



# County of Burlington

## Department of Resource Conservation

50 Rancocas Rd., Mount Holly, NJ 08060  
Mailing: P.O. Box 6000, Mount Holly, NJ 08060  
(856) 642-3850 • www.co.burlington.nj.us

Eve A. Cullinan, *County Administrator*

## Board of County Commissioners

Felicia Hopson, Director  
Dan O'Connell, Deputy  
Linda A. Hynes  
Tom Pullion  
Balvir Singh

### Burlington County Agriculture Development Board

#### Minutes

January 9, 2020

**Members in Attendance:** Chairman Phillip Prickett, Kevin Sparkman, John Kocubinski, Richard Toone, Dan Kennedy, Ed Cohen, Randi Rothmel, Brian Lestini, John Hlubik, Peter Johnson, Jeff Tober, Paul Shinn, Thomas Budd

**Members Absent:** Sherry Dudas, Stephen Specca, William Bamka, Thomas Stanuikynas

**Staff in Attendance:** Brian Wilson, Timothy Willmott, Heather Haines, Anthony Drollas-Legal Counsel

**Public in Attendance:** Bill Harrison – Genova Burns, LLC, Bill Jr. and Carolyn Pettit – Peticote Vet Clinic, Charles Roohr – SADC, Chris Noll – Township of Medford, Don Rawson – EDP Soccer, Ashley Donlav – EDP Soccer, Richard Viccaro – Clarksville Sod Farm, Jesse Barnard, Allie Johnson, Will Johnson, Jim Johnson, Wes Johnson – Johnsons Locust Hall Farm, John Gardner – Tuckerton Sod Farm, Allen Carter – Tuckahoe Turf Farms

#### Call to Order

Opening Statement and Sunshine Law Compliance

Chairman Prickett called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and indicated that the meeting was held in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Prickett led the Board in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call

Brian Wilson read the roll call and indicated that the meeting had a quorum.

#### I. Minutes of

A. November 14, 2019 - Open Session Minutes - **(Motion)** Dan Kennedy motioned for approval of the November 14, 2019 Open Session Minutes, John Hlubik seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion.

B. November 14, 2019 – Closed Session Minutes – **(Motion)** John Kocubinski motioned for approval of the November 14, 2019 Open Session Minutes, John Hlubik seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion.

#### II. Staff Update

A. Administrative Update

I. Administrative Update –

- Special Occasion Events Working Group – Brian Wilson reported on the Special Occasion Events Working Group and that the group will be meeting January 10, 2020.

- SADC Soil Protection Standards for Preserved Farms – Brian Wilson reported briefly stating that a presentation will be on the agenda for next meeting on March 12, 2020.

II. FPP Applications – 2019 Round – Brian Wilson reported stating all landowners have accepted and we will be passing the final approval resolution this meeting under **New Business**.

III. Stewardship/Monitoring – Brian Wilson reported on the preservation signs and that they have all been replaced.

IV. Right to Farm – There are no Right to Farm matters.

B. Relevant Legislation – (refer to handout) –

Tim Willmott reported on the relevant legislation.

C. Communications, Press & Other Items of Interest –

There was no Communications, Press & Other Items of Interest to report on.

D. Economic Development and Regional Planning –

There was no Economic Development and Regional Planning to report on.

E. SADC

Chuck Roohr from the SADC commented on applications that have been submitted by the County to the SADC and that they are moving along with no issues. He also stated that Susan or Jeff will be at the next meeting with the Soil Protection Standards presentation that they have been doing statewide.

### III. Old Business

A. Proposed Special Occasion Events on preserved farm – CADB Comments – **(motion)** – (refer to presentation) Brian Wilson reported on special occasion events and the proposal that the SADC will be presenting to the Legislature. He also referenced the proposed bill that would take the place of future comments or concerns. Kevin Sparkman asked who is really behind the bill in which Mr. Wilson responded that he was not sure, and this was all brought to his attention within the last two days.

