



3/14/11

Cumberland County Open Space and Recreation Master Plan

SC# 09154.1

MEETING MINUTES – Study Committee Meeting #6

Meeting Dates: March 10, 2011

Meeting Time: 9:30 AM

Location: County Administration Building, Bridgeton

Present: See attached attendance list.

1. Roger Ruske (Cumberland County Planning Board) began the meeting with introductions.
2. Peter Simone reviewed the New Jersey SCORP (Statewide Comprehensive Open Space and Recreation Plan) calculation as it pertains to this study. He noted that past interpretations of SCORP by NJ Green Acres Staff has required direct ownership of land in order for it to be considered as “supply” in the Balanced Land Use formula. As a result, lands not directly owned by Cumberland County should not be counted as “supply” in the calculation as currently found in the Draft Cumberland County Open Space & Recreation Plan (OSRP). Municipal parks, NJ DEP lands and Non-Profit lands are excluded from the County’s “supply” of land. Only the County’s fairground parcel may be counted as “supply”. This “official” SCORP calculation will be included in the OSRP.
3. Since Cumberland County owns little land, the Balanced Land Use formula will indicate a large deficit of open space / recreational land available that is actually owned by the County. As this finding does not completely reflect the reality of open space and recreational land available to County residents, the OSRP will also include an alternate calculation showing lands actually available to residents. Simone Collins suggests this is a reasonable approach to calculating where Cumberland County is in relationship to the State guidelines, since from a recreational lands supply standpoint, it makes little difference to County residents whether the County owns a site like Union Lake Wildlife Management Area or the State does.

X:\09154.00 Cumberland Cnty\Meetings\110310_SC6_minutes.docx

4. Peter Simone reviewed comments received to date on the draft OSRP and Simone Collins' responses to those comments (see attached).
5. The Study Committee and other attendees had the following comments on the draft OSRP:
 - Add more information on the positive impacts of preserving open space.
 - Emphasize language that leaves open the option of county land ownership in the future.
 - Include a list of the amounts of open space / recreational land amassed by other counties in New Jersey.
 - Some in attendance expressed a need for including a percentage spending cap on activities other than land acquisition when and if the County's Farmland and Open Space Preservation Trust Fund legislation is revised. Simone Collins suggests that any caps determined at this time are somewhat arbitrary and recommends that language be added to the OSRP stating that caps (or funding set-asides) may need to be considered in the future.
6. The draft OSRP will be revised per the discussion items above. The final version of the OSRP is tentatively scheduled to be presented to the County Planning Board in May. Bob Brewer will confirm a date as it approaches.

The preceding notes are the professional's summation of the meeting and not an official transcript. Please advise of any errors or omissions.

Submitted by:

SIMONE COLLINS
Landscape Architecture



Stephen Sinclair

Cc: Meeting attendees
Study Committee members



[SIMONE COLLINS RESPONSES IN BOLD]

Bob Brewer, Director of Planning
Cumberland County Planning and Development
790 E. Commerce Street
Bridgeton, NJ 08302

Peter Simone, FASLA
Simone Collins Landscape Architecture
511 Old Lancaster Road
Berwyn, PA 19312

February 10, 2011

Dear Bob, Peter & Staff,

The South Jersey Bayshore Coalition thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Cumberland County Open Space & Recreation Master Plan (OSRMP). The Plan is a good amalgamation of recommendations, survey results and information. However, the critical reasoning for preserving open space in Cumberland County is lacking in the document.

We would like to see the Green Acres Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) Guidelines adhered to in the document and language inserted that accentuates the importance of Cumberland's open space for forest habitat, biodiversity, wildlife, water quality, recreation and ecotourism dollars. Studies should be referenced which show the economic benefits of open space. The 2006 USFWS studies can be found at:
<http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/Subpages/NationalSurvey/reports2006.html> **[USFWS Studies will be referenced.]**

As part of the County Master Plan, the OSRMP should reflect and honor voter and resident survey sentiments regarding the need for more open space and their willingness to pay for it. Current and future goals for county implementation of the OSRMP should clearly state that the County is interested in preserving farm, recreation and open space lands as the County is mandated to protect these lands by the Open Space Tax purposes. Adherence to Green Acres Planning Incentive Guidelines will profit the county in the future, and create a balanced land preservation program. The OSRMP will be a critical guidance document for future county planning and coordination with the state Green Acres Program and non-profits.

