



# *State of New Jersey*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUSINESS ACTION CENTER  
OFFICE OF PLANNING ADVOCACY  
PO Box 820  
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0820

PHILIP D. MURPHY  
*Governor*

LT. GOVERNOR TAHESHA L. WAY  
*Secretary of State*

MELANIE WILLOUGHBY  
*BAC Executive Director*

WALTER C. LANE  
*Acting Executive Director*

## **Cross Acceptance Negotiation Phase – Second & Final Interim Report July 29, 2025**

The Office of Planning Advocacy (OPA) is pleased to provide this report, in accordance with N.J.A.C. 15:30-4.5(b), on the Cross Acceptance Negotiation Phase.

The first Interim Report was delivered to the State Planning Commission on July 17, 2025 and summarized all Cross Acceptance activity from the official release of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan on December 6, 2024 through July 14, 2025. The first Interim Report was occasioned by the approximate halfway point of the Negotiation Phase of Cross Acceptance. As of this writing, the Negotiation Phase is complete.

Since July 15, 2025, the State Planning Commission's negotiating committee has met with the authorized representatives of Negotiating Entities in an additional ten (10) public Negotiation Sessions, for a total of twenty-two (22) public Negotiation Sessions. As with the sessions held through July 14, 2025, these subsequent Negotiation Sessions have been productive and efficient. In each of the ten (10) sessions, all agenda items have been addressed, and each Negotiating Entity elected to forego their second scheduled session.

As in the first half of the Negotiation Phase, the substantive portions of the agenda for each Negotiation Session were presented in two parts. An "Appendix A" was presented first; this contained items for negotiation that have been taken directly from the Negotiating Entity's Cross Acceptance Response and any supplemental municipal submissions. An "Appendix B" was then presented; this was comprised of a standardized list of items that have been gleaned from multiple Cross Acceptance Responses and/or comments received through other means, all of which the Office of Planning Advocacy staff had deemed to be of statewide relevance. During discussion of both appendices, members of both negotiating committees and any municipal representatives in attendance were welcome to offer input for the purposes of coming to an agreement, if possible. Following the completion of all agenda items, members of the public were given the opportunity to comment.

Also, as in the first half of the Negotiation Phase, the State Planning Commission's negotiating committee committed to consider revising the pertinent content of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan for the vast majority of items discussed. When a Negotiation Session participant requested a definition of a term contained in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan, those requests were noted. In most cases, Negotiation Session participants consented to the State Planning Commission's decision to pause consideration of all proposed amendments to the State Plan Policy Map until after the adoption of the new State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

Instances in which the State Planning Commission's negotiating committee objected to a request from a Negotiating Entity or member of the public have been minimal, and no disagreements of significance were noted since the first Interim Report. In some cases, different Negotiating Entities took opposing positions on items presented in Appendix B. One example is whether or not "Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas" should be mapped as a new Planning Area on the State Plan Policy Map. This and all other differing positions will be summarized for the State Planning Commission in the Draft Statement of Agreements and Disagreements (see below).

It should be noted, as per the parameters of his recusal, that the Acting Executive Director has refrained and will continue to refrain from any and all discussions pertaining to his prior position as the Director of Planning for the County of Somerset. These matters include: 1) all matters broadly pertaining to Somerset County, 2) all discussion of the Sourlands Mountain Region as a potential Special Resource Area, 3) all discussion of the removal of expirations for designated centers, and 4) all discussions of the West Trenton Passenger Service Reactivation and Raritan Valley Line One Seat Ride Improvements. In so keeping, the Acting Executive Director has not reviewed Somerset County's Cross Acceptance Response, and has not participated in Somerset County's "Prep Meeting" or Negotiation Session. When any topic included in his recusal came up during any Prep Meeting or Negotiation Session with another Negotiating Entity, the Acting Executive Director has excused himself from the conversation.

Tables summarizing the product of all Negotiation Sessions held since July 15, 2025 are attached hereto. These will form the basis of the Draft Statement of Agreements and Disagreements, which, in compliance with N.J.A.C. 15:30-4.6, will be submitted for the State Planning Commission's review and approval. Cross Acceptance will conclude with the State Planning Commission's approval of the final Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

The Office of Planning Advocacy remains confident that the final State Development and Redevelopment Plan can be adopted by the end of 2025. Amidst the tightly compressed timeline of the Cross Acceptance process, members of the public and representatives of local governments have still been provided ample opportunities to contribute substantively to the shaping of New Jersey's new State Plan. Important considerations are being raised and addressed, and the entire process is proceeding in conformance with the State Planning Rules and all other relevant regulations.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lisa Avichal". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Lisa" and last name "Avichal" clearly distinguishable.

