

CMP POLICY & IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Richard J. Sullivan Center / Terrence D. Moore Lecture Hall
15C Springfield Road
New Lisbon, New Jersey
January 30, 2009 - 9:30 a.m.

MINUTES

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Acting Chairman Norman Tomasello, Candace Ashmun, Leslie Ficcaglia, Stephen Lee (arrived after approval of the Minutes), Ed Lloyd, John Haas (1st Alternate), Paul E. Galletta (2nd Alternate; arrived @11:05 a.m.) and Daniel M. Kennedy (3rd Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Robert W. McIntosh

STAFF PRESENT: John Stokes, Susan Grogan, Paul Leakan, Robert Zampella, Nick Procopio, John Bunnell, David Kutner, Paul Tyshchenko, Michael Yaffee, and Betsy Piner

Acting Chairman Tomasello called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

1. Adoption of minutes from the January 5, 2009 CMP Policy and Implementation Committee meeting

Commissioner Ashmun moved the adoption of the minutes of the January 5, 2009 meeting. Commissioner Haas seconded and all were in favor.

2. Review of the Executive Director's recommendations to the Pinelands Commission as to the eligibility of a parcel for the 41st round of acquisition under the Limited Practical Use program

Ms. Piner said that the single application for the 41st round of acquisition under the Limited Practical Use (LPU) program was a 0.34 acre parcel in Maurice River Township's Forest Area. Staff is recommending eligibility.

Commissioner Ficcaglia recommended that the Commission approve the parcel submitted pursuant to the 41st round of the LPU program. Commissioner Ashmun seconded and all were in favor.

Mr. Stokes outlined the procedure that he was recommending that the Committee follow for the remainder of the agenda to allow for presentations, comment from the public and then discussion by the Committee on each item with appropriate time intervals. The Committee agreed to use that format.

3. Ecological Integrity Assessment: review of final draft of revised Land Capability Map

Members of the Planning Staff distributed a series of maps of numbered polygons that had been examined for potential boundary area changes, a series of corresponding charts containing

information related to the polygons, and (later in the meeting) an explanation of the criteria (*Definitions of Inclusionary and Exclusionary Criteria*) used by staff in developing recommendations regarding map changes based on the EIA project. (*These documents are attached to the File Copy of the minutes only.*)

Mr. Liggett made a PowerPoint presentation explaining these materials noting that there are a series of charts (Recommended Changes and Not Recommended Changes) with maps associated with each. The threshold size of polygons being considered for changes is 100 acres for freestanding areas and 25 acres for those on the boundaries of existing management areas. These recommendations will be the subject of the special Committee meeting scheduled for February 18, 2009.

In response to questions from the Committee regarding the inclusionary and exclusionary criteria, staff clarified that: “clustered T&E species” means that multiple (2 or more) T&E sightings had been identified within a polygon; and “Public Development Plan” means that a commitment to a project, e.g. sewer line, high school, has been made.

Commissioner Lee asked if undisturbed drainage basins could cover multiple drainage basins. Mr. Tyshchenko said that the actual shapes are the wetlands drainage shapes created by the Science Office for their EIA project. Dr. Procopio said that these wetlands drainage units were developed by taking any section of stream between two confluences and then splitting them in half on either side of the stream, reflecting that the impact of development on the stream comes from the uplands on either side. These drainage units can vary in size according to the watershed, ranging from perhaps 0.5 ac. to 100 acres. Mr. Stokes summarized that the chart indicates the percentage of the polygon that lies in undisturbed basins.

In response to Commissioner Ashmun’s question if the maps had been developed after consulting with the municipalities, Mr. Stokes said that in October 2008, staff had presented preliminary maps at two meetings attended by some 100 people and Mr. Liggett has held numerous meetings since then with individual municipalities. Mr. Stokes that the approach has been to seek information related to the criteria being used. However, some of the municipalities see this as a “negotiation” although that is not the process. He said that the towns are interpreting things that are more appropriate during the conformance process that would follow adoption of these rules, should that occur. He said that many of the municipalities would prefer that the Commission do nothing but, with all the good information generated by the EIA project, that is not an option.

In response to Commissioner Ashmun’s question if the 100-acre threshold were useful, Mr. Liggett said that it was useful as a focusing tool.