As indicated in the Green Acres Mission Statement and Program language:

"Green Acres Mission Statement

To achieve, in partnership with others, a system of interconnected open spaces whose protection will preserve and enhance New Jersey's natural environment and its historic, scenic, and recreational resources for public use and enjoyment.

An OSRP articulates a local government's vision of open space and recreation. It should establish a philosophical and practical justification for the protection and preservation of open space and recreation opportunities. The purpose of an OSRP is to provide a framework for implementation. Through an OSRP, you identify and examine open space and recreation resources important to you and lay out ways to protect and enjoy them.

Why is it important to plan for open space and recreation? Without planning, the appearance of a community, the quality of life enjoyed by residents, and the community's natural resources can all be dramatically altered in a short period of time due to random changes in land use. We all know of areas that have been suburbanized and the associated impacts these areas have experienced. No one wants to live in a community that does not have parks or recreation areas. Yet, in order to provide these for residents, a local government must plan for them. Open space and recreation should be considered

as part of the public infrastructure, just like roads, schools and utilities. No community would build a road without establishing the need for it and planning where it should go. The same is true for open space and recreation.”

(GREEN ACRES PROGRAM New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION PLAN GUIDELINES for Participation in the Green Acres Planning Incentive Program)

Perhaps most importantly, the Cumberland County OSRMP should clarify the acreage of open space data to reflect SCORP Guidelines. Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) are not “parks” and are not recognized by Green Acres as Open Space in their calculations for the percentage of open space needed in each county. The WMA acreage should not be used in calculating the open space needs of Cumberland County. ***[Acreage the county does not own (including WMA’s) will not be used in the official SCORP calculation. An alternate calculation will also be included which does include the WMA / Non Profit / Municipal acreage.]***

We would like to recommend the language changes below based upon the long-term requirements of an Open Space Plan and to clarify Cumberland County’s vision for the future:
(Suggested language is underlined)

Please don’t hesitate to contact Jody Carrara if you have any questions about the SJBC Recommendations.

Sincerely,
Sandy Batty, Executive Director
Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions

1. Executive Summary

Page 1, 6th Bullet

Investigated the current financial implications of this initiative ***[We still need to note that investigation of financial implications was “general” in nature – current or not.]***

Linkages-Summary

Page 2, 3rd Bullet

*On-Road trails and Off-Road trails – complete a comprehensive master plan for a system of on-road bicycle trails and additional off-road trails throughout the county. Engage NJDOT at the outset of this process to coordinate and possibly help fund this process. Engage the National Park Service, NJ Fish & Wildlife, NGOs and local municipal partners in this process. ***[Agreed]***

Land Acquisition-Summary

Page 3,

*Land preservation for parks, open space and natural areas should prioritize and recognize municipal Open Space Plans & Goals. Acquisition of open space must recognize private property rights; every effort should be made to accommodate the landowner, while also apprising the municipality of open space purchased. ***[Agreed]***

*Acquisition of new lands for parks, open space and natural areas is an important part of the OSRMP and should be supported by the County in conjunction with the Farm Land Preservation Program. The County should act as a source and conduit for funding to municipalities and NGO’s for open space acquisition. ***[Language should remain about acquisition not being the primary focus of the OSRP initiative.]***

(Third Bullet as written minus the last sentence) ***[Agreed]***

Funding- Summary

Page 3, 1st Bullet

*Do not include planning as a use for County Open Space Tax/Include a cap of 20% for activities other than acquisition. Administration of the fund should be derived from the General Administrative Fund. ***[We do not agree. This does not provide the county with flexibility and could limit the funding of equally important initiatives.]***

Data Collection

Natural Characteristics

Page 7

Expand this paragraph to include the forest complexes, biodiversity, Natural Heritage Priority Sites, RAMSAR Convention site, migratory flyway and shorebird beaches. (This is part of the rationale for preserving open space.)