Brian Wilson referenced the draft letter sent to the Board Members to Susan Payne at the SADC. Ed Cohen asked a question regarding Right to Farm and Brian explained why Right to Farm would not be included with this bill.

Brian Lestini asked about since wineries have been excluded from the definition of preserved farmland, is the idea that wineries should have the same parameters of non-wineries in terms of what is defined. Brian Wilson stated that wineries are excluded from that bill and that they will continue to operate with all the flexibility that they currently have.

Jeff Tober asked if there are any examples of what would be considered an infrastructure improvement and is this referencing improvements that would otherwise not be allowed with farmland preservation and it would only be

allowed to accommodate these special events. Brian Wilson responded that any improvement that you want to make on your preserved farm for your farm operation is allowed, but the current proposal for special occasion events is referencing improvements to any farm building or building. A new building that would only be done for non-agriculture activities is not allowed. Dan Kennedy stated that when he saw the word “infrastructure” that they are also including septic systems that would serve restrooms or ingress and egress, site triangles, grading and improving roads at a minimum. By having to go to the towns for non-ag uses, the permit limits the public health and safety aspect then you really don’t have a permit. Brian Wilson said that he will be sure to investigate that.

Richard Toone asked about municipal right to farm and Brian Wilson said that it would be independent from that so the underlying municipal zoning would come into play.

Brian Lestini asked that if what is not stated in the draft letter, is it assumed that what is proposed in the bill, do we agree? Brian Wilson stated that he did not have the time to get into details and if the Board feels something is unreasonable in the bill, his recommendation would be for the Board to ask the Legislature not to advance the bill this session and to wait for a future session.

Chairman Prickett asked if there is anything that the Board wants to add to the draft letter in which the Board agreed that Brian Wilson amend the letter to include an objection to the concerns. Richard Toone motioned the amendment and John Hlubik seconded the motion. A majority voted in favor.

Chairman Prickett then said we need a motion to send the letter as amended. John Kocubinski motioned the amended letter be sent and Paul Shinn seconded the motion. A majority voted in favor.

B. 2019 Farm Stewardship Award – Richard Vaccaro (Walton Farm) – **(Presentation)** – Tim Willmott reported on the stewardship award. Richard Vaccaro was presented with the Stewardship Award for 2019.

#### **IV. New Business**

A. 2020 Application Round – **(Motion)** – John Hlubik motioned for approval of the and Richard Toone seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion.

B. Township of Medford – Notice of Intent – Non-Agriculture Development in Agriculture Development Area – **(Motion/Resolution)** – Dan Kennedy recused himself from discussion and voting before Brian Wilson reported. Mr. Wilson explained the Notice of Intent from Medford Township and told the Board that their job is to find if the proposed project poses any adverse effects on the ag development area or State agricultural preservation and development policies.

Kevin Sparkman asked what the relevance was of the red line crossing Hartford Road in which Chris Noll, the Engineer for Medford Township answered saying that it shows part of the sanitary sewer line which is a continuation of the line. Mr. Sparkman asked what the receiving pit was, and Mr. Noll explained that the sending pit is a larger excavation to put the pipe in which must have a receiving pit for the pipe. Mr. Noll also clarified that the road that goes through Jennings Farm is a 30-foot-wide right of way which makes it a public road that’s exempt from farmland preservation.

Jeff Tober asked a question referencing the environmental impact and that it would be separate for the disturbance of the wetlands and would be out of the Boards domain. Anthony Drollas said that the route that is being proposed would not affect the wetlands.

Randi Rothmel mentioned the concerns that Jennings had regarding trees being cut down and asked if in addition to any soil impact, would those be restored as well? Mr. Noll confirmed that they did commit to restore anything that is affected with this project.

Brian Lestini asked Brian Wilson that since Dan Kennedy recused himself, is he to vote on this and after discussing with Tony Drollas, Mr. Wilson said that since we have enough without Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lestini cannot vote.

