

Approved 1/19/2011

NJ Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 8, 2010

Assunpink WMA  
Robbinsville, NJ

**ATTENDEES**

COMMITTEE: Barbara Brummer-Chair, James Applegate, Joanna Burger, Emile DeVito, Jane Galetto, Rick Lathrop, Erica Miller, David Mizrahi, James Shissias, and Dale Schweitzer.

Absent: Howard Geduldig.

STAFF: Dave Jenkins (Chief), Dave Chanda, Kathy Clark, Amy Wells, Pete Winkler, Patrick Woerner.

GUESTS: Rick Dutko (DPF), Linda Cherkassky, Dmitry Cherkassky, Ryan Kaitlyn Castared (Animal Welfare Federation of NJ), Elizabeth George Cheniara (NJBA), Annette Scherer (USFWS)

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. Notice of the meeting date and location were filed with and posted at the Office of the Secretary of State on October 22, 2010.

Minutes

**A motion was made by Jim Applegate, seconded by Rick Lathrop to accept the October 2010 as presented with the following change: Erica Miller should be deleted from the list of absent members. 8 in favor, 2 abstained; the minutes were approved.**

Action Items

Members reviewed the status of pending action items and the schedule of proposed agenda items.

Members were directed to forward specific questions regarding the NJ Deer Management Program to Barbara Brummer for presentation to the Fish and Game Council.

The Nominating Committee will review the composition of ENSAC members and prepare recommendations for 3 terms expiring 4/2011. ENSAC members Rick Lathrop, Jane Galetto and Jim Shissias mentioned that they would either serve on or were willing to serve on the nominating committee.

Outreach to Pharmaceutical Industry regarding Horseshoe Crab Populations

Members discussed the shortage of funding for the Horseshoe Crab trawl surveys and noted ENSAC's and the pharmaceutical industry's joint interest in the long term sustainability of the

species. Given the current financial shortfalls, ENSAC discussed how they may be able to influence the industry to provide more financial support for this critical survey.

#### Director's Report

Director Dave Chanda provided an overview of the Community Based Black Bear Management Policy (CBBBMP), the status of the bear hunt (Dec. 6-11), the Division wide financial impact(s) resulting from the loss of the state appropriation serving as State Wildlife Grant (SWG) matching funds, the potential financial impact resulting from bills A823 and S1122 pertaining to the implementation of a National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) mandatory saltwater fishing registration program.

ENSAC members drafted a letter to Senator Smith expressing strong concern regarding NJ Legislature's approval of the unfunded mandate associated with bills A823 and S1122.

**A motion was made by Joanna Burger, seconded by David Mizrahi to approve and present the letter noting ENSAC's opposition of A823 and S1122 which pertains to an unfunded mandate implementing a "free" saltwater fishing registry. All in favor; none opposed; the motion was approved. (Letter attached)**

#### Landscape Project – Stakeholder Summary & Letter to the Commissioner

Members again reviewed both documents. Rick Lathrop provided modifications to the summary report that would include LSP version 3 would address some issues presented by those at the stakeholder meeting.

**A motion was made by Joanna Burger, seconded by Jim Applegate, to approve the letter to Commissioner Martin regarding the Landscape Project Stakeholder meeting as written. All in favor, none opposed, the motion was approved. (Letter attached)**

**A motion was made by Rick Lathrop, seconded by Joanna Burger and unanimously approved by the Committee to approve the Summary Report with the proposed amendments. (Summary attached)**

**A motion was made by Joanna Burger, seconded by Jim Applegate to send the approved letter and the LSP Stakeholder summary (with modifications as presented by Rick Lathrop) to DEP Commissioner Martin. All in favor, none opposed, the motion was approved.**

#### Delphi SOP Report Format

Members reviewed the Delphi SOP materials prior to the meeting. Requested revisions include: 5C-delete the information within the parenthesis (provided in Section II background) and distribute the final NJ report and recommendations to USFWS and/or other governing agencies as appropriate.