The language inserted can be found in the NJF&W Wildlife Action Plan, excerpts from pages 181-181, available on the web: <http://www.njfishandwildlife.com/ensp/waphome.htm>:

"This region has the highest concentration of rare and endangered wildlife in New Jersey, accompanied by the lowest density of urban development in the state. The Delaware Bay Landscape is a region of global importance and offers considerable opportunities for conservation." **[Agreed]**

"The Delaware Bay Landscape is essential for the viability of national and international bird migrations as well as rare New Jersey wildlife. This region includes the Delaware Bay coast and marshes, critical stopover habitat for Western Hemispheric migratory shorebirds, including red knots, which depend on this coastline and an abundant food supply. This region also includes the Cape May Peninsula, nationally recognized for its high-density migration of passerines, American woodcock, and raptors that are funneled along the Atlantic and Delaware Bay coasts." **[Agreed]**

The Delaware Bay region supports the largest portion of the state's bald eagle population, and has been essential to the recovery of the eagle in the state. The Delaware Bay region is a critical migration and wintering area for American black ducks in the Atlantic Flyway. The marshes of the large rivers of this region support one of the largest fall concentrations of sora in the Atlantic Flyway. The region is crucial to the state's population of eastern tiger salamander, Cope's gray treefrog, northern harrier and black rail. **In addition, the region holds some of the state's largest contiguous forest blocks, which support species that depend on unbroken forest habitats – some of the most rare and sensitive species in the state.** Delaware Bay beaches, wetlands, forests, and grasslands support an abundance of rare and migratory wildlife. Included are federally-listed aquatic species (sea turtles and shortnose sturgeon) marginally supported in this region. There are 13 state endangered, 14 state threatened, and 128 special concern and regional priority wildlife species. The bald eagle, black skimmer, Henslow's sparrow, least tern, northern harrier, peregrine falcon, red-shouldered hawk, short-eared owl, sedge wren, vesper sparrow, corn snake, Cope's treefrog, eastern tiger salamander are the state endangered within the Delaware Bay Landscape. State threatened wildlife include the barred owl, black rail, black-crowned night-heron, bobolink, Cooper's hawk, grasshopper sparrow, long-ear owl, osprey, red knot, red-headed woodpecker, savannah sparrow, northern pine snake, Pine Barrens treefrog, and frosted elfin. Special concern wildlife include cavity-nesters, coastal marsh birds, colonial waterbirds, forest passerines, grassland birds, and scrub-shrub/open field birds; northern diamondback terrapins, carpenter frogs, and other reptiles and amphibians. In addition, summer populations of forest-dwelling bat species, potentially including the federal endangered Indiana bat, occur in the Delaware Bay." **[Agreed]**

Page 14

Page 14

Include an internet link to the NJDEP Landscape Project & Mapping **[Agreed]**

Page 15

Include language about the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan which mandates Cluster Ordinances and density bonuses which allow for significantly more development. **[Agreed. However, development will still tend to be less than that of non-Pinelands areas.]**

Page 16

Both Cohansey and Maurice Rivers and the Delaware Bay serve as part of the Atlantic Flyway for migratory birds. **[Agreed]**

Page 17

Cape May County, New Jersey

...45% of the County's land area is preserved, wetlands or open water. CAFRA regulations have been avoided by building developments of 24 units or less. **[Agreed]**

Page 19

Salem County Open Space Plan

The language in their plan reflects their vision for the future. Language such as this should be inserted in the Cumberland County OSRMP recommendations to support the rationale of protecting open space. **[Addressed in previous comments.]**

2. Analysis

Page 32

Open Space Need Chart.