4. Electric Transmission Right-of-Way Plan: review of draft rules

Mr. Bunnell gave a PowerPoint presentation (*Attachment A*) on the proposed rules related to vegetation management in electric transmission rights of way (RoW). He referenced the presentation given by Dr. Lathrop at the last Committee meeting regarding the mapping of the RoW and reference habitats through field survey and aerial photo interpretation. Mr. Bunnell provided information related to the RoW length and area by each of the three utilities (Atlantic City Electric, Public Service Enterprise Group, and Jersey Central Power and Light) and the characterization of the vegetation into six cover types and vegetation management prescriptions for each of the 3,041 spans (a span being the distance between two towers).

He said that the vegetation management prescriptions included timing restrictions based on the presence of T&E plant and animal species and also timing restrictions related to wetlands (active management to occur at driest times of the year). He said that there were standards for the disposal of trees, access road maintenance and flexibility (e.g., emergency situations or need to cut a tree in a span otherwise designated as requiring mowing). He noted that there could be other special circumstances such as discovery of mistletoe; if found within a span, then the utility would be responsible for a survey.

Mr. Bunnell said that each span was assigned a unique ID and a GIS layer had been developed containing that ID and the associated vegetation data and a vegetation management plan. The Science Office had prepared for Commission members CDs containing the GIS layers (but no aeriels) and freeware so that they could be installed on their personal computers. He anticipated that by the time the meeting was concluded, this would also be posted on the website where it would be available for the public.

Commissioner Ficcaglia asked about the pH of the clean sand that was to be used for filling and grading the access roads under this plan, noting that this became an issue for the Pine Barrens Gentian in Ocean County. Dr. Zampella said that although he didn't think it was an issue, staff would look into it.

In response to Commissioner Ashmun's questions about access roads, Mr. Stokes said that access roads are part of the plan, are very sparse, and no new ones are being proposed. Any new access roads in the future would require application to and approval by the Commission

Mr. Stokes invited the utilities to offer their observations.

Mr. David Richter, an attorney with PSE&G said that his firm was very supportive of the plan which achieves two goals: it assures the reliability of their lines while protecting the environment.

Commissioner Lee asked Mr. Richter if, since PSE&G has the most forested spans, in terms of transforming forests to shrubs, did they have all the tools they needed to accomplish this goal, e.g. girdling? herbicides?

Mr. Richter responded that no herbicides were being proposed and that he believed the plan did what the utilities needed.

Mr. Stokes said that, while the plan does not authorize herbicide use now, he suggested that the Commission move ahead with the plan as it is while recognizing that adjustments may be necessary in the future.

Commissioner Lee asked about phragmites control. Mr. Bunnell responded that there are several genotypes, native vs. non-native, but staff discouraged mowing phragmites as it was a means of spreading it. Commissioner Lee said that if the Commission were adopting these rules, it needed to consider the challenges to the applicants.

In response to Commissioner Ashmun's question if the utilities would be implementing this program right away, Mr. Richter said that they would likely start in the fall, working on a portion of their spans this year and then a portion next year. They would start with the "red" spans, those in the most forested areas as that is where the greatest concern with reliability. Mr. Richter's colleague added that probably 50-60 Pinelands spans out of the 264 are in that "red" category.

Mr. Robert Jubic, Manager, Environmental Planning with Atlantic City Electric (ACE), said that overall this has been a very good project and that he has been working with staff since 2004 to integrate ACE's management plan while protecting habitat. He said that he believed that the practices being used now were beneficial and he believed that this plan represented a tweaking. He did have some concern with the use in the draft rules of the term "compliance" and would prefer "conformance." He said that ACE was concerned with possible modifications imposed by BPU (NJ Board of Public Utilities) or NERC (North American Electric Reliability Corporation) thus leaving ACE caught between regulatory agencies. (Mr. Jubic submitted written comment, *Attachment B*).

Mr. Ron Lacey, with JCP&L, said that his firm was supportive and agreed with the concepts and goals of the plan. He said that maintenance is on a four year cycle so it would take a few years to apply but he looked at this as a learning and cooperative experience. (Mr. Lacey submitted written comment, *Attachment C*).