**A motion was made by Joanna Burger, seconded by Emile DeVito and approved by the Committee to approve the Delphi SOP Report Format as amended. All in favor; none opposed; the motion was approved.**

Atlantic Sturgeon – listing update

Dave Jenkins provided an update on the federal (NMFS & NOAA) and the NJ State proposed listing status of the Atlantic Sturgeon. The NJ rule amendment includes revisions to the endangered, threatened species of odonates, creation of a status of special concern, and amended list of nongame wildlife. The proposal is scheduled for publication in the January 18, 2011 register. Due to new information that became available between 2007 (when the NJ review of marine fish was completed) and last month (when the federal proposal to list Atlantic Sturgeon as endangered was published), a decision was made to remove the Atlantic Sturgeon from the NJ rule proposal to afford the ENSAC the opportunity to review the new information. Members noted their disagreement with the decision to remove the species from the proposal and requested the NJ rule proposal (when released) be sent to the members for comment.

Feral Cat Stakeholder Process

Barbara Brummer provided an update on the proposed feral cat stakeholder process. The drafted process would include representatives of 3 main categories including: 1) local, county and state government agencies; 2) wildlife experts and advocates; 3) cat advocates, owners, animal rights organizations.

Recommendations would be broken down into those recommendations for which there was consensus and those without consensus. Staff will recirculate the document for further review.

All parties are awaiting clarification from the Assistant Commissioners office regarding the role of ENSAC versus the Department in this stakeholder process.

ENSP Budget

Dave Jenkins and Kathy Clark distributed information pertaining to the ENSP budget and operating expenses. The current budget has the potential for a deficit of about totaling \$86,000. The projected deficit in FY12 is estimated at \$468,000 as the result of last year's elimination of state appropriation.

NJ American Kestrel Project

Dr. John Smallwood gave a presentation on American Kestrels in NJ and throughout their North American range. The presentation included an overview of the natural history, evidence for a decline in the breeding bird surveys, hawk migration counts, and a review of national and NJ population status. Dr. Smallwood offered 3 possible causes of the decline including: West Nile Virus, predation by Cooper’s hawks, and habitat loss.

**A motion was made by Rick Lathrop, seconded by David Mizrahi and approved by the Committee to adjourn the meeting.**

\*\*\*\*\*

*Attachments:*

- *Approved Letter to Senator Smith regarding A823 and S1122, an unfunded mandate implementing a marine fisheries registration program*
- *Approved Letter to Commissioner Martin regarding LSP Stakeholder meeting, meeting summary, and attendance sheet*



## State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mail Code 501-03

PO BOX 420

Trenton, NJ 08625-0420

David Chanda, Director

[www.NJFishandWildlife.com](http://www.NJFishandWildlife.com)

(609) 292-2965

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
*Governor*

KIM GUADAGNO  
*Lt. Governor*

BOB MARTIN  
*Commissioner*

Dr. Barbara Brummer, Chair  
Dr. James Applegate  
Dr. Emile DeVito  
Howard Geduldig  
Dr. Rick Lathrop  
Dr. Erica Miller  
Dr. David Mizrahi  
Jane Morton Galetto  
Dr. Dale Schweitzer  
James Shissias

8 December 2010

Dear Senator Smith:

I am writing on behalf of the Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee. This Committee is mandated by the New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Conservation Act of 1973 (N.J.S.A. 23:2a -7e). It is composed of eleven persons representing academia (4), veterinary-public health (1), nonprofit organizations (3), and the public at large (3), according to regulation (N.J.A.C. 7:25-4.18). As you may know we are mandated in an advisory capacity to the Division of Fish and Wildlife and the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

The New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee does not support Assembly Bill 823 and Senate Bill 1122 that establish a "free" saltwater registry. We consider this to be an "unfunded mandate" that could severely impact the New Jersey Division Fish and Wildlife's ability to manage the State's marine waters and the threatened and endangered species that inhabit these areas.

It is estimated that this "free" saltwater registry program will cost more than a half-million dollars per year, and this new program will drain critical funds from other essential NJ Division of Fish and Wildlife programs.

Furthermore, establishment of a NJ saltwater fishing license, at a nominal fee annually, would leverage four-fold with Federal dollars that New Jersey anglers already pay in excise taxes on fishing gear. New Jersey saltwater anglers currently receive no return or benefit from paying

these excise taxes, because these funds currently flow to other surrounding states that have a saltwater license.