Remove the NJDEP Lands as Open Space. This 42,994 acreage is not supposed to be in the SCORP calculation. Provide an asterisk at the bottom of the table explaining why the acreage is not included. **[Addressed in previous comments.]**

Page 33

- Remove the paragraph about 37% open space being sufficient. The OSRMP is supposed to give rationale for preserving open space, not reasons for NOT preserving open space. This document should reflect the recreational open space needs of the county and resident sentiments which were clearly expressed in the survey. The County's current fiscal state should not be guiding the language in the OSRMP as the document will be a part of the overall vision as part of the Master Plan. The fiscal state of the county will change over time and change significantly when voters choose an increase in Open Space Tax. **[This section will be re-worded based on the official SCORP calculation.]**

Page 35

Map 5

*...CAFRA law regulates all land development within 150 feet of the Mean High Water (MHW) line. Beyond the 150 feet from MHW, CAFRA regulates residential developments of 25 units or more and commercial development of 50 or more parking spaces. **[Agreed]**

Page 36

Map 6 Areas of Interest for Preservation

Add language for each Tier which indicates the species, habitat, wetlands, streams and biodiversity found in these Tiers. (Information can be found in Landscape Project Data). This data is also the rationale for preserving open space. **[This detail is not necessary. The OSRP explains how the data is used and as requested, the hyperlink to the Landscape Project Data will be provided.]**

3. Recommendations

Land Acquisition

Page 43 & 44

Change language to conform to Green Acres SCORP Guidelines. Cumberland County does not have 37% Open Space. Municipal residents voted unanimously for an Open Space Tax believing funds would be spent on both Farmland and Open Space, thus the county is mandated to preserve both. While apprising a municipality of open space acquired, again, we emphasize that the plan is a guide for the future and should NOT discourage private property owners from selling their land. **[We will re-word based on the official SCORP calculation.]**

Land Acquisition – Summary recommendations

Page 48

*Land preservation for parks, open space and natural areas should prioritize and recognize municipal Open Space Plans & Goals. Acquisition of open space must recognize private property rights; every effort should be made to accommodate the landowner, while also apprising the municipality of open space purchased. **[Repeat comment.]**

*Acquisition of new lands for parks, open space and natural areas is an important part of the OSRP and should be supported by the County in conjunction with the Farm Land Preservation Program. The County should act as a source and conduit for funding to municipalities and NGO's for open space acquisition. **[Repeat comment.]**

(Third Bullet as written minus the last sentence) **[Repeat comment.]**

An additional observation about relating to the general public regarding preservation, the public feels a strong attachment to the benefits of open space – clean water, drinking water, clean air, fresh vegetables, farms and recreational

opportunities. And they do not as readily connect to words like watershed, water recharge, and open space. In as much as the summary document is to be used by the general public we should explore if the friendlier words are abundant enough. We not suggesting eliminating proper language but suggesting we have enough of the words that people connect with, since we want them to embrace the final document. **[Agreed]**

Local Municipal Open Space Tax

Page 51

Upper Deerfield sets aside \$50,000 each year for open space purchase. **[This will be noted; however, it is not a dedicated tax.]**

Use of Funds for Park, Open Space and Natural Area Initiatives

Page 58

Remove Planning & Administration from the list of activities the Open Space Tax may be used for and place a cap of 20% on usage other than acquisition **[Addressed in previous comments.]**

Criteria for County Funding Applications

Page 60

Bullet 4 Open Space saves municipalities money. This is well documented

http://www.cfr.washington.edu/research.envmind/Policy/EDRA_Value.pdf

<http://www.skyclean.org/archive/rtables.html> **[We assume this comment refers to the fourth bullet point: "Acquisition does not negatively affect the local tax base." We think this is a reasonable criteria item for decisions relating to county funding.]**

Funding – Summary Recommendations

Page 61

Remove Planning & Administration from list of activities to be supported by an OS Tax and place a 20% cap on activities other than acquisition **[Addressed in previous comments.]**

Add language to the final chapter of the OSRMP that is supportive of Open Space protection while recognizing current fiscal restraints. Reference could be made to the funding that other counties receive from the Green Acres Program.

[Agreed.]