Mr. Stokes reviewed the next steps. He said that, should it choose to do so, the Commission could adopt a pilot program with an annual reporting requirement by the utilities. Staff will spot check that the actual activities reported were undertaken in accordance with the plan. At the conclusion of the pilot program, a determination will be made if the ecological and transmission objectives can be met. This is a ten year program to allow monitoring of several cycles. The cost of inspection and monitoring is allocated over 9 years, apportioned among the utilities based on the miles of right of way. However, it might be more equitable to base it on acreage of actively managed area and, as ACE has narrower rights of way, they have less acreage, thus their costs would be reduced.

Mr. Stokes said that he had no issue with Mr. Jubic's concern with the terminology (conformance vs. compliance) and that if they preferred a different term that would be alright.

Mr. Stokes said that if staff finds that a utility is ignoring the plan with "significant and recurring issues" then they would be required to go through the standard permitting process to perform their vegetation maintenance. Mr. Stokes said that he felt obligated to put this in the rules although he found it unlikely to occur. He said that any amendments to the plan would follow the same format as the wireless communications rules. He said that if the Committee recommends these rules at its next meeting, then they would be held and packaged with some others to be proposed at the Commission's April meeting. He said that the remaining issues are: the conformance/compliance distinction, reapportioning the funds, addressing the pH of sand and gravel, and phragmites control. Commissioner Ashmun noted that nowhere does it mention that the plan is for "existing" rights of way and, following a brief discussion that clarified that construction activity is not part of this plan, Mr. Stokes said that "existing" will be inserted.

Commissioner Haas complimented the Science staff. Mr. Stokes thanked the utilities. Commissioner Lee complimented ACE and their customers.

Pending the arrival of Mr. Michael Catania to lead the discussion of the forestry rules, Mr. Stokes modified the agenda by reversing the sequence of items 5 and 6.

5. Wetlands restoration: continued review of draft rules and rule proposal

Referencing the document included in the meeting packet, Mr. Kutner said that the Committee had preliminarily reviewed the rules previously and that he would now review the questions that

the Committee had generated. He said that he believed that most of the concerns could be addressed by expanding the background material of the rule proposal and not the provisions of the rules and he highlighted each of the issues.

In response to Commissioner Lee's question as to where "characteristic wetlands" are defined, Mr. Stokes said that the definition exists in the CMP.

Mr. Kutner indicated that the rule proposal makes it clear that the rules do not take precedence over existing easements or restrictive covenants. In response to Commissioner Lee's question if wetlands restoration would ordinarily be allowed under SADC restrictions, Commissioner Kennedy said that SADC requires that land remain active for agricultural production so he didn't think that restoration would be allowed. Following a brief discussion about whether it was necessary to call out SADC restrictions, Mr. Stokes suggested inserting "subject to agricultural restrictions" for clarification.

Mr. Kutner said that staff was not asking for action on these rules today but hoped that the Committee would be ready at its next meeting.

Commissioner Galletta arrived at 11:05 a.m. Mr. Stokes noted that there was now a quorum of the Commission present and he read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement.

Commissioner Lee referenced #8 of Mr. Kutner's cover memo and said that he wanted any research design not so restrictive that it cannot be applied. Commissioner Lee also indicated that it should be clear that the size of a research project should be only that which is necessary to accomplish the project objective. Mr. Stokes said that staff would note the limit to the scope of a research project.

6. Forestry: continued review of draft rules

Mr. Stokes said that Mr. Kutner and Mr. Catania, Chairman of the Forestry Advisory Committee (FAC) would provide an update. Mr. Kutner reviewed a series of questions that the Committee raised during its January 5, 2009 P&I Committee meeting.

Referencing the draft rules that had been included in the packet, Mr. Stokes noted that minor revisions had been made to the section on management plans for State Conservation lands at the bottom of page 13. He noted that little in the way of forestry research or monitoring was being done. Mr. Stokes noted that, as with the wetlands restoration rules, staff will provide a clear explanation of intent of the rules in the rule proposal.

Referencing the forest harvesting data provided in Mr. Kutner's cover memo, Commissioner Lee noted the abysmal economic value of Pinelands forestry (~\$40,000/year) and asked how much time the Commission would spend on a \$40,000 *structure* in the Pinelands. He said that he had no idea that the industry was so bad and that the rules should not create further obstacles to forestry.

Mr. Catania responded that the FAC was aware that the very little forestry management activity is currently being undertaken in the Pinelands and he indicated that the Committee's goal was to help resuscitate the industry. He said that the FAC believes that the recommendations will help stimulate forestry, albeit as a niche industry.