So, instead, we support the New Jersey Marine Fisheries Council in their attempts to establish a recreational saltwater fishing license similar to the State's extremely successful freshwater fishing license. Such a license would not only bring NJ into compliance with the requirements of the Magnuson Stevens Act, but would provide critical funding to effectively manage the State's marine fisheries resource.

If implemented, saltwater fishing license money would be placed into a dedicated account and only used to support marine fisheries research and management programs, marine law enforcement, artificial reef management and the development of fishing/boating access sites and marine angler information and education resources. There are both State and Federal laws to ensure hunting and fishing license money is placed into a "dedicated" account and spent solely on fish and wildlife management. In fact, New Jersey has collected license revenue from hunters and freshwater anglers for nearly 100 years and never has the dedicated license account been used for anything other than fish and wildlife management.

Please join us in our efforts to conserve New Jersey's valuable fish and wildlife resources by securing the necessary funding to properly manage the marine fisheries resource.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Barbara Brummer', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Barbara Brummer, Chairperson  
Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee



## State of New Jersey

Mail Code 501-03

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee  
c/o Division of Fish and Wildlife-ENSP  
501 East State Street / PO Box 420  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0420

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
*Governor*

KIM GUADAGNO  
*Lt. Governor*

Dr. Barbara Brummer, Chair  
Dr. James Applegate  
Dr. Emile DeVito  
Howard Geduldig  
Dr. Rick Lathrop  
Dr. Erica Miller  
Dr. David Mizrahi  
Jane Morton Galetto  
Dr. Dale Schweitzer  
James Shissias

BOB MARTIN  
*Commissioner*

February 3, 2011

Bob Martin, Commissioner  
State of New Jersey  
Department of Environmental Protection  
401 East State Street  
7th Floor – East Wing  
P.O. Box 402  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0402

Dear Commissioner Martin,

I am writing on behalf of the NJ Division of Fish and Wildlife's, Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee (ENSAC). Our committee is the independent advisory body given the responsibility, pursuant to the New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Conservation Act (N.J.S.A. 23:2A et seq.), for advising and assisting you in carrying out the intent of that statute. We review land use and resource management issues, including Department of Environmental Protection policies and decisions that affect nongame, threatened and endangered wildlife species in the State, and when appropriate, make recommendations. Among our principal functions is to provide scientific guidance and oversight for the research, monitoring and management activities of the Endangered and Nongame Species Program.

In partnership with the Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP), the Committee conducted an evaluation of the Landscape map and its use over the past several months, culminating with a special meeting that included a cross-section of invited stakeholders held at Rutgers University on September 21, 2010. At the meeting, the Committee heard seven presentations from Landscape Project map end-users representing federal agencies, county governments, environmental commissions and the consultant community. The presentations offered constructive input, stimulated valuable discussion and advanced understanding of the Landscape maps in the various contexts they are applied.

Throughout the stakeholder process, ENSP staff took detailed notes and summarized the major issues raised. They have also developed proposed responses, where appropriate. ENSAC reviewed the summary and responses and made recommendations that were then incorporated by ENSP. The resultant document is attached for your review. Our Committee has reviewed this summary and concurs with the characterization of issues raised by stakeholders and is supportive of the responses and proposed actions.

While conducting this thorough evaluation of the Landscape maps and their use, four key lessons emerged from the process:

1. The Landscape maps are a valuable tool for a wide range of users. While regulatory implications of the mapping tend to pervade our discourse, it was revealing to hear from consultants, environmental commissions, planners and other stakeholders that Landscape maps are being applied voluntarily in contexts other than land-use regulation, such as conservation planning.
2. While use of Landscape maps in land-use regulation was the most controversial issue raised, our committee believes that such use *is appropriate* provided that rules do not treat maps as determinative and allow for closer examination of habitat values to further clarify or even dispute any presumption provided by the maps.
3. Many of the perceived problems with the maps and their use are the result of misunderstanding and misinformation.
4. Specific issues raised regarding the design of the mapping will be addressed when ENSP completes the version 3.0 approach on a statewide scale and through further research and development carried out by ENSP.

It is the determination of this Committee that Landscape maps are based on sound scientific principles and that the Department promote their appropriate application to land-use regulation and conservation planning. In doing so, the Department will continue to afford transparency and predictability to the land-use permitting and development process. Our Committee will continue to advise and support the Endangered and Nongame Species Program as they continue to develop the next version of the Landscape maps and carry out the action items resulting from our evaluation. We welcome the opportunity to meet with you and your team to further debrief you on the outcome of our review and actions the Department should take to protect our nongame, threatened and endangered wildlife species in New Jersey.

