sites and should be examined before streambank restoration. She spoke in support of the new language in the Historic Preservation Program but was concerned about the two types of historic preservation commissions in the state. She advocated for commissions that were not just advisory, but those that had regulatory authority and commented that those individuals interested in this subject were disappearing. She also recommended to the Council that it to do design review for historic sites as there was no municipal or state entity doing that work currently. She also supported guidelines for teardowns and historic transportation infrastructure. She reiterated her previous comments about increasing the inventory of

historic resources by requiring that subject to be addressed by applicants for Council approvals.

Helen Heinrich, NJ Farm Bureau

She commented that there are a great many issues with respect to historic and scenic preservation and that these are very subjective issues. She asked that her concerns be shared with Mr. Siemon and it was noted that he was still in attendance. She asked if she should continue to submit comments prior to November 19th and Chairman Weingart encouraged her to do so.

Mr. Schrier introduced a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:03 pm and Ms. Kovach seconded it. All voted to adjourn.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council.

Dated: _____

Paula M. Dees, Executive Assistant

historic resources by requiring that subject to be addressed by applicants for Council approvals.

Helen Heinrich, NJ Farm Bureau

She commented that there are a great many issues with respect to historic and scenic preservation and that these are very subjective issues. She asked that her concerns be shared with Mr. Siemon and it was noted that he was still in attendance. She asked if she should continue to submit comments prior to November 19th and Chairman Weingart encouraged her to do so.

Mr. Schrier introduced a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:03 pm and Ms. Kovach seconded it. All voted to adjourn.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council.

Dated: December 19, 2007

Paula M. Dees
Paula M. Dees, Executive Assistant

TRUE COPY