John Hlubik motioned for approval of the and Richard Toone seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion with the recusal of Dan Kennedy.

C. Review of proposed activities on a preserved farm – Indian Mills, LLC – **(Discussion)** – (refer to presentation) Brian Wilson reported on Indian Mills, LLC (Tuckerton Turf Farms) in Shamong Township. This is a sod farm that was preserved, and the easement is held by both the County and the SADC. John Gardner, the landowner, is seeking concurrence that hosting soccer tournaments is permitted by the Deed of Easement. It would help market the agricultural products grown on the farm (sod/turf) and is used both as direct marketing and indirect marketing of the sod farm. EDP Soccer is the group that intends to lease the space for two years. The number of tournaments would be 15 a year, daytime only and would last 2 to 3 days depending on if it's a holiday weekend or not. 45 acres would be devoted to the soccer fields, police would be in attendance to direct traffic, food truck vendors would be on site, portable toilets, merchandise tents, no permanent structures. 30 acres would be for parking which would hold up to 3,000 cars and the area would be harvested at the beginning of the two-year period and then reseeded and put back in turf production at the end. The only improvement that would be made on the property along the County road would require ingress and egress aprons about 20 feet long to be paved at the entrances of the farm. EDP and Mr. Gardner are proposing this is a marketing event which will show the sod and how it stands up to heavy usage, the durability and desirability and allow potential customers to observe actual use conditions. EDP will produce handouts advertising the farm to be distributed at all the soccer tournaments along with sandwich board advertisement signs along with advertisement of the farm in any correspondence in reference to the tournaments that would be held at this site.

Brian Wilson reported that paragraph 9 of the Deed of Easement “allows for recreational uses under certain conditions” on all preserved farms. The recreational paragraph does not apply in this matter. The SADC has already taken a position on this by stating this type of use interferes with the actual use of the land for agriculture. The landowner has been very clear, they are not submitting this request based on the recreational clause, it is about marketing their ag output of their farm. The proposal from Mr. Harrison included references to Right to Farm and the on farm direct marketing standard, but Brian is cautioning that we cannot entertain and discussion towards right to farm or the on farm direct marketing standard. It is a separate process.

Brian Wilson reports that his staff recommendation is that the CADB find that this proposal conflicts with the Deed of Easement for the reasons stated below:

- No evidence provided that this marketing results in increased sales
- Tournaments serve primarily as a non-agricultural business

- Tournaments are “detrimental” to continued use for agriculture (no sales for 2 years and no production in the parking area for 2 years)
- Vast majority of spectators will not be potential buyers of sod
- Impacts due to parking could be in conflict with the soil protection requirements

He said there could be three different options for the outcome of this proposal; 1. Motion to prepare a resolution concurring with the request (possibly with conditions), 2. Motion to prepare a resolution denying the request, 3. Motion to come back with additional information.

Chairman Prickett called Mr. Harrison up to comment on the situation. Mr. Harrison commented on the proposal and distributed handouts showing marketing done by the EDP including emails that would go out to people attending the tournament and how to get in touch with Tuckerton Turf to acquire the sod. Mr. Gardner did not want to enter into a long-term arrangement like Tuckahoe Turf and he wanted to limit it to two years. There are other locations where the selling of the turf will be done. Mr. Harrison said that turf farms are different from other farms such as not being able to do strawberry or blueberry festivals, hayrides, “pick your own”, etc. as they are not available to a sod farm. They need a way to attract people to the farm that would not otherwise be customers. He believes it is much closer to a “pick your own” where you are actually involved in the crop like a crop maze being where you are working through the corn to get through the maze but you aren’t there to harvest or look at the corn, it’s a way to get people to the farm but it is not directly related to production. Sod is used for people to walk and play on and customers can see that being done and how well it holds up. Mr. Harrison speaks about the Agriculture Retention Development Act and how its purpose is to support increased agriculture production. He states in no way that the parking of vehicles inhibits future use of the farm for ag production and that they are in no way establishing soccer fields. 90% of the year you can drive by and see nothing but sod, no cars, no goal posts, etc. Everything is all moved. Mr. Harrison states the Deed of Easement doesn’t say “no athletic fields”, it says “other recreational activities from which income is derived in which would alter the premises such as golf courses and athletic fields are prohibited”. He states that this in no way alters the premises, it remains a sod farm.