Sincerely,



Barbara Brummer  
Chair, Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee

Attachments:     Synopsis of the Landscape Project Users Stakeholder Meeting  
                          Landscape Project Stakeholder Meeting – Sign-in Sheet

C:     Amy Cradic, Assistant Commissioner – Natural and Historic Resources  
       Dave Chanda, Director – Division of Fish and Wildlife  
       Dave Jenkins, Chief – Endangered and Nongame Species Program

# Synopsis of the Landscape Project Users Stakeholder Meeting

Conducted by:

**The New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee,  
September 21, 2010**

Prepared by:

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Fish and Wildlife -- Endangered and Nongame Species Program  
for  
The Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee  
January 12, 2011

**New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
ENDANGERED AND NONGAME SPECIES PROGRAM**





# **Synopsis of the Landscape Project Users Stakeholder Meeting**

conducted by:

**The New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee,  
September 21, 2010**

prepared by:

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Fish and Wildlife -- Endangered and Nongame Species Program  
for the Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee, January 12, 2011

## **INTRODUCTION**

In partnership with the Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP), the Endangered and Nongame Species Advisory Committee (ENSAC) conducted an evaluation of Landscape Project maps and their use. The review culminated with a special meeting, which included a cross-section of stakeholders, held at Rutgers University on September 21, 2010. At the meeting, the Committee heard seven presentations from Landscape Project map end-users representing federal agencies, county governments, environmental commissions and the consultant community. Below is a summary of the major issues raised during the stakeholder meeting along with ENSP responses and proposed action items to address them. ENSAC has reviewed this summary and concurs with the characterization of issues raised by stakeholders and is supportive of ENSP's responses and proposed actions. ENSP maintains copies of all presentations given at the stakeholder meeting as well as detailed notes on individual presentations and the guided discussion that are available upon request.

## **LANDSCAPE PROJECT STAKEHOLDER MEETING: SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED**

- = ENSP response

### **Valid Landscape Project Mapping Criticisms**

- Overlapping Landscape Project map layers sometimes result in different ranks for the same location.
  - With Landscape Project Map Version 3 methodology, ENSP is attempting to incorporate all habitat layers into one geographic information system (GIS) layer to eliminate overlapping habitat layers that potentially have different ranks based on the status of the species present.
- Freshwater mussel mapping is not available statewide.
  - The expansion of Version 3 methodology will complete the statewide mapping of known mussel occurrences.

- Habitat patches are not designated as being under the jurisdiction of particular regulations, such as Freshwater Wetlands (FWW) or Flood Hazard.
  - ENSP could code patches of habitat that serve as potential habitat under different NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) rules such as Freshwater Wetlands Act regulations or flood hazard regulations. This would require collaboration with the NJ Division of Land Use Regulation (DLUR). Given that the applicability of particular rules requires site-by-site determination through the permit application review process, however, ENSP believes that coding patches with respect to potential jurisdiction of land-use regulations has the potential to be misinterpreted. Any decision to do so would need to be made by the Division of Land Use Regulation, and not by ENSP.
  
- The Version 3.0 wood turtle mapping is more accurate than the V2.1 mapping; and, overall, the Landscape Project Version 3 approach to mapping habitat is superior to the Version 2 method.
  - Version 2.1 wood turtle mapping will be replaced by the Version 3 mapping when Version 3 is completed for the remainder of the state.
  
- Narrow strips of land included as potential habitat in the Landscape Project maps can contribute to patches of documented habitat extending far across the landscape regardless of patch structure and the size, length, and use of such connections as travel corridors by wildlife.
  - Adjusting the Landscape Project map methodology to include a set of corridor rules will limit the potential of narrow strips of land to serve as connectors of extensive areas and that may unreasonably extrapolate documented habitat across the landscape.
  - ENSP has begun work on a statewide wildlife habitat corridor map for a number of focal species that will identify key travel corridors and prioritize linkages for maintaining and restoring landscape permeability for wildlife. As a result of this effort, ENSP will also be able to identify linkages that connect potential habitat that are not documented travel corridors and therefore, can be considered for removal as connectors in the Landscape maps.
  