Lisa Avichal  
Senior Planner

Appendix A - Passaic County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	County/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
General		5	How will the state plan address revitalization and housing in our downtown district with the elevated flood plain recently put in place?	Bloomingtondale	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
General		15	The State Plan should also include a detailed statement regarding the need to balance all statewide objectives to ensure that the emphasis on any one goal does not adversely impact other important goals that should carry equal weight with respect to a ‘goals evaluation’ process.	Hawthorne	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
General		35	provide a matrix of who is responsible for implementing each goal (different levels of government)	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
General		35	goals should be numbered	Woodland Park	Disagree	consider a reference to each goal
Executive Summary	12	28	Woodland Park also seeks clarification of the statement “provide for a proportional increase in housing”. What does proportional mean? The statement should be quantified.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Executive Summary	12	Totowa letter	Concerning revitalization and recentering, the Borough feels that the restoration of existing vacant and abandoned properties should be the highest priority when discussing underperforming economic assets. The state should enact policies that incentivize redevelopment of existing previously developed spaces versus the development of undeveloped properties.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Executive Summary	13	Totowa letter	The Borough feels that impacts on the local community should also be included among the concerns with respect to sound and integrated planning process for any municipality. We concur that effective planning must consider impacts on neighboring communities, however we feel that the municipal residents and stakeholders where the development is taking place must be given due deference. Residents must have a say, and their concerns must have priority over the concerns of residents outside of their municipality.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Executive Summary	14	Totowa letter	The Plan states, “Land use planning in New Jersey can champion and implement progressive ideas that have positive impacts on the prosperity and quality of life in New Jersey.” The Borough feels that this goal can be better phrased and suggests stating that, “land use planning can be utilized to develop policies that have positive impacts on all residents of New Jersey.”	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Economic Development	18	Totowa letter	The Plan indicates that it is a goal to, “[r]estructure and simplify government regulatory activities through comprehensive planning and careful reengineering to eliminate unnecessary bureaucracy and costly delays. Provide the resources necessary to complete project reviews quickly without sacrificing the quality and thoroughness of the review. The statement does not provide any context with respect to what regulations should be changed. The Plan should be more specific regarding what parts of the development approval process should be altered.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	disagree
Housing	23	29	This strategy should be revised to encourage housing development outside of environmentally sensitive lands and limit housing development to existing utility constraints.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	qualified agreement (consider environment vs. housing)
Housing	23	29	The Draft State Plan does not provide a separate housing goal oriented towards communities lacking public transportation. Clarification should be provided on the goal for housing development in areas lacking public transportation.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	26	30	"Where a municipality has limited land suitable for development, redevelopment options, up-zoning, or other similar solutions must be implemented to meet constitutional requirements." the last sentence in this statement is incorrect, specifically the word “must”. [range of strategies]	Totowa, Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	disagree
Housing	29	30	“Boost transit ridership through Transit-Oriented Development. Appropriately sited housing is proven to boost transit ridership while reducing congestion and air pollution.” The last sentence above is not qualified. A report or study should be cited, otherwise it appears to be a net opinion.	Totowa, Woodland Park	A citation will be provided.	agree

Housing	29	31	Who would be responsible for preparing evacuation plans? Who would be responsible for requiring building and flood insurance?	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	29	31	It is unclear if the last sentence applies to new construction, additions, or certain types of renovations. The text should be clarified. Additionally, an explanation is needed on what “systems” need to be elevated.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Infrastructure	34	31	Clarification is needed on what “higher intensity mixed-use” includes. Is it a specific density range or just above the average permitted density in a municipality?	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Climate Change	41	31	who is tasked with conducting regional watershed level planning? [joint efforts]	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Climate Change	41	32	unclear what entity would be in charge of leading the creation of intergovernmental and community partnerships?	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Climate Change	42	32	Additional text should be provided to clarify how DEP floodplain regulations promote smart growth in developed towns.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Climate Change	42	32	The Draft State Plan should add details on how to mitigate impacts to existing developed areas in high-hazard areas.	Woodland Park	New planning areas under consideration (PA1A/PA1B).	agree
Natural and Water Resources	43	32	unclear how a community can avoid site disturbance, tree removal, and impervious coverage when building housing unless all housing construction is to take place on previously developed land. The Borough supports the above goal as written, but believes the State should reconsider and revise the goals and priorities listed for housing.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	44	32	As NJDEP regulates the habitats of threatened and endangered species, habitat restoration should be the purview of NJDEP and its experts, not a municipal zoning ordinance.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	46	33	Clarification should be given as to what entity would be in charge of managing “regional flood and stormwater management planning and implementation.” The text should be supplemented to indicate the responsible entity.	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	46	33	who is responsible for identifying/delineating...?	Woodland Park	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
SPPM	68	25	The State Plan Policy Map should be enhanced with an overlay for flood hazard areas to recognize the danger stream corridors face.	Woodland Park	New planning areas under consideration (PA1A/PA1B).	agree
SPPM	68	33	identify where the SPPM is located	Woodland Park	SPPM will be included in final SDRP.	agree
SPPM	69	15	The State Plan includes goals to protect environmentally sensitive areas which is fine, but there should be a caveat that these broad intentions are subject to site-specific features that warrant some flexibility when planning for individual site development.	Hawthorne	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Executive Summary	11-12	Totowa letter	Borough recommends that the Plan more explicitly support strategies that prioritize infrastructure enhancement, protect remaining open spaces, and promote context-sensitive redevelopment.	Totowa	Will consider revised language.	neutral
Economic Development	20-21	Totowa letter	Attempting to engineer proximity between jobs and housing without accounting for individual autonomy could oversimplify complex residential patterns. Not all jobs are interchangeable, nor are all workers seeking the same type of housing or lifestyle. A more nuanced approach that considers worker mobility, remote work trends, and regional transit options might be more effective than a one-size-fits-all proximity-based strategy.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	23	Totowa letter	Inclusionary zoning and public-private partnerships have indeed played a role in supporting diverse housing types, but they cannot be applied uniformly.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	23	Totowa letter	Furthermore, many current homeowners wish to maintain their existing dwellings and community character. Any strategy that overlooks these preferences risks local pushbacks and diminishes public support. A more context-sensitive approach that considers both the limitations and opportunities within fully developed communities would be more appropriate.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	23	Totowa letter	Plan notes that, “[i]deally, new housing will be created in transit rich locations and in communities that are ethnically and economically diverse and integrated.” The aspiration to create new housing in transit-rich, economically, and ethnically diverse communities is commendable. However, this approach does not consider municipalities like the Borough, which have limited or no meaningful transit access. The current plan lacks a parallel strategy or goal for communities that fall outside of transit-served areas.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree

Housing	23	Totowa letter	municipalities with limited transit options are left without a clear housing framework that aligns with regional goals. These communities still need to plan for growth, affordability, and diversity in housing options—just within a different context. The plan should be expanded to include guidance for how these municipalities can contribute to housing goals through alternative means, such as enhancing walkability, encouraging compact development near town centers, or strengthening local employment-housing linkages.	Totowa	Will address in revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	23-24	Totowa letter	” [z]oning used to exclude potential residents from communities with plentiful jobs and high performing schools is inconsistent with the plan.” The Plan does not provide any examples or context with respect to this goal. Are existing zoning classifications to be considered inconsistent with the goals of the Plan?	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	neutral
Housing	27	Totowa letter	The plan should recognize and build upon the existing housing fabric rather than assume a universal deficiency.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	neutral
Housing	27	Totowa letter	Equally important, housing strategies must consider the needs and desires of existing residents. Prioritizing growth without respecting current community character and resident input risks eroding public trust and undermining the effectiveness of planning efforts. Good public policy must strike a balance between welcoming new residents and preserving the values of those who already call the community home.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	neutral
Housing	27	Totowa letter	While the statement that bans on multifamily housing or ADUs restricts affordability and disincentivize development may hold true in some contexts, it lacks necessary nuance and supporting examples.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Housing	27	Totowa letter	Including case studies or best practices where zoning reform has worked—alongside acknowledgment of where it may not be suitable—would strengthen the overall credibility and usefulness of this section.	Totowa	We can look to incorporate case studies.	agree
Housing	33	Totowa letter	Factors such as school quality, family ties, cultural connections, housing costs, and overall neighborhood conditions all influence residential choices. Therefore, while improved transit and job access are essential, the strategy should also emphasize the importance of investing in the overall livability and infrastructure of neighborhoods.	Totowa	Will address in revised final draft plan.	neutral
Housing	34	Totowa letter	The Plan states that,” [a]ll new buildings in the State should be energy efficient and existing buildings should be retrofitted and weatherized to reduce energy demand. A phased or incentive-based approach may be more appropriate and achievable.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	36	Totowa letter	The Plan should provide more guidance on how to address these kinds of places, including strategies for: • Incremental infill and context-sensitive redevelopment. • Supporting adaptive reuse and small-scale commercial or residential retrofits. • Enhancing basic infrastructure to allow for future adaptability. • Encouraging context-specific zoning reform even in car-dependent areas.	Totowa	Will address in revised final draft plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	37	Totowa letter	“(a)uto centric planning over the past decades has resulted in an excessive number of parking lots... The Plan should emphasize that municipalities must engage in partnerships with private property owners, including businesses, religious institutions, and shopping center owners.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	38	Totowa letter	While it is true that suburban zoning and large landscape buffers can present barriers to pedestrian connectivity, most municipal buffering regulations already allow for pedestrian egress or exceptions. However, it is important to recognize that these buffers serve a critical compatibility function—particularly between residential and non-residential uses. For example, landscaped buffers often function as noise barriers from delivery truck activity, loading zones, and other commercial operations that could negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods. The Plan should acknowledge this dual role and encourage context-sensitive solutions that balance walkability with buffering needs.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	38	Totowa letter	The statement that auto-oriented commercial strips “have no nighttime activity” is an overgeneralization. Many of these areas do in fact have significant evening activity, particularly where restaurants, bars, and late-night services are located. While it is true that the absence of residential development may limit 24-hour vibrancy, the Plan should qualify this claim and better distinguish between inactive commercial zones and those that are already active into the evening.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	38	Totowa letter	The Plan should offer more nuanced guidance for retrofitting commercial strips, including encouraging pedestrian connectivity without compromising necessary land use buffers, and recognizing existing economic activity while promoting more complete, mixed-use redevelopment.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree

Natural and Water Resources	43	Totowa letter	The Plan should provide clearer guidance on how these priorities are to be reconciled. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where should new housing be prioritized to reduce environmental impacts?</li> <li>• What tools are recommended to identify low-impact development opportunities?</li> <li>• How can local governments be supported in navigating tradeoffs between conservation and development?</li> </ul>	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	44	Totowa letter	Any planning guidance related to these sensitive environmental areas should acknowledge and defer to NJDEP’s regulatory framework to avoid confusion and ensure consistency across state and local jurisdictions.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	44	Totowa letter	Any references within the Draft Plan to construction practices, building standards, or environmental performance requirements should be addressed to the NJDEP and DCA.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Natural and Water Resources	44	Totowa letter	the State’s priority to accelerate housing production and the equally critical need to preserve environmental resources. The Plan should explicitly acknowledge this tension and provide more detailed guidance on how local governments and agencies can navigate these competing objectives. This may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear criteria for evaluating development potential in environmentally sensitive areas;</li> <li>• Incentives for low-impact or conservation-oriented development.</li> <li>• Coordination between DCA housing priorities and DEP environmental regulations.</li> </ul>	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Implementation	82	Totowa letter	the Draft State Plan should be supplemented with a copy of the official State Plan Policy Map.	Totowa	Already addressed.	agree
Implementation	83	Totowa letter	“Municipal planning in New Jersey is outdated... The Borough strongly objects to the assertion that municipal planning in New Jersey is outdated.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Implementation	83	Totowa letter	The Borough urges the State to reconsider the language and tone of this section and to affirm the importance of local autonomy in planning decisions, while still encouraging voluntary regional coordination where appropriate.	Totowa	Clarifying language will be provided in the revised final draft plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	25	It is unclear why the County Parks and lands essential to the drinking water reservoirs were included in the PA1 designation. The Borough requests that these areas be revised to Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (PA5) and/or Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas to better reflect their characteristics.	Woodland Park	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	[see list of manhole covers]	Woodland Park	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	[see list of streets]	Woodland Park	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree
Mapping	N/A	27	[see attached map]	Woodland Park	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree
Mapping	N/A	34	add 2 county parks to PA5 or PA8	Woodland Park	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree
Mapping	N/A	Totowa letter	These unique characteristics may warrant further consideration when evaluating the appropriateness of the Borough’s PA-1 designation.	Totowa	To be addressed in the mapping phase, after plan adoption.	agree