Allen Carter, owner of Tuckahoe Turf Farms is called up by Mr. Harrison. Mr. Carter provided an overview of what they do at Tuckahoe Turf Farms. Although Tuckahoe Turf Farms is a much different scale than Tuckerton Farms, he discusses and compares the attraction from customers. He states that Mr. Gardner is going after retail market, and Mr. Carter says he cannot tell us how many phone calls they get from people that want small amounts of sod and Tuckahoe Turf Farms cannot do it as they are not set up to do the small jobs.

Mr. Harrison asked Mr. Carter if the parking, in any way, has been detrimental due to holding these tournaments and Mr. Carter stated that the events have not caused any issues with growing sod or re-establishing the growth of sod. There are also no erosion problems due to this as well.

Mr. Carter speaks on how sod farm numbers have gone down yearly and now, in Cape May County, there is only one sod farm left. He also stated that since Mr. Gardner is only looking for a two-year lease, due to the production time of sod, he is only going to miss about one harvest.

Kevin Sparkman asked if the farm that he is hosting the soccer tournaments on is farmland preserved. Mr. Carter responded stating he had PVC’s that were sold, and Mr. Harrison stated that most of his farm is subject to a deed restriction that is equivalent to this. Mr. Carter said that when the Pinelands Commission came out to the farm, the expected a soccer complex, but after these tournaments take place, everything is pushed to the side, there are no score boards, no benches, etc. Everything is moveable. Mr. Sparkman asked what it was that the Legislature did on

behalf of the sod farm and Mr. Harrison explained that the basic point says that field sports, not limited to soccer and soccer tournaments conducted in an agriculture production area in the pinelands area should constitute a low intensity recreational use. Mr. Sparkman asked if Mr. Gardner's property is also in the pinelands so the legislation would have resolved any pinelands issues in which Mr. Harrison agreed.

Anthony Drollas commented about the issue being a recreational use permitted under that deed of easement, but this is a different application. Mr. Harrison said that in terms of the CADB different issues, they still have the same pinelands issue. Mr. Sparkman comments that Mr. Harrison is saying this isn't a recreational use, it is marketing. Mr. Harrison states that it is defined as a low intensity recreational use, but they are not doing it for this, they are doing it for the marketing purposes.

Dan Kennedy asked about the scale of the value of the rent that is derived from the soccer tournament versus the value added in marketing production. Mr. Carter states that rental is not a lot when Jeff Tober asked how much they make off each tournament. Mr. Carter did not want to disclose financial amounts, but Mr. Harrison asked him what percentage of the income for the farm would it be. Mr. Carter answered that about 7-8% on their tax return.

John Kocubinski asked about compaction regarding the acreage for parking and wants to know if Mr. Carter has gone to the soil conservation regional office asking if it was approved. Mr. Carter responded yes, and Mr. Harrison said that although it is an issue, it is not an issue for Mr. Gardner.

Brian Lestini brings up an exaggerated example asking what happens if he's a company that sells helicopter tours and he thinks he can increase the farmers marketing of their crop by flying helicopter tours over their fields, would that be a permitted use under the deed for him to have a facility like that? If not, what is the difference? Mr. Harrison asks about if it's just flying over, not landing on the farm in which Mr. Lestini responded that he wanted to build a small helipad so he could sell helicopter tours. Mr. Harrison stated that that is the critical difference, if you are building a helipad, you are taking away from production of the crop. It is taking away land to be farmed. In Mr. Gardner's situation, nothing is being taken permanently out of production, everything that is sod today will be sod two years from now. The only impact would be the county and township requirement of the 20-foot apron that has existing access that the deed of easement allows him to maintain. If looking, some may believe it is something that should be done anyway for Stokes Road because of it only being two travel lanes, no shoulder, so it may be a good idea just for his farming purposes. He is not farming any of the area that would be where the aprons would be at.