- The grassland layer contains areas not suitable for grassland birds (cultivated row crops).
  - The grassland layer is made up of a number of agricultural lands, including “cropland and pastureland,” as derived from the NJDEP Land Use Land Cover (LU/LC). The current version of the LU/LC makes no distinction between cropland and pastureland, thus there is no mechanism yet available to differentiate one from the other. Moreover, many grassland dependent species require large areas and at a landscape level, agricultural lands are viewed as part of the grassland matrix that a species requires. Additionally, many fields have areas that are typically not farmed when they are too wet; those areas are beneficial to grassland dependent species. The tillable agricultural lands are potential habitat for grassland dependent species.

- The distance bald eagle foraging habitat extends from a given nest can vary greatly because the model to map foraging habitat selects suitable open water around the nest until 660 hectares of open water is reached without regard for distance from the nest.
  - ENSP biologists have reviewed all bald eagle foraging models and are confident in the area represented as habitat and the principle that bald eagle foraging habitat is better represented by area of open water than by a strict distance measurement from a nest.
  
- There is a need for a quicker turn-around time for sightings data being incorporated into the Landscape Project database, as well as timed, regular releases of updated versions of the Landscape Project maps.
  - Funding and staff constraints influence the ability of ENSP to quickly incorporate the volume of species occurrence data received.
  
- The selection of 1970 as the cutoff date for the use of occurrence data in the Landscape Project maps is completely arbitrary. Thus, important decisions may be made based on occurrences of protected species that may be forty years old.
  - Species occurrences from the decade of 1970 account for less than two percent of the total occurrences used in the Landscape Project maps. In addition, there are standards that reported sightings must meet in order to be included in the Biotics database and additional standards for inclusion in the Landscape Project. ENSP biologists have reviewed all data used for inclusion in Landscape maps and are confident in the accuracy of the data regardless of age. In particular, data from 1970s were reviewed in conjunction with recent habitat data to evaluate their continued use in Landscape Project maps. If occurrences were deemed outdated, and/or no suitable habitat remained, they were excluded from use in the Landscape Project maps
  - In completing Landscape Version 3 statewide, ENSP will again revisit the 1970 cutoff date for the use of occurrence data and eliminate data that is determined to be no longer valid.
  
- The Landscape Project maps do not take into account topographic or other elevation data.
  - Complete LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data for NJ is expected to be available in 2011. ENSP is working with DEP Bureau of Geographic Information Systems (BGIS) and U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to become familiar with the data and explore whether and how it can be used to depict relevant habitat patch characteristics in the creation of the Landscape Maps.
  
- There is a need to clarify the terminology of “critical” versus “potential” habitat.
  - ENSP will evaluate the use of these terms in the Landscape reports and more clearly define what the Landscape Project maps depict in future published documentation, including materials available on the ENSP website.
  
- Landscape Project maps display retention basins and medians as habitat.

- When working on Version 3 methodology for the next release of Landscape Project maps, ENSP will evaluate the possibility of eliminating these classes or areas in the mapping.

### **Myths**

- ENSP has developed a document that addresses criticisms, myths and frequently asked questions about the Landscape Project maps that propose to post on the Division of Fish and Wildlife's website in early 2011.
- Identifying species information associated with a habitat patch is difficult to obtain.
  - Those using ArcGIS software may retrieve species information pertaining to a patch with a simple “Identify” for the patch. The same is true for NJ GeoWeb. ENSP has free training and information sessions that instruct users on how to obtain this information.
- New Jersey Audubon Breeding Bird Atlas (BBA) data is not used by ENSP in Landscape maps.
  - ENSP did review BBA data, however ENSP has different standards for inclusion of data in Biotics than New Jersey Audubon Society (NJAS) did for inclusion into their BBA. Only BBA data that met the Biotics standards were included in the database and in Landscape Project maps.
- Landscape Project maps do not address habitat succession and change over time.
  - Landscape Project maps use the most recent LU/LC data available and the mapping is updated to reflect changes in the LU/LC data.