Funding for other counties

2008 – 2012

New Jersey

Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation

Plan

Table 11

Green Acres County Planning Incentive Funding

1999-2006

County Funding Awarded

Atlantic \$ 8,000,000

Bergen \$ 5,650,000

Burlington \$ 8,750,000

Camden \$ 6,750,000

Gloucester \$ 4,550,000

Hudson \$ 2,385,000

Hunterdon \$ 7,523,350

Mercer \$ 7,000,000

Middlesex \$ 9,750,000

Monmouth \$ 12,045,000

Morris \$ 7,225,706

Ocean \$ 5,250,000

Passaic \$ 5,000,000

Somerset \$ 13,250,000

Sussex \$ 1,250,000

Union \$ 6,750,000

Warren \$ 3,250,000

Total \$114,379,056

Stephen Sinclair

Subject: RE: Additional recommendations for OSRP

[SIMONE COLLINS COMMENTS IN BOLD]

From: Matt Blake [<mailto:Matt@littoralsociety.org>]

Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 2:55 PM

To: Peter M. Simone; Stephen Sinclair; Robert G. Brewer; Matt Pisarski

Cc: William Whelan; efresh@mindspring.com

Subject: Additional recommendations for OSRP

Dear Peter,

Sorry I was unable to make yesterday's OSRP session.

I know Jessica conveyed our support for the plan and the great work you and Stephen put into, but I also wanted to make a few additional suggestions.

1) We would really like to have the attached map included in the OSRP at it shows the general location of each of the sites and/or areas we outlined in our submission. We actually used the Garden State Greenways Map as background, and agree with Steve Jandoli that it might be useful to discuss the program/tool. **[Agreed]**

2) Also, we think item #8 on the Project Ranking Criteria for County Funding Requests, i.e. the "Score Card" is problematic and recommend it be removed. Item #8 is: Project does not negatively impact existing property tax ratables. We don't think it's a good idea to include this criterion, because some highly sought properties will invariably also have high development potential and competing uses. Since the plan specifies that all projects decisions will require local approval it seems unnecessary to include this language and tie a given town's hands. Consider the 400 acre Wawa Tract where city officials are considering preserving half the tract while intensively developing the remainder. No. 8 could cost them 2 points on a tract that city representatives have already suggested as possibly appropriate for establishing a future county park. **[Agreed]**

3) It might be helpful to elaborate on recommendation that the "County should act as a source and conduit for funding to local municipalities and NGO's for acquisition." (land acquisition summary recommendations 3rd bullet, pg 48). I am concerned that some readers might not make the connection between this recommendation and that of "County not taking ownership and maintenance role for new lands at this time." (land acquisition summary recommendations 3rd bullet, pg 48) Evidence of this can be found in coverage of yesterday's meeting from the News of Cumberland County (attached), where the part about county being a "source and conduit for funding" got left out of explanation of county's limited early role. **[Agreed]**

4) Finally, just want to reiterate that while we understand why the plan recommends the county not embark on acquiring land for establishing county parks at this time, we think the price and availability of certain ideal county park quality parcels out there at this time warrant some flexibility should an opportunity come along at very little cost, whereby county could land-bank certain tracts and eventually develop and establish recreational uses/facilities on them over time. The Cohansick Country Club is a prime example. Does it really make sense to discourage land banking if other partners are willing to assist with cost and management until county capacity is brought up to speed? I believe certain opportunities may come along over next few months/years that county will never get another shot at and should at least be encouraged to consider. **[Our opinion is that the OSRP does not prevent land banking, should the county decide to do so.]**

Otherwise it's very clear that while Cumberland may be the last county to do an open space plan, we've saved the best for last, because this plan is a great plan.

Please don't hesitate to contact me to discuss.

PS: Non-compressed version of our map is included on disc we submitted.

Best,

Stephen Sinclair

Subject: RE: Open Space Plan comments

[SIMONE COLLINS COMMENTS IN BOLD]

From: Sally Birdsall [<mailto:seb@sarahbirdsall.com>]

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2011 2:25 PM

To: Cumberland - Robert G. Brewer

Subject: Open Space Plan comments

Bob,

First and foremost, please convey to Peter and Stephen what a great job the draft plan is. It takes a thorny and complicated issue and lays out the facts and possibilities very well. That said, I do have a few comments...