Brian Lestini asked if there were any other examples of recreational "activities" that would be acceptable marketing as in if he were to have a cranberry bog, can he sell motorboat tours on his cranberry bog to increase sales. His example is trying to help him understand what precedent will be set. Mr. Harrison thinks that it is a valid concern because it won't impact the bogs for Mr. Lestini's example, same as the use of the sod farm for the soccer tournaments. Mr. Harrison wants to get back to the key point, are you doing something that is changing or negatively impacting the ability to farm this property and it is not. If it did impact it negatively, then no, you cannot do it for the marketing ability.

Mr. Carter asked Mr. Gardner where he would be selling and distributing his sod and Mr. Gardner responded within Burlington County and Ocean County. Mr. Harrison asked where he would be harvesting the sod that he would be selling in which Mr. Gardner responded that it would be sold right from the field along with his other fields of sod.

Jeff Tober made the comment that it's being implied that he's selling enough sod that he is expanding in which Mr. Gardner responded that his father was down to about 25 acres before he passed away four years ago and it has been

a struggle to get back to where he is so he said that the marketing chance with the tournaments would certainly help his business.

Brian Lestini brought up that there was a mention of rotating the location and he wanted to confirm that there was enough room for that to happen. Mr. Carter stated that he was the farm that rotated, and Mr. Harrison said that the rotating was not part of the proposal for Mr. Gardner. They are over-estimating the parking area so there is no chance of having parking on the road and that Mr. Gardner has opted to choose the way in the proposal due to the short duration so rotation would not necessarily be needed.

Kevin Sparkman asked if the proposal states two years, is this something that Mr. Gardner wants to try and see if it works or if it is going to continue. Mr. Harrison states that Mr. Gardner is confident based on Mr. Carter's experience, it will work for sufficiently well that he will build up his client base so he will not need soccer tournaments. Anthony Drollas asked Mr. Harrison to confirm that it will not be sport sod that Mr. Gardner will be growing in which he did. Mr. Harrison said that the goal of Mr. Gardner is for landscaping purposes.

Dan Kennedy stated that if it is compatible with the Deed of Easement, the Board would have no grounds to put a time limit on it if it is marketing an ag product in which Tony Drollas responded that if it's offered at the two year term, it's incentive for the Board to look at it favorably since it is not intended to continue. If the Board were to approve it for the two-year term, if Mr. Gardner wanted to continue, he would have to go in front of the Board again. Mr. Harrison stated that at a legal standpoint, the question would be we don't want to see the thirty acres not return to production which would be the basis in the future if it continued. Ed Cohen asked that if we approve this, are we setting a precedent for others to come and say that since the Board approved this for Mr. Gardner, you have to approve it for me in which Mr. Drollas responded with maybe, but his proposal may not succeed either. Dan Kennedy said that he thinks it is self-limiting given the nature but if we let it for one day "marketing an ag product", it's marketing an ag product whether its two years or ten years as long as the conditions are set very clear and how acreage should be used.

Paul Shinn asked a question regarding how the Township sees the parking proposal on the field if they are farmland assessed if they aren't farming it for two years stating that if a preserved farm owner doesn't farm a crop in two years, they are in trouble. Mr. Harrison responded that it is going to be somewhat less than two years, he will harvest in March or early this year and will be back growing sod here in early 2022. Mr. Carter cleared up that if they utilize the fields in 2020 into 2021, the fall (2021) is when they would be planting. Tournaments end early November in which Mr. Gardner would then be able to plant.