### **Issues Raised Tangential to Landscape Project Maps**

- There is a need to go through a process to determine what habitats and habitat areas are critical for species and identify species that seem able to adapt to human activities and development (e.g., bald eagle).
  - ENSP is working on several species recovery plans which will identify habitat requirements and associations for the subject species. In addition, if a species' adaptability to human activities and habitat alterations affects its recovery prospects and/or appropriate management approaches, this information will be included in the recovery plans and/or background information. ENSP does not expect such information to be readily reflected in mapping, but will certainly be included in guidance documents that accompany mapping to assist with assessing habitat suitability.
- The process of updating the species status list and reflecting those list changes in the Landscape Project maps is too slow (e.g., Cooper's hawk delisting).
  - Pending species status changes are awaiting publication and adoption by the Department. Once the status changes are adopted those changes will be reflected in the next version of the Landscape Project maps.

### **Criticisms that are not within the purview of ENSP to address (i.e., criticisms that are directed at, and better responded to by, other NJDEP Programs**

- Rare plant location data should be incorporated into the Landscape Project maps.
- NJ Natural Heritage Program (NHP) Rare Species Data Request response letter is not useful for Flood Hazard Area reviews.
- Large areas of Endangered (E) and Threatened (T) species habitat have no regulatory protection.
- Water Quality Management Planning rules are putting the burden of conducting investigations to determine habitat suitability and to conduct species surveys on local governments, corporations and private citizens. There is often no collaboration between Municipal Master Plans and sewer service areas (SSA). It would be useful to see negative survey data reflected in the Landscape Project maps (e.g., results of Division of Land Use Regulation letter of interpretation [LOI] determinations).
  - Incorporating results from LOIs would require collaboration with the Division of Land Use Regulation and any decision to attempt to amend the Landscape maps to reflect site-by-site information obtained through individual applications to DEP would need to be made by the Division of Land Use Regulation, and not by ENSP. Updating the Landscape Project maps to reflect information obtained in the course of a habitat suitability determination or LOI may be difficult to implement without additional staff resources because the Landscape Project maps are not updated with the same frequency that LOI determinations are completed. In addition, the scale at which LOI determinations are carried out differs from the scale of the Landscape Project maps, thus editing the habitat patches in the area of a particular parcel would just update the area of that parcel and not the surrounding habitat patch as delineated in the Landscape Project maps. Moreover, even if the correction could be made on a particular parcel, it would be of limited usefulness to the regulated community in terms of avoiding future regulatory review because such site-specific review would have already been completed with the issuance of the LOI for the parcel in question. Since the LOI is parcel-specific, future regulatory review would still be required for surrounding parcels.

### **Praise**

- One of the first steps in protection of a natural resource is to map it. Landscape Project maps are used daily by a wide audience for many purposes including: permit reviews (Freshwater Wetlands (FWW), CAFRA, Flood Hazard, Natural Resource Inventories (NRI), Environmentally Sensitive Areas Protection Planning, and Sewer Service Areas.
- Landscape Project maps help facilitate preliminary determinations of potentially regulated areas.
- The Landscape Project Version 3.0 approach to mapping endangered and threatened species habitat is superior to the approach employed in previous version of the Landscape Project maps.

- Landscape Project maps are a useful tool for targeting and prioritizing open space acquisitions.
- Environmental commissions utilize maps for site plan evaluation and to incorporate environmental values into municipal master plans.
- A number of municipalities have directly adopted Landscape Project maps by reference in township ordinances (Woodstown-Pilesgrove).
- United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) utilizes Landscape Project maps as a tool to conduct conservation planning and environmental compliance (NEPA, ESA). New Jersey is unique because NRCS does not have access to data of the same quality in other states.

**NJ Landscape Project Mapping Stakeholder Meeting  
Rutgers University  
Cook Campus Center**

**September 21, 2010**

**Attendees**

**ENSAC**

Dr. Barbara Brummer (Chair)  
Dr. James Applegate  
Dr. Joanna Burger  
Dr. Emile DeVito  
Jane Galetto  
Howard Geduldig  
Dr. Rick Lathrop  
Dr. David Mizrahi  
James Shissias

**ENSP**

Dave Jenkins  
Kathy Clark  
Amanda Dey  
David Golden  
Rob Somes  
Amy Wells  
Patrick Woerner  
Peter Winkler