Commissioner Lee said that these rules do not reflect the view of the landowners; the rules do not encourage one to make the substantial investment needed in hopes that 40 years down the road there will be a return. There has to be some economic value in forestry.

In response to a question from Mr. Stokes, Mr. Kutner confirmed that his memo presented annual income figures not a composite figure for 2001-2006 (e.g., \$200,000/year, not \$40,000).

Mr. Catania said that when the FAC initiated its review, it quickly divided into two camps...those who advocated no tree cutting under any circumstances vs. those not wanting any regulations under any circumstances. After spending 2 years on this project, the Committee reached agreement that forestry should and will continue to play an important role as a tool in managing our forests. The FAC members, some of whom are present today, believe that they have struck a policy compromise to support forestry.

Mr. Stokes said that he wanted to reaffirm what Mr. Catania has said. It was Governor Florio who had asked that the FAC take on this project and it was largely driven by his (Mr. Stokes') suggestion that the forestry provisions of the CMP appear to have created outstanding issues for property owners. The concern was whether the provisions are as clear as they might be. On that basis, the FAC was asked to review the rules. Mr. Stokes said that, while he was unable to attend all the FAC meetings, he had attended the majority of them. He found that everyone had a common purpose: to promote what Mr. Catania refers to as a niche industry in the Pinelands, in an ecologically appropriate way. There are a lot of opinions about how that objective should be accomplished, e.g., if one wants to mimic historic disturbance, one just cuts down the forest and leaves it. There was a lot of give and take on the part of the Committee and a lot of increased understanding on both sides. There are some recommendations from the FAC that he said he did not support fully but it was the role of staff to take the work of the FAC and try to reflect its recommendations accurately in the rules. Mr. Stokes said that he thought these rules will be an improvement and will provide more certainty to the foresters, e.g., When can I drum chop? How do I deal with T/E species?

Mr. Kutner continued with his review of questions the Committee had raised and said that in response to the question of whether forestry activity should be audited, the FAC felt that they should reconsider the rules in five years to determine if they are effective. Mr. Catania added that the FAC has expressed an interest in continuing to assist staff in the review of forestry applications. These rules should help the review process.

Commissioner Lee noted that he remembers that more forestry applications had been submitted to the Commission in the past. Mr. Stokes said that the MIS office could check to see if a report could be generated indicating application trends.

Mr. Kutner said that there had been questions about whether the rules had to be so specific on particular forestry practices. He said that the FAC concluded that the specificity was necessary in order to forge a consensus among the Committee members who expressed disparate views.

Mr. Kutner said that there were questions as to why some of the rare native forest types were not included in the prohibitions against conversions of forest stands to other species. He indicated that this was because not all the forest types had been adequately mapped yet and that it would be difficult to use those categories for regulatory purposes. He said that Dr. Andy Windisch, present in the audience today, is working on the mapping project.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Ficcaglia, Mr. Kutner noted that Appendix 2 in the FAC Report was a description of the forest types. These descriptions have now been incorporated into the rules. Therefore, reference to forest type descriptions in Appendix 3, Monitoring Protocols, needs to direct the reader to the rules and not the Report Appendix.

Mr. Catania said that there are still outstanding issues with respect to forestry management but, if the Commission intends to make these rules more or less stringent, they might upset the consensus achieved by the FAC. Even if these rules aren't perfect, it is better to move forward now than later. He noted that a number of the Committee members were here today including George Pierson, Walter Bien, and Emile DeVito who are among the newer members as well as his colleague, Jon Wagar, one of the earlier members.

Mr. Stokes invited the members of the public to speak with a 3 minute limit.

Mr. Carleton Montgomery, Executive Director of the Pinelands Preservation Alliance (PPA), said that the struggles within the FAC were nuanced and the report reflects the current consensus. He said that forestry in the Pinelands should perpetuate the native forests of the Pinelands and not create monoculture plantations. Among the members of the FAC, there had been struggles over artificial regeneration, restriction to native trees and no conversion from one forest type to another. Unfortunately the proposed rules allow conversion of forest types.