Kevin Sparkman asked what other marketing tactics Mr. Gardner has used to promote his product that are making him go this direction and Mr. Gardner responded with a basic internet site that is all they have to work with.

Mr. Carter stated that they have starting using "geofencing" which will alert people with smart phones once they cross the property lines onto their fields. He offered to help Mr. Gardner if he would be interested in using that product. Mr. Harrison included that the emails that will be going out to literally thousands of people, the recipients can easily click on the sod farm advertisement located within the email that will take them directly to the sod farms website.

Chairman Prickett added as a final comment that the Board's responsibility is to keep that ground open and valuable for agriculture and that their second responsibility is to keep the farm viable for the farmer to continue working the ground and in Chairman Prickett's opinion, if Mr. Gardner finds a way to help his business and keeps the agriculture

going, Chairman Prickett is in favor of the proposal. He stated that he believes the parking should have some sort of growth on it and is not just left bare but it won't because natural grass and natural weeds will come and Mr. Gardner will not let it go into weeds that are in violation.

Brian Lestini asked what the definition of marketing is and how does this proposal impact that definition. He understands what Chairman Prickett is saying about how everyone wants to preserve its ability to do so but what is the opportunity to come up with any of the schemes that would be less able to preserve the character of the farm but be considered marketing and since they set a precedent here they would have to consider that to be marketing. Chairman Prickett responded that what he thought Mr. Harrison was trying to prove was that the precedence has already been set. Other farmers bring people on their farms if they sell apples or blueberries, "pick your own", etc. but you have to work with the public in order to keep the farm viable and this is just another way of doing it for sod since there aren't many ways.

Kevin Sparkman pointed out that Tuckahoe Turf Farms is a good example of what can be done but also thinks its comparing apples to oranges with Tuckerton Farms since it is a more targeted audience of athletics for Tuckahoe whereas Tuckerton Farms doesn't have that outlook. Dan Kennedy added that the Freeholders hold the easement on this farm, not the Ag board or the SADC and Brian Wilson added that the decisions the Freeholders typically defer to the CADB so the next step would be if the SADC is a joint easement holder, they have the right to enforce as well. Whatever decision this Board makes, the SADC has the right to take up the matter again themselves. Mr. Kennedy asked Mr. Wilson if there have been any preliminary conversations with them on this matter and if there is any statewide precedent other than the pinelands example they were presented with earlier. Mr. Wilson said the SADC has dealt with similar request on a sod farm in Monmouth County but that was done under the recreational clause and there were reasons why it was denied as a result of recreation. It was not presented as "marketing". Mr. Wilson added that there has been a joint meeting with Mr. Harrison, Mr. Carter, Mr. Gardner and SADC at the staff level to hear the proposal once and to make sure everyone involved had an understanding, but no decision has been made at the SADC level.

Brian Lestini commented that if looking at just this farm, it is simple because if you think of what potentially opens the door to and he is not sure if it is exactly the same as someone who goes to a farm motivated by wanting to buy the produce on that farm as it is someone who is going to farm primarily to participate in a paid soccer tournament and then may decide to purchase the product. Chairman Prickett added that they aren't the same. John Kocubinski said that the vast majority of spectators will not be potential buyers granted, but listening to the plan and if entities are going to be invited in to review this, you need that in order to articulate the negative or positive in regard to the uses. He reiterated that there is nothing there that is going to be permanent like if you were to put a baseball field there instead of the soccer fields.

Kevin Sparkman and Brian Lestini agreed with one another stating that there are going to be farms playing by the rules for special occasions and are limited to certain rules in the bill but then if we say its marketing, then those rules all of the sudden don't apply. He thinks there is much more precedent being set than from this one farm and Brian Wilson added that those are going to be difficult decisions that will make it back to the Board and the scenario is likely.