**DEP**

Judy Jengo, NJ DEP  
Robert Piel, NJ DEP, Div of Land Use Regulations  
Larry Torok, NJ DEP Div of Land Use Regulations  
Rick Dutko, NJ DEP, Div of Parks and Forestry  
Elizabeth Semple, NJ DEP, Office of Planning and Sustainable Communities

**Presenters**

Daniel Brill, EcolSciences  
Amy Greene, Amy Greene Environmental  
John Pabish, Amy Greene Environmental  
Eric Snyder, Sussex County Planning Division  
Gary Casabona, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Debbie Kratzer, Kingwood Environmental Commission  
Francis Rapa, Woodstown-Pilesgrove Environmental Commission

**Guests**

Tanya Nolte, NJ Conservation Foundation

David Roth, TWT/Consultant

Lynn Maun, Greater Egg Harbor Watershed Association

Fred Akers, Greater Egg Harbor Watershed Association

Ken Benscoter, NJ Highlands Council

Carl Figueiredo, NJ Highlands Council

Larry Liggett, NJ Pinelands Commission

Brian Szura, NJ Pinelands Commission

Ken Bogen, Hunterdon County

Ed McCaffrey, Hunterdon County Parks Dept.

Donna Lewis, Mercer County

Eric Snyder, Sussex County

Sandy Batty, ANJEC

Brian Henderson, Conserve Wildlife Foundation of NJ

Helen Heinrich, NJ Farm Bureau

Marie Banasiak, NJ Farm Bureau

Barbara Sachau, general public

Others



ENSAC/Landscape Project Stakeholder Meeting  
September 21, 2010

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

Name	Organization/Affiliation
1. BARBARA BRUMMER	THE NATURE CONSERVANCY
2. Dave Jenkins	N.J. Div Fish + Wildlife
3. Jane Morton Galetto	CUPMT
4. JAMES SWISSIAS	ENSAC (PUBLIC)
5. Jim Applegate	Rutgers
6. Joanna Burger	ENSAC - Rutgers
7. Rick Lathrop	Rutgers
8. Howie Geduldig	ENSAC / Public Member
9. David Mirzakhani	ENSAC / NJ Audubon
10. Rick Dotto	Div. Parks & Forestry
11. B Saehau	public
12. Robert Somes	NJ Div. of Fish and Wildlife
13. Patrick Woerner	DFW-ENSP
14. Peter Winteler	DFW - ENSP
15. KATHY CLARR	NJDFW-ENSP
16. DAVID GOLDEN	NJDFW-ENSP
17. Daniel Brill	EcolSciences, Inc
18. AMANDA DEY	NJ Fish + Wildlife
19. FRANCIS RAPA	NJCF / WPJEC
20. Amy Wells	DFW Rutgers
Officer Emile DeVito	NJCF/ENSAC

ENSAC/Landscape Project Stakeholder Meeting  
September 21, 2010

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

Name	Organization/Affiliation
1. David Roth	TWT / consultant
2. Lynn Mann	GEAWA
3. FRED ALCORS	GEAWA
4. ERIC SNIDER	SUSSEX COUNTY
5. Brian Szura	NJ Pinelands Commission
6. Donna Lewis	Mercer Co
7. Marisa Wiczorek	Mercer
8. Ken Reuscher	Highlands Council
9. Ed McCaffrey	AUNT CARY PARKS DEPT.
10. JOHN PABISH	AMY GREENS ENV. OBS.
11. Debbie Kratzor	KINGWOOD ENV. COM.
12. Amy Greene	Amy Greene Environmental
13. Larry Lizzell	Pinelands Commission
14. Ken Bowen	Hartford County
15. CARL Figueiredo	Highlands Council
16. Jody Jensen	NJDEP
17. Lodey TOROK	NJDEP / DLUR
18. Tanya Nolte	NJCF
19. Robert Juel	NJDEP / DLUR
20. Sandy Betty	ANJEC

ENSAC/Landscape Project Stakeholder Meeting  
September 21, 2010

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

**Name                      Organization/Affiliation**

1.	Liz Sample	NJPEP
2.	Brian Henderson	Conserv Wildlife Foundation of NT
3.	Helen Heinrich	NJ Farm Bureau
4.	MARIE BANASIA	NJFB
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		