- Throughout the document, and evident at the meetings I attended, there is an ambiguity regarding the types of recreation being discussed. Open space preservation is given significantly more weight compared to sports recreation and urban park use which probably constitute the interest of the two-third's urban majority of the County population. **[While preservation has been the focus of many public comments, we do not agree that the OSRP encourages preservation over active recreation.]**
- Could there be more in the "linkages" section on incorporating the Coastal Heritage Trail into the trail network? We should be building on what we already have, even as limited as it is. **[Agreed]**
- The emphasis on the cost to municipalities of preserved land could be shown in a more realistic light if the public realized the small amount of tax revenue most preserved land provided prior to preservation. Perhaps this data could be provided? **[Revenue varies from parcel to parcel.]**
- The survey section notes that swimming access is a high priority recreation request. Could this be better addressed in the recommendations? **[We will emphasize potential funding for lifeguards.]**
- As I have said earlier, the elimination of CAFRA areas from Tier 1 and Tier 2 priority preservation does not take into account the desirability of CAFRA land (especially near water) to developers and the weakness of the CAFRA regulations. It also removes the poorer, more rural municipalities from the top two tiers of interest for preservation. **[The OSRP seeks to identify and rank "areas of interest" for preservation – this does not necessarily equate to "priority". Our opinion is that the top two tiers should be closest to where people live (in addition to the other criteria items listed). Tier 1 and 2 areas also tend to be more in the path of development than the CAFRA areas.]**
- I would like to see more in the Funding section on self-sustaining active recreational possibilities for the County. **[Will note the possibility.]**

Sally

11-12-11 observations by Steve Eisenhauer of Natural Lands Trust after review of Draft Cumberland County Open Space and Recreation Master Plan

[SIMONE COLLINS COMMENTS IN BOLD]

p. 2

Water trails: distinguish between motorized (note any horsepower limitations), non-motorized and dual use). **[This is a task for the water trail master plan.]**

Prioritize linkages on page 2 of Executive Summary (e.g., I'd put sidewalk development at the top of the list). Include criteria for priority ranking. **[Prioritization is accomplished through Project Ranking Criteria for County Funding Requests in Chapter 3.]**

Clarify what "off-road trails" means. Off-road bicycle trails are becoming more and more common, but not all trails are good for off-road bicycle use. Many people equate off-road trails with quad/ATV/motorcycle trails. Maybe we just need to say "non-motorized off-road trails", if this is what we mean. **[Agreed]**

This section should include a category that highlights existing roadway right-of-way width, e.g., if a road is 24' wide but the right-of-way (for future expansion, safety issues, sidewalk construction, etc.) is 50' wide then there's 13' on each side which can be claimed for public use. In many parts of the county without sidewalks this unpaved strip is now utilized by pedestrians (see many parts of rte. 47 south of Millville and elsewhere). Perhaps this information should be included in the sidewalk section since, technically, these pathways are unpaved sidewalks. An economical option exists to surface these unpaved trails with crushed stone, clamshells, recycled crushed concrete or a similar trail cover. **[This is a task for the off-road trail master plan.]**

p. 3

Change phrase: "must involve the municipal level" to "should involve the municipal level" regarding decisions about open space. By law, if a landowner wants to sell their property to a land preservation organization, it is not legal to prevent them from doing so. And clarify what municipal involvement means: a public meeting to solicit comments, an advisory to the township committees 60 days before closing, etc.. Pay special attention to legal issues, since a landowner desiring to preserve land (and who may plan to use the funds to pay for a medical operation for a family member, for their children's college education, etc.) may decide to challenge the municipality's right to hold up the sale of their property. **[We will clarify. Our opinion is that the county should be able to require municipal approval when reviewing requests for county funding.]**

Regarding : "Revise / enact new County legislation to allow the use of County Open Space Trust Fund for activities other than acquisition", a percentage limitation should be included, e.g., "the amount used each year for non-acquisition expenses cannot exceed 25 percent of the total tax collected for any single calendar year". This will minimize potential abuses of the system. **[Our opinion is that this could hinder county funding of worthy projects / initiatives.]**

p. 5

Change category on maps from "Parks and Open Space" to "Preserved Nonfarmland". Nobody really knows what open space means without a definition. And a park doesn't necessarily mean land that is protected from development.