### Appendix B - Statewide Policy Issues - Passaic County

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY/NE RESPONSE	SPC NC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		ok with new definitions	agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		ok (map should also be added)	agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		ok	agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		agree	agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy.	State		agree	agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		no comment	
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	overlay would be preferred	agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	may be appropriate	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center.	State		consider transit-served areas	agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed, then CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		agree	agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	consider adding to exec summary	agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		agree	agree

Appendix A: Middlesex County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE INITIAL DRAFT RESPONSE	County/AGREE/DISAGREE	NOTES
State Plan Policy Map			While we understand that the OPA intends to address mapping issues after policy changes have been adopted, it is important to us that an acknowledgment of these requests, at least generally if not on an individual basis, be made in the State Plan and that OPA affirms its commitment to address those in a timely manner. As a County, and on behalf of our municipalities, we do have some concern that future development could be burdened by appearing to be inconsistent with the future State Plan Map when in fact, edits have been requested and may be pending.	Middlesex County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new final plan. Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Agency Coordination		16	"To ensure participation and long-term compliance with the State Plan, state agency financial incentives and technical assistance must be built into the Cross-Acceptance process. This will ensure that counties and municipalities embrace not only the State Plan but also what the planning area designations are on the State Plan Policy Map when confronted by development."	Middlesex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Plan Policy Map		17, 18	"The Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve is comprised of approximately 660 acres of freshwater wetlands, forested uplands, and meadows in a densely populated, highly developed central part of the State, offering unique natural habitat including federal priority wetlands. Over 15 different bird species have been spotted in the preserve, including the threatened and endangered grasshopper sparrow and yellow crowned night heron. In addition, 25 mammals and over a dozen reptile and amphibian species have been sighted, and archeological digs have uncovered at least 5 significant archeological sites, including one that is at least 10,000 years old.  This significant State environmental resource, which is located in a dense urban environment, has been preserved by State Statute, yet is not mentioned in the Preliminary State Plan, nor is it represented on the State Plan Policy Map. <b>Middlesex County is requesting that this situation be addressed and rectified during the negotiation phase such that both the text of the State Plan and the GIS behind the State Plan Policy Map be updated to include this special geographic area.</b> "	Middlesex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
Special Resource Area		77, 78, 79	"A policy change request is hereby made to create an "Area of Critical State Concern" for the 660-acre Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve. Similar to the Pinelands, Highlands, NJSEA, Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority, and Casino Reinvestment Developemnt Authority, the Barnes Wildlife Preserve deserves special statutory treatment under the Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preservation Act, and the Plan should treat the Preserve with the same deference as the Special Resources that are named in the State Planning Act. Map policy change requests have been prepared as submitted as a supplemental appendix in this Cross-Acceptance Report. Each map change is presented graphically on a quadrangle map, and an explanation provided for each request on the corresponding table."  "Page 61 of the Preliminary Draft State Plan addresses Regional Planning and Areas of Critical State Concern. This section should be updated to include Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve."  "The requested policy change to create an "Area of Critical State Concern" for the Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve does not have a viable alternative beyond a PA5 designation."	Middlesex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	



Climate Change		167	"Sprawl is not an issue in the municipality. However, the municipality does have flooding issues along the Raritan River. There are both existing single-family homes and apartment complexes located along the river. Homeowners may choose to raise their dwellings or the State could possibly offer a buy-out to raze them, neither of which has been done to date."	Township of Piscataway	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: Will address the definition, and remap some of those areas.
Climate Change		171	"The City has no space for sprawl development. Areas near the Raritan River are highly developed but also at risk during major events. The State should explore improvements to Rt. 18 to install major detention infrastructure under the roadway to absorb impact of major flooding events. They can replicate this elsewhere that roadways are buffers from flooding."	City of New Brunswick	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: We send this recommendation to NJDOT for their awareness. We can add that to the plan in a broader way.
State Agency Coordination		184	" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NJDEP regulations should have special considerations and/or ways to facilitate redevelopment of prime downtown areas and designated Centers</li> <li>• this is especially true for stormwater regulations in places with existing poor soil (type D) conditions. Similarly, NJDOT permitting processes should give special consideration to municipalities with walkable downtowns that include state highways."</li> </ul>	Borough of Highland Park	Will address in revised final draft plan. Will refer to the appropriate state agency.	AGREE	
State Agency Coordination		184	"1. State Planning Areas and Center Designation, specifically how to make it easier/more meaningful to be identified as a center 2. State/County Support for Local Efforts to Implement the SDRP - Technical assistance - Financial assistance - Permitting exceptions"	Borough of Highland Park	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: #1: Will address in Appendix B. #2: Provide Language
State Plan Policy Map		184	"Very well - the entire municipality is designated PA-1. However, <b>it may be worth considering placing the Rutgers Ecological Preserve, including parts of Piscataway and Edison, as well as the existing municipal and county parks along the Raritan River, into PA-5.</b> Also, we would suggest enhanced PA-1 core areas, perhaps as PA-1A, and remaining transitional metro areas as PA-1B."	Borough of Highland Park	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: Revise definition, core definition,
State Plan Policy Map		185	"In addition, in looking at the State Plan Map, we were struck by the fact that most of our region is Planning Area 1 and there is no distinction between walkable Highland Park and more suburban places like East Brunswick. A re-thought Center Designation process, one that is streamlined, would go a long way. We would suggest enhanced PA-1 core areas, perhaps as PA-1A, and remaining transitional metro areas as PA-1B."	Borough of Highland Park	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new final plan.	AGREE	
State Plan Policy Map		190	"We agree that we are predominantly PA 1 and have made minor revisions to the map to reduce environmentally sensitive lands that have been developed as subdivisions. I have also amended the map to show that the township believes that the 212-acre transit village should be designated a regional center."	North Brunswick	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new final plan. Will be addressed in the PE.	AGREE	NS#1: The center can be address in the Plan Endorsement
Infrastructure		191	"We recommend that it be made clear that state infrastructure resources should be targeted specifically to facilitate the construction of rail stations given their enormous cost." "Again, our concern is that state funding continue to be made available to complete the design and construction of North Brunswick Station on the Northeast Corridor."	North Brunswick	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	