Chairman Prickett reiterated that he is not changing the structure of the land, he is not hurting the land, if it doesn't work in two years, he will do what he did before or something else that will work for him. It's an opportunity Mr. Gardner would like to explore.

Randi Rothmel asked regarding the conditions, is there any way to add a condition that if there is any damage that it must be put back to the way it was. Mr. Harrison replied with a logical condition is to require that the entire area that is being used as far as the soccer events be returned to sod production at the end of the term and that is what they are stating with the proposal.

Brian Wilson reported that the three options are a motion to concur if you wanted to add conditions, a motion to deny or

Brian Lestini suggested that if motioned for the approval of a resolution, they should have a very clear and narrow definition on how this is within the scope of marketing for this particular type of crop. He states that since this can be directly tied to the marketing of the sod, it can prevent problems down the road of opening the door towards things that are stretching the definition of marketing.

Brian Wilson stated that what should be done for the next is to direct him to prepare a resolution concurring, he would pass the resolution around prior to the meeting so everyone can look over it and add any comments or questions so this discussion wouldn't have to be had at the next meeting. Chairman Prickett mentioned to have a guide of all the comments so they can work on the resolution within the next week.

Kevin Sparkman asked if there was any sort of timing issue that could affect this proposal. Mr. Harrison stated that they have applied where needed and things are in the process of moving along so things can potentially start in March. He stated that he'd like to see resolution at the next meeting and try to do something that night.

Brian Lestini asked a question to the farmers on the Board regarding if there is a set of special occasion event rules that get approved that are more stringent than this, what is the comfort level with different kinds of farms having different sets of what you can and can't do. Chairman Prickett stated that they were going to take it one step at a time and try and resolve this first and have everyone's concerns and comments are stated. Dan Kennedy stated that there are several different forms of the easement depending on when you preserved your farm and that some farms have exceptions and some don't, so he believes the ag community is used to having different nuances of different easements.

Richard Toone added that since, as tax payers in the County, he thinks there should be a sign within on the property for when people from all over come to play their tournaments that adds a thank you to tax payers in New Jersey that shows the good of having the land preserved.

Chairman Prickett asked for a motion to authorize Brian Wilson to move ahead with creating a resolution in agreement with the proposal. Richard Toone motioned the approval and John Hlubik seconded the motion. A majority voted in favor and Pete Johnson and Dan Kennedy abstained.

#### D. Final Approval 2019 Applications

i. Allen Pointville Farm – Pemberton Twp. – **(resolution)** – Dan Kennedy motioned for approval; John Kocubinski seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion.

ii. Giberson Home Farm – Southampton Twp. – **(resolution)** – Dan Kennedy motioned for approval; John Kocubinski seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion

iii. Giberson North Farm – Southampton Twp. – **(resolution)** – Dan Kennedy motioned for approval; John Kocubinski seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion

iv. Eckert West Farm – Pemberton Twp. – **(resolution)** – Dan Kennedy motioned for approval; John Kocubinski seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion

v. Eckert East Farm – Chestsefield Twp. – **(resolution)** - Dan Kennedy motioned for approval; John Kocubinski seconded the motion. A majority vote approved the motion

#### **V. Public Comment**

Brian Wilson added comments regarding his memo sent to the Board last week that was addressed to Mary Pat Robbie regarding his family farm in Chesterfield Township. He reiterated that since he has bought the farm himself, the State of New Jersey will continue to handle monitoring.

Bill Pettit Jr. handed out copies of a packet pertaining to SADC and non-severable exception areas (see attached handout). He voiced comments and concerns regarding the restriction of non-severable exception areas in past preservation purchases. Bill Fox also voiced his comments and concerns regarding the special occasion events and policies that that SADC have in place in which he believes needs to be changed.

#### **VI. Closed Session**

There was no closed session.

**VII. Next meeting: March 12, 2020 -7:00 PM**  
Cooperative Extension of Burlington County  
2 Academy Drive  
Westampton, NJ 08060-3826

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 PM.