Open Space Definition per NJ Municipal Land Use Law

["Open-space" means any parcel or area of land or water essentially unimproved and set aside, dedicated, designated or reserved for public or private use or enjoyment or for the use and enjoyment of owners and occupants of land adjoining or neighboring such open space; provided that such areas may be improved with only those buildings, structures, streets and offstreet parking and other improvements that are designed to be incidental to the natural openness of the land."]

p. 9

Change title of map to "Open Space Map". "Preserved Lands Map" is not an accurate title. The map does not accurately include all NLT's open space so I assume some of TNC's land may also have been missed. I've requested our GIS person to forward an accurate map to you. Also, a more readily-understood title for PSE&G's land is "PSE&G preserved land". Most people don't really know what the Estuary Enhancement Program is about and, regardless, the enhancement work is essentially over. **[The map was previously prepared by the county (not Simone Collins) and is included for reference. The source of the map is clearly noted in the report.]**

p. 14

It would be interesting to know how many Rank 2, 3 and 4 areas are located within the county. **[The hyperlink to the Landscape Project data will be provided in the report for those who want to explore in more detail.]**

p. 15

The NPS office in Newport is a Heritage Trail Program office. The NPS Wild and Scenic Rivers office is in Philadelphia. The description that the Heritage Trail Program is solely a vehicular route is misleading. Many of the program's interpretive signs are on pedestrian trails and in the offices and interior display areas of historical/environmental destinations. **[We will clarify.]**

p. 19

It would be good to see how Salem County is using its open space funds (generated from the tax). All for farmland? What is their formula? Can Cumberland County learn from it? **[We will determine.]**

It would be very helpful to include a profile of Atlantic County's park system. This is a neighbor county to Cumberland that has a well developed county park system, as well as federal, state and nonprofit protected land. Profiling Ocean County would also be helpful, since they also have a well-developed county park system. However, finding out from the closer Atlantic County about how they finance and manage their park system (especially their future plans) is very important to include in any Cumberland County Open Space Plan. **[We do not think Atlantic and Ocean Counties are good comparisons. They both have much higher populations and greater financial resources.]**

Cumberland County Open Space & Recreation Master Plan

Study Committee Meeting 6 (Conference Room, County Admin. Building)

March 9, 2011, 9:30 AM

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE	EMAIL
Roger Ruske	CCPB		
JODY CARVARA	ANSEC		JODYANIEC@AOL.COM
LeeBurka	4331 Juniper St, Vineland, NJ	856 327-1559	leeburka@comcast.net
FRUSTRATED	POB 98 GREENWICH	856-455-5068	frustrated@earthlink.net
FRANCIS RAPA	NJCF WOODSTOWN	856-769-0816	FRANCIS@NJCONSERVATION.ORG
Shirley Kline	187 Buckhorn Rd., Bridgeton, NJ 08302	856-455-0553	N/A
Matt Pirocki	790 E. Commerce St. Bridgeton, NJ 08302	856-453-2175	matt@co.cumberland.nj.us
Robert Brewster	790 E. Commerce St. Bridgeton	856 453-2175	bobbr@Cumberland.nj.us
Kim Gauntt	790 E. Commerce St. Bridgeton, NJ 08302	856 453-2184	Kimga@Co.Cumberland.nj.us
AL CAGGANO, JR	400 GREENWICH RD, BRIDGETON	856 451-0022	SSFALJR@AOL.COM
Nancy Ridgway	582 Irving Ave., Bridgeton	856-451-0995	
SALLY BIEDSILL	POB 243 GREENWICH 640 E. WOOD ST. P.O. BOX 1508 VINELAND, NJ 08362-1508	856-305-1626	SAB@SARAHBIRODALL.COM
MARLENE HICKS	169 Silver Lake Rd U.D. NJ 08302	856-794-4101	khicks@vineandcity.org
Lynn Mang		856-453-9739	lynnemang@comcast.net
Matt Blake	1055 Bridgeton Rd Greenwich NJ 08323	856 825 2174	matt@littoral.society.org
Tom Stanzior	PO Box 1021 Bridgeton NJ	856 451 4200	cdc@ccdcnj.com
Ben Casella		856 455 3901	BN5FB
EILEEN CLARK	193 OLD DEER FIELD RD.		