State Plan Policy Map		195	"Extremely well - nearly the entire municipality is designated PA1. However, it may be worth considering placing the future County park associated with the Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve (as part of the Gulton redevelopment project) into PA-5. Also, we would suggest enhanced PA-1 core areas, perhaps as PA-1A, and remaining transitional metro areas as PA-1B."	Borough of Metuchen	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new final plan.	AGREE	
State Agency Coordination		195, 196	"NJDEP regulations (i.e., stormwater regulations) should have special considerations and/or methods to permit redevelopment of designated centers. Streamline permitting process involving federal grants, including enabling scope changes, as well as with projects involving AMTRAK coordination and/or review."	Borough of Metuchen	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: We cannot provide expedite review, but can provide language.
State Plan		196	"1) State Planning Areas and Centers designation, specifically to make it easier to renew/extend (or make permanent) the extension, and make it more meaningful to be identified as a center (i.e., financial benefits, permit prioritization)	Borough of Metuchen	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	NS#1: Row 17-20 Refer to in Appendix B.
State Plan		196, 197	"The Borough allowed the Centers designation to expire because the cost-benefit of the application to extend made the effort infeasible. The benefits should be more easily understood. Perhaps the Centers designation should not expire, or should be subject to a Statement of Strategy analysis as municipalities re-examine their master plans. As to the State Plan Policy Map, Metuchen is clearly a town center, and there should be a designation that clearly differentiates a walkable downtown area, particularly one with a train station, from suburban areas. This would further emphasize and implement the State's goal to revitalize and recenter.	Borough of Metuchen	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Plan		78, 79,	"Other requested policy changes related to the State Plan Map. These are generally corrections to Plan Area boundaries based on existing development, planned development, or the desire to protect existing open space. One municipal suggestion is to create an additional PA1 classification for existing, established downtown areas." "One municipal suggestion is to create an additional PA1 classification for existing, established downtown areas. A viable way to accomplish this would be to survey downtowns in existing PA1 areas based on density or other criteria. In the alternative, additional Center designation may be effective."	Middlesex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Plan		195	"We think you did a great job. Perhaps there should be greater emphasis on transit-oriented developments and emphasizing actual centers within PA-1, not necessarily suburban / rural areas that happen to be within PA-1. Such should be commiserate (sic) with enhanced technical assistance and funding opportunities, similar to the Transit Village program."	Middlesex County , Borough of Metuchen	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	

Appendix B - Statewide Policy Issues - Middlesex County

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY/NE RESPONSE	SPC NC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		agree	agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		agree	agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		agree	agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		agree	agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy.	State		agree	agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		PJB3 warrants recognition as SRA, added to map	agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	SRAs should be on SPPM now	agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		should be more flexible	agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	should be a planning area	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	support overlay for rural areas	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center.	State		agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	tiered center definition; smalled centers could be periodically reviewed; designations should not automatically expire	agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		strongly agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed, then CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	CESs should be overlays for smaller sites	agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		agree	agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	agree (use term "policy guide")	agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		agree	agree

### Appendix A: Essex County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE INITIAL DRAFT RESPONSE	AGREE/DISAGREE	NOTES
State Agency Coordination		4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional funding should be provided to municipalities to implement the State Plan Goals</li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Technical assistance can be provided.
State Agency Coordination		5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State should establish a comprehensive data collection and sharing platform that allows municipalities to track their progress on State Plan goals using consistent metrics.</li> <li>The goals of the State Plan set clear guideposts for municipalities but without clear, actionable direction on how to achieve them. It would be advantageous to provide resource guides, including recommendations for funding opportunities, alongside the goals.</li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Language to track progress.
State Agency Coordination		8, 11	Grant funding opportunities should be made available to implement the goals and priorities outlined in the State Plan.	Borough of Roseland, Township of West Caldwell	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Help municipalities
General		14	The State Plan includes goals to protect environmentally sensitive areas which is fine, but there should be a caveat that these broad intentions are subject to site-specific features that warrant some flexibility when planning for individual site development. <b>The State Plan should also include a detailed statement regarding the need to balance all statewide objectives to ensure that the emphasis on any one goal does not adversely impact other important goals that should carry equal weight with respect to a ‘goals evaluation’ process. This is particularly critical to ensure that a ‘one size fits all’ approach does not serve to negatively impact sound planning at the local level.</b>	Township of Fairfield, Bergen County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Providing guidance. Language addressing all of this. Some goals are important to some towns than others, so considering this is vital for municipalities.
State Agency Coordination		36	Additionally, the State Planning Commission should create a cross-acceptance process that occurs more frequently than the current cycle allows. Regular checkins with municipalities would help identify implementation challenges early and allow for adjustments to both local plans and State agency approaches.	Montclair	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Agency Coordination		36, 37	Finally, the State should establish a comprehensive data collection and sharing platform that allows municipalities to track their progress on State Plan goals using consistent metrics. This would facilitate better evaluation of outcomes and enable municipalities to learn from each other's successes and challenges. By creating this shared measurement framework, the State would enhance accountability while providing valuable insights for continued improvement of the State Plan itself.	Montclair	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Implement this in the SP.
Economic Development		44	Poverty continues to impact Newark residents and city resources. As Newark is not physically separated from abutting municipalities, the economic wellbeing of the City is an issue that could be more effectively addressed with the addition of regional interventions. The State Plan should encourage further economic strengthening between municipalities and governing bodies who are able to provide longer-term solutions.	City of Newark	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Strengthen the economic section. Interdisciplinary coordination.