Mr. Stokes said that Mr. Montgomery was referring to p. 9, Paragraph #2 of the draft rules that were attached to Mr. Kutner's January 23, 2009 memorandum. He said that he believed Mr. Montgomery felt that #2 did not adequately convey the sense of non-conversion. Commissioner Ficcaglia said that #3 addresses that issue. Commissioner Ashmun also noted that the issue is addressed on page 4 of the FAC report.

Mr. Catania referenced page 4 of the report and said that the Committee had struggled with what constitutes a native forest type but had come to a working consensus. The difficulty was in turning policy to regulation.

Mr. Harry Monesson, Pemberton Township resident, cranberry/blueberry grower and forester, said that he lived with forestry and that some 40 years ago he had bulldozed his forests to create bogs but they have since regenerated themselves and now he sells the trees he harvests as firewood, something that he believes should be promoted.

Mr. George Pierson introduced himself as one of the newer members of the FAC and said that he had served 34 years in the state forest service. He said that prior to the adoption of the CMP, some 25 mills, 3 active pulp mills, 60 to 70 woodcutters and a number of basket mills were active. He gave a brief history of forestry in the Pinelands. He said that the entire industry is now gone. He said that it was forestry that promoted rare plants.

Dr. Emile DeVito, with the New Jersey Conservation Foundation and a current member of the FAC, said that while he had not been on the Committee that produced the report, he had actively participated with the Committee, as had others. Since the introduction of the draft rules, he said much discussion has occurred regarding the conversion of forest stands. He said that the rules need to say that forest stands should not be converted to another forest type. Also he said that the pitch pine-shrub oak forest (the subject of much of Dr. Windisch's research) is one of those rare forest types. The requirement that an applicant map all forest stands types is appropriate.

Dr. Andy Windisch, ecologist with NJ DEP Office of Natural Lands Management, said that his mapping project of the Pinelands forest was ongoing. One of the requirements of the forestry application includes that the forest type be mapped. He said that forestry and ecological fire management are the two most important tools for managing forests and protecting rare ecological communities and T/E species.

Dr. Walter Bien, community ecologist at Drexel University, identified himself as a “late addee” to the FAC who had done extensive research on rare plant communities. He said that it was incumbent upon the Commission to see that forest types are maintained so as not to change the Pinelands landscape and that if forestry is to be sustainable in New Jersey it must be economically viable.

Mr. Jay Mounier said that he would be forwarding a set of questions to the Committee related to technical minutiae but he also suggested that a number of terms in the proposal be clarified, e.g. “mimic historic disturbance patterns,” “broad landscape patterns” etc.

Mr. Stokes said that most of the concern is raised by the first three standards on page 9. If one looks at the balance of the forestry rules, he believed they were fairly clear and straightforward. These 3 are more akin to goals and therefore it is difficult to interpret what they mean in practice. He said that since these provisions were evoking the most concern, the Committee might want to simplify the rules by eliminating the first and third standard and revising the second standard to reflect the current language in the CMP. He said that it had served the Pinelands well over the years and now, with the addition of the description of the forest types in the proposed rules, it would work even better. He said that the silvicultural prescriptions are what these standards mean in practice. Their appropriate use was the way to avoid conversion.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he believed that made sense.

Mr. Stokes said that Dr. Windisch’s report, which Mr. Kutner distributed to the Committee, describes rare plant communities but that it is largely undocumented. (Members of the Committee received copies of *Rare Ecological Communities of the New Jersey Pinelands*.) However, the Science committee is starting a forest characterization study which would supplement Dr. Windisch’s report. The anticipated schedule to release the results of that study will correspond with the recommended timing for the next review of the forestry rules (five years).

Mr. Catania said that he felt the body of the rules incorporated the provisions of #1 and #3 already.

Ms. Grogan said that the background material to the rules will emphasize the intent of the rules, including the goals now stated in #1 and #3.

Commissioner Lee asked about the distinction between stand and parcel.

Mr. Catania responded that it relates to the size under consideration and the species composition of the forest on the property. There could be a number of forest stands on a single parcel. She noted the term “forest stand” is defined in the CMP.

Ms. Grogan added that the concern is that, in the CMP, a “parcel” is defined as the entire contiguous property under common ownership, e.g. Wharton State Forest, and activity in a particular stand may not necessarily apply to an entire parcel.

Commissioner Lee said that he had a number of questions that he would like to discuss with Mr. Catania and staff and, rather than take up the time of the entire Committee, he would like to do so separately and unfortunately would be unable to attend the February 27, 2009 meeting. Mr. Catania said that he would be happy to meet prior to the meeting.

