MINUTES OF THE MEETING

DATE: 26 October 1976
TIME: 12:30 - 3:45 p.m.
LOCATION: The Canal House, 25 Calhoun Street, Trenton
            New Jersey

ATTENDING:
  Commission: Mr. Jones, Mr. Jessen, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Hamilton
               Mr. Burns, and Mr. Sayen
  Staff: Mr. Jim Amon, Mrs. Sandra Brown
  DAG: Steven Gray, Esquire
  DEP: Mr. Frank Rigg, Chief, Bureau of Parks
       Mr. Mike Galley, Chief, Bureau of Water Facility
            Operations
       Mr. Eric Pearl, Assistant to Commissioner Wilson

ABSENT: Mr. Kirkland, Mr. Torpey, and Mayor Holland

**************************************************************************************************************/

Vice Chairman Jessen brought the meeting to order and stated that the requirements of the Public Meetings Law had been properly met for the meeting of the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission 26 October 1976.

Minutes of 28 September 1976 Meeting

It was moved by Mr. Jones and seconded by Mr. Sayen to accept the minutes of the 28 September 1976 meeting as transcribed; all Commissioners present and voting concurred.

Leases

It was moved by Ms. Wilson and seconded by Mr. Hamilton with no dissenting votes, for approval of the following two leases:
1. Lease # 03-001-330-01 dated from 1 August 1976 to 31 July 1977 for the yearly sum of $75.00. The Lessee is Etta T. Kent.

2. Lease # 03-001-269-01 dated from 1 March 1976 to 28 February 1977 for the yearly sum of $960.00. The Leasees are Leon and Margaret Nowaliniski.

Trash fill in the Canal Park

Mr. Galley informed the Commission that the Bureau of Water Facility Operations has been using a section of the canal south of Lalor Street as a dump. Almost everything being dumped at this site is material taken from the canal during maintenance and repair operations. Mr. Galley would like to be able to continue using that section of the canal as a dump but now he must receive a permit from the Solid Waste Administration. Before he can do that he will need approval from the Canal Commission.

Mr. Amon suggested that he, Mr. Sayen, and Mr. Galley visit the dump area and report their findings at the November meeting.

Design Vocabulary Book

Mr. Amon suggested that the Commission still go ahead in developing the Design book despite the fact that the Commission did not receive the $10,000 grant. Mr. Amon suggests that the Design book be financed by the money allocated for it in this year's budget in addition to the surplus money from last year, 1975, which, at this time, is not budgeted.

The Design Vocabulary Book would consist of standards for architectural and landscape architectural design within the park. Such a book would be used by the State, counties, and municipalities along the canal so that there would be consistency in the design elements of the Canal Park, and so that there would be a continuity between private parks bordering the canal and the Canal Park itself. The Design book would also be a useful guide for community groups who want to do some work in the Canal Park.

The issue of a less expensive means of developing such a Design book was brought up for discussion. Ms. Wilson suggested that the Commission look into the possibility of using Rutgers University students in the Cooke College. Mr. Amon mentioned that, in any case, the Commission would need to draw up a set of Canal Park
standards. These standards would be developed into a "Scope of Work". Ms. Wilson made the motion that Mr. Amon be authorized to go ahead and look with Parks into establishing such a "Scope of Work". Mr. Sayen seconded the motion, with no dissenting votes.

Discussion of Commissioner's Work to Engage Community Action in the Canal Park.

There were three points made regarding community action in the Canal Park. First, the Division of Parks, the Division of Water Resources, and the Canal Commission are evolving ways of issuing permits to community action groups. Community groups must present their proposal to the above three for approval. Second, by issuing these permits, the Canal Commission can help give groups specific ideas for work projects. Third, the Commission needs to stress specifics of group activities; i.e. Where is the work being done?, How is it being accomplished?, What exactly constitutes the work?, and Who is doing it?

The idea was suggested that community groups could contribute to the canal maintenance by clearing brush or other cosmetic effects. In order to attract participating groups, the Canal Park should be cleared of major problems. Subsequent work by community groups could then be aimed at maintaining the park. Ms. Wilson suggested that prisoners could be used as a viable source of manpower for clean-up activities. This suggestion is going to be investigated further by Ms. Wilson.

Mr. Gray mentioned that, legally, a necessary premise prior to any community group activity would be the proof that that group held liability for its members, and that the State was absolved of any such liability requirements.

Review Zone - Presentation by Jim Amon

Mr. Amon stated that the key to the Review Zone is the visual and drainage impact on the Canal Park. There followed a discussion concerning the definition and uses of the terms "partial/critical area" and "general watershed area". Mr. Amon suggested that the partial area is the area of greatest concern, and, therefore, it should have a different set of standards and regulations. The opposing viewpoint was that it would be too difficult to prepare a written public distinction between the partial area and the general watershed area; hence, the Review Zone should be applicable for the entire area as one. Mr. Gray brought up the legal point, that it would be extremely difficult to review any given area that could change from being non-critical to critical, or vice-versa. Such criteria should be kept "in-house", not made into the public regulations.

Mr. Amon also proposed that he be authorized to spend up to $1,000 to set up a small group of professionals to review the numerous studies currently being made for the Review Zone (i.e. soil, land use, vegetation, historic and water studies.) These professionals would act as consultants and help determine what the standards
for the Review Zone should be for land use within the Canal Park. The motion was made by Mr. Sayen, and seconded by Mr. Burns, with no dissenting votes.

Progress report on Vegetation Survey by Rogers & Golden

Rogers & Golden reviewed the entire scope of their project and showed examples of the work that has been completed. Their field work is now complete and is presently being transcribed into the narrative text. Their approximate date of completion is by the first of the new year.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m.