Climate Change	41	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Climate Change goal could be <b>enhanced by providing more specific guidance on addressing climate vulnerabilities</b> in already developed areas.</li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Row 10-13: will provide language on this.
Climate Change	41	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan could recommend the development of regional level rather than municipal level climate change related hazard <b>Vulnerability Assessments/ Mitigation Plans.</b></li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
Climate Change	41	11	West Caldwell is traversed by the Passaic River along with numerous streams and tributaries. The Township is experiencing flooding issues in residential areas. The Township is considering preparing a <b>Climate Change Related Hazard Vulnerability Assessment</b> to address the flooding concerns. There may be a need for a more regionalized solution.	Township of West Caldwell	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
Climate Change	41	35	The Climate Change goal could be enhanced by providing more specific guidance on addressing climate vulnerabilities in already developed areas. Montclair's ongoing efforts to develop a <b>Climate Change-Related Hazard Vulnerability Assessment</b> would benefit from clearer state-level guidance on implementation strategies for existing urban centers where major infrastructure changes present significant challenges.	Montclair	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
Historic and Scenic Resources		4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should acknowledge the unique challenges faced by historically established communities like Montclair that have limited undeveloped land yet still need to accommodate growth.</li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Add language, community amenities. strenght the plan
Historic and Scenic Resources		35	The Plan should acknowledge the unique challenges faced by historically established communities like Montclair that have limited undeveloped land yet still need to accommodate growth. While the Plan emphasizes transitoriented development, it could provide more specific guidance on balancing density increases with historic preservation and neighborhood character maintenance.	Montclair	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	
State Agency Coordination		4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streamlining the NJDEP minor application process, as well as providing more realistic affordable housing regulations that are readily understood, is recommended.</li> <li>The DEP should <b>create specific programs and technical assistance for urban stream restoration, brownfield remediation, and green infrastructure implementation that can be applied in established communities.</b> The State Planning Commission should create a cross-acceptance process that occurs more frequently than the current cycle allows. Regular check-ins with municipalities would help identify implementation challenges early and allow for adjustments to both local plans and State agency approaches.</li> </ul>	Essex County	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Encourage language, but cannot expedite it.
State Agency Coordination		36	For effective implementation of the State Plan, several adjustments to state agency approaches would enhance coordination and outcomes at the local level. <b>NJDEP could develop tailored guidance for urban environmental restoration that acknowledges the constraints and opportunities in developed communities like Montclair.</b> NJDEP should create specific programs and technical assistance for urban stream restoration, brownfield remediation, and green infrastructure implementation that can be applied in established communities.	Montclair	Will address in revised final draft plan.	AGREE	Strengthen the language.

## Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Essex County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY RESPONSE	SPC NC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		Agree	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area defintion and policy.	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		No comment	
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	keep map simpler. Not on static map but on locator map.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State	possibly keep 1sq mile but strengthen flexibility language on criteria	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	good thing for areas to be recognized. Show all of them. Add language on air-rights	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	No Comment	
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the defintion of Center.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	Agree with less than 1 sq mile	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Agree	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree

Appendix A - Monmouth County Cross Acceptance Response Items						
PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	County/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
General			The need for additional Emergency Services generated by new development should be addressed.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
General		15	Restructure the narrative of each of the 10 aspirational goals to make them more impactful. For each section, there should first be a discussion of why the issue is a priority for the state, followed by a set of goals that reflect what success would look like, followed by a list of strategies for planners to employ in order to reach the specified goals.	Monmouth County	(Prioritizing goals will not occur.) Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Economic Development	17	M15	Tourism is a major economic factor in Belmar and elsewhere along “the Shore.” Should be discussed in economic development section.	Belmar	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Housing	23	16	The current Housing Element of the State Plan omits any discussion of the intersection between housing and healthcare, including the state’s efforts with the “Housing First” model.  If the Plan aims to promote forward-thinking, integrated, and equitable planning strategies, it should acknowledge and build upon programs like the Hospital Partnership Subsidy Program. The Plan needs to recognize the connection between housing security, long-term community stability, and public health as important components to achieving holistic community well-being.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	5	The State Plan would need to include an evaluation of risks (such as major storms, flooding, housing unaffordability, and economic opportunities) and identify local and regional actions that the County could take to create a more sustainable, resilient, and vibrant future while considering impacts to environmentally vulnerable and transportation disadvantaged.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	5	To better meet local needs, it is recommended that the Preliminary State Plan Infrastructure Goal be more expansive in the passage related to wastewater treatment infrastructure...The NJSDRP does not adequately support the need for updating current wastewater systems to accommodate future needs, or the expansion of capacity where the population is expected to increase, or the limitations that should be placed on privately maintained, independent water treatment systems intended to accommodate large scale developments in conflict with conserving and protecting rural and/or environmentally sensitive lands.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	6	Additionally, within Infrastructure, the conversation about warehouses or industrial facilities and their need for infrastructure infusion is mute in the State Plan. Warehouses bring in a large influx of workers and infrastructure may need to be improved for transportation networks, or public services.	Monmouth County	(Reference Warehouse guidance document.) Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	17	Utilities Infrastructure: The Plan should address aging infrastructure beyond transportation, particularly utilities that need policy support and state investment, such as upgrades to electrical grid, retrofitting equipment, resilient utility infrastructure.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	17	Investment Prioritization: Infrastructure upgrades should be prioritized based on public health and safety—for example, replacing lead water pipes and resilience in locations vulnerable to the effects of climate change.	Monmouth County	(Env Justice/Equity goals?) Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	17	Affordable Housing and Environmental Impact: The state’s affordable housing mandates create new infrastructure demands. The Plan should consider how these requirements impact natural systems, particularly large amounts of groundwater disposal in rural and environmentally sensitive areas.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	17	Water Protection and Treatment: The protection of groundwater and surface water, essential sources of drinking water, must be raised as a concern. The Plan should link development to needed investments in water and sewer treatment facilities, improving capacity, efficiency, and containment - replacing components that could fail resulting in environmental contamination.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	17	Connecting Suburbs to Jobs: The Plan should propose strategies and give examples on how the state proposes how jurisdictions could retrofit and link dispersed, post-WWII suburban developments to specific employment centers.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree

Infrastructure	30	18	Broaden Pedestrian Planning: Instead of focusing solely on areas around train stations, pedestrian circulation improvements should extend to: ☐ Bus-oriented development areas ☐ Isolated clusters of commercial properties and their connection to each other and nearby residences ☐ Cultural and entertainment destinations and surrounding supportive land uses	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	18	Clarify Mixed Transportation Concepts: The paragraph that combines the reuse of abandoned rights-of-way (ROWs), high occupancy vehicles, and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure needs better cohesion. These topics should be presented with a clear and unifying purpose or goal.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Infrastructure	30	18	The long-term shift toward remote and hybrid work has not been fully integrated into discussions about regional transportation planning or housing policy. In particular, there has been limited attention paid to how changes in commuter behavior are reshaping demand for public transit and influencing infrastructure needs.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	35	7	the plan only dedicates one paragraph to “Carefully reevaluate local land use policies,” and two related to reducing the burden of parking. In the case of Monmouth County and its 53 municipalities addressing recentring in this piecemeal way will not keep up with the demand for construction in suburban and rural areas. Additionally, making a priority to develop streamlined review processes may be misappropriated and applied to unwanted single use greenfield development, including those proposed in environmentally sensitive areas. A holistic approach is needed throughout the state to limit the development of sprawl.	Monmouth County	(Promote collaborative planning, not overruling Home Rule.) Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	(appropriateness of place) agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	35	M31	The plan should also consider local traffic issues and ensure that state policies don’t interfere with town efforts to revitalize certain areas.	Eatontown	(guidance, not regulatory) Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	broadly agree
Climate Change	39	8	Although the CRS program is crucial to the implementation of best practices in climate resilience, it is not mentioned within the NJSDRP.	Monmouth County	Text will be added.	agree
Historic & Scenic Resources	51	11	The County recommends a final review of scenic roadways before they are included in on the State Policy Map as HCS to verify that they still meet the definition of scenic.	Monmouth County	To be addressed in mapping phase. HCS will be redefined.	agree
Historic & Scenic Resources	52	16	it is not clear what “Encourage voluntary, speedy documentation of archaeological finds” means. Clarification on what is meant by voluntary is important.	Monmouth County	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	agree
Equity	55	16	The Equity element isn’t broad enough in its conversation about marginalized groups and only offers a “appropriate action” to be taken without offering much in the way of substantial guidance.  While it is important to recognize the needs of rural populations, equity must be addressed comprehensively. The absence of broader representation in this discussion reduces a complex, intersectional issue to a narrow lens centered on a predominantly white demographic. If the state is serious about advancing equity, the Plan must reflect the full spectrum of communities affected by historically repressive policies—and actively propose strategies to help all marginalized groups thrive.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
SPPM	78	15	“The only land in New Jersey that is located outside the Pinelands and designated as a Military Installation is the Picatinny Arsenal in Morris County.” This needs to be revised.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
SPPM	78	15	the current draft fails to consider land uses in the vicinity of the bases. Supporting the military’s mission by diminishing potential future land use conflicts between the public and military for both safety and security reasons should be identified as an objective of the State Plan.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
various	40, 44, 46	16	If a specific best management practice or state guideline exists, then the Plan should cite the reference to this practice to establish expectations. If one does not exist, the Plan should provide references to best industry practices, relevant case studies, or emerging guidance. This does not apply only to decarbonization practices (pg. 40), but for other concepts posited, such as “urban forestry principles” (pg. 44), “carrying capacity” (pg. 46), etc.	Monmouth County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	19	Identify preserved farms on the State Plan Map to reveal regional “centering” of farmland preservation investments over time.	Monmouth County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree



Mapping	N/A	19	Naval Weapon Station Earle, the New Jersey National Guard Training Center in Sea Girt, and the Sandy Hook Coast Guard Station should be included in in the Military Installations Classification, not the current the Environmentally Sensitive Area (PA-5).	Monmouth County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	19	Identify “Areas in Need of Redevelopment” as primary investment areas on the State Plan Policy Map.	Monmouth County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	19	All Open Space in Monmouth County to be shown as PA-8: All County owned open space and parkland should be identified as PA-8 along with any municipal parklands conveyed to the state on our official open space layer.	Monmouth County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	19	Include Designated State Scenic Byways on the New Jersey State Plan Map	Monmouth County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	21	CN1: The draft State Development and Redevelopment Map should be corrected to delineate Block 56.01 in the south east corner of the Township as PA5.	Colts Neck	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	21	E1: Monmouth Mall Area in Need of Redevelopment	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	22	E2: Existing Downtown Area in Need of Redevelopment	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	22	E3: Filming Overlay Zone	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	22	E4: Identify as Historic District.	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	22	E5: ROSI – Maxwell Street Playground	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	23	E6: ROSI Wampum Lake Park	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	23	E7: ROSI Wolcott Park	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	23	E8: ROSI Bliss Price Arboretum	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	24	E9: ROSI Capilupi Tract	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	24	E10: ROSI Husky Brook Park	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree

Mapping	N/A	24	E11: ROSI 80 Acres Park	Eatontown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	24	FT1: 1147 Burke Road - now owned by NJ DEP.	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	25	FT2: 1155 Burke Road [Blk 91, Lot 49] now owned by NJ DEP	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	25	FT3: 55 Turkey Swamp Road [Blk 92, Lot 47] - now owned by NJ DEP	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	25	FT4: 100 Cottrell Rd [Blk 102, Lot 93] - now owned by NJ DEP	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	FT5: 28 Cottrell Rd [Blk 102, Lot 40] - Now owned by NJ DEP	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	FT6: 305 Hendrickson Rd [Blk 102, Lot 46] - Now owned by NJ DEP (Green Acres)	Freehold Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	MT1: Node for Lincroft Business District	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	26	MT2: 100 Schultz Drive Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	27	MT3: 325 Highway 36 Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	27	MT4: Circus Liquors Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	27	MT5: Half Mile Road Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	28	MT6: Municipal Complex Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	28	MT7: North Middletown Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	28	MT8: Port Belford Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree

Mapping	N/A	29	MT9: River Centre South Redevelopment Area	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	29	MT10: Provided ROSI Map, identify as parkland.	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	29	MT11: Node for Campbell's Junction Business District	Middletown	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	29	R1: NJDEP Park - Assunpink Preserve	Roosevelt	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	30	TF1: Not park areas.	Tinton Falls	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	30	TF2: Change PA5/PA2 boundary to include all of Willowbrook development in PA2.	Tinton Falls	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	30	TF3: Include residential developments around Sam Drive, Daniel Court & Hockhockson Road in PA2	Tinton Falls	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	31	TF4: There is no park here. Change to PA2.	Tinton Falls	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	31	TF5: Include new Enclave at Shark River housing development in PA-2. They installed sewer.	Tinton Falls	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	31	W1: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, CONTIGUOUS TO LARGE PARK	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	31	W2: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, CONTIGUOUS TO LARGE PARK	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	32	W3: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN CALLS OUT PRESERVING RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	32	W4: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN CALLS OUT PRESERVING RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	32	W5:	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	33	W6: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, WETLANDS, ALSO TWO PARCELS ON COUNTY TARGET FARMS LIST	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree

Mapping	N/A	33	W7: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, WETLANDS, ON COUNTY TARGET FARM LIST, NEAR CENTER OF TOWN WHICH MASTER PLAN CALLS OUT FOR RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	33	W8: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN ENCOURAGES RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	33	W9: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN ENCOURAGES RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	34	W10: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN ENCOURAGES RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	34	W11: USDA PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, CENTER OF TOWN WHERE MASTER PLAN ENCOURAGES RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL CHARACTER	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	34	W12: USDA PRIME FARMLAND, SURROUNDED BY STATE PARK	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	35	W13: USDA PRIME FARMLAND, SURROUNDED BY STATE PARK	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	35	W14: FARMLAND OF UNIQUE IMPORTANCE IN WETLANDS SURROUNDED BY WETLANDS AND OPEN SPACE.	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	35	W15: FARMLAND OF UNIQUE IMPORTANCE IN WETLANDS SURROUNDED BY WETLANDS AND OPEN SPACE.	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	35	W16: SOME FARMLAND OF UNIQUE IMPORTANCE, SOME WETLANDS ADJACENT TO ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree
Mapping	N/A	36	W17: PRIME FARMLAND SOILS, IN MIXED AREA	Wall	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	agree

### Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Monmouth County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY RESPONSE	SPC NE AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		more than define, but clarify in text as well; give examples in document.	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		add photos, graphics, for all types of learners. Must translate between different types of publications.	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		general agreement	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		include littering and relation to streams	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area defintion and policy.	State		no issue with item. Retained with original intent.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		include Raritan Bay for recognition w/o regulatory authority. Addition of coastal areas for recognition.	Will revise and add in the revised draft plan after input from all negotiation sessions.
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	editorial decision by the state. Will like to reserve comment till language is provided.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	strengthen County regional endorsement.	agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State	or to strengthen flexibility criteria.	does not agree with having a minimum. Be mindful of planning area criteria. Can't be rigid either.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	not sure if it needs to be an official planning area, but should be recognized as an overlay with a planning area underneath.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	not sure how to define the boundary. But should identify the risk. There needs to be distinction between high density and low density. Huge dilemma that needs to be defined.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	review language on policy prior to comment	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	agree with redefining centers and refocusing.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the defintion of Center.	State		agree with redefining centers and refocusing.	Agree

State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	if a place is a center it is a center. Agree with concept. Recognize good planning.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		not sure how to resolve list. Ok with existing and those that expired and would come back.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	Not ground truthed. Mapping should inform. Clarify the intent of what the map is trying to portray.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Important to identify HCS. Criteria and intent need to be clarified and strengthened. To inform intention.	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	work with the rules and regulations and municipality work with land use.	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		how the interagencies react to the State Plan? Strengthen coordination.	Agree

Appendix A: Hudson County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	County AGREE/DISAGREE
Resiliency and Water Quality		15	The State should consider language supporting the inclusion of a budgetary appropriation to assist towns with the implementation of NJDEP’s REAL Rule, which would provide