Mr. Stokes said that the goal is having the Commission authorize rule proposals for Forestry, Wetlands Restoration, and the RoW Pilot Program at its April meeting. He anticipated at least two more meetings on Forestry and that would provide time to address Commissioner Lee's concerns.

Commissioner Lee said that he had reached out to those who harvest and sell timber and he would also like to know the value of the total gross income for DEP's forestry activities as perhaps different programs are needed for state and private lands.

Mr. Catania said that he would like to have Bob Williams meet with them also as he has a good perspective on the economic issues of forestry.

Commissioner Ashmun said that while they were looking at economic factors related to forestry, they should also look at the Pinelands Protection Act and the ecosystem.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Fred Akers, Administrator of the Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association, said that he had submitted written comment on the EIA and he wanted to know more about the definitions *disturbed* and *undisturbed*, *high* and *low integrity*. He said that he believed that there had been a change in the approach since it was first introduced and questioned the statistics.

Mr. Stokes said that Mr. Akers was mixing two things. Thirty percent was a watershed disturbance that much of the Commission's research has supported. The ranges that are included in the EIA are generally misinterpreted. It is not 70% of this area is "good"; it is the total of three parameters are averaged into a "unit" and the unit is related to the other units in the Pinelands. If, for example a unit is in the top 90%, it is not that 90% of that area is good; it is that the unit is within the top 90% when compared with the other units. He said that he feared that this misunderstanding would continue. He encouraged Mr. Akers to continue to speak with the Science Office.

Mr. Montgomery said that he had confidence that Mr. Akers did not misunderstand the approach of the EIA and that there had been a shift since its inception and that staff is trying to find places to upzone. He said that he thought the RoW Plan was good, but that he had a couple of concerns. He said that he supported Commissioner Ficcaglia's concerns about use of non native soils in the RoW Plan which have the potential to introduce non-native species and promote their survival in the Pinelands. Also, he said that as new habitats are created under the RoW Plan, he said that he hoped that the prescriptions would be applied in these new areas. He also asked if any of the prescriptions might be promoting non-native species.

Mr. Stokes responded that discussion needed to occur with the utility companies about timing restrictions and that the monitoring program will tell what is occurring.

Commissioner Ashmun added that she hoped the Commission would do what it can to protect T&E, whether or not their presence is known at this time. She asked if any of these practices were perpetuating non-native species and Commissioner Lee asked if cessation of mowing might create new habitat. Mr. Stokes responded that some of this is related to the return intervals and that he had made a note to follow up on these questions.

Dr. Emile DeVito said that Chinese Bush Clover is an example of a non-native species spread by mowing during roadside management if done while there are mature seeds. Also a spray program for wetlands restoration in tidal areas would not work against phragmites, as evidenced by PSE&Gs efforts in Salem County. Elimination of phragmites requires modification of the hydrology.

Mr. Monesson said that the arrival of non-native species by wind, water and glacier is part of nature that man cannot control; that no one at the Commission has ever been able to explain adequately to him what wetlands are; and, that with his long history with wetlands forestry activities, e.g. cedar logging, he recognized that wetlands are a beneficial resource.

8. Other Items of Interest

Mr. Stokes noted that the meeting packets had contained the draft reports that are submitted annually to the National Park Service on the Long Term Ecological and Economic Monitoring Programs. Staff is awaiting the budget information which will be inserted into the report.

Mr. Stokes said that, following adjournment, Mr. Liggett and Ms. Grogan would need to speak with the members of the Permanent Land Committee to make sure there were enough members available to proceed with the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:30 p.m. (moved by Commissioner Lee and seconded by Commissioner Ficaglia.)

/CS15A

CMP POLICY & IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Richard J. Sullivan Center / Terrence D. Moore Lecture Hall

15C Springfield Road

New Lisbon, New Jersey

January 30, 2009 - 9:30 a.m.

SUMMARY

The Committee adopted the minutes from the January 5, 2009 meeting.

The Committee received maps and materials for the February 18, 2009 Special P&I Meeting for the EIA Project.

The Committee discussed the following draft rules:

- ? **Electric Transmission Rights-of-Way Plan**
- ? **Forestry**
- ? **Wetlands Restoration**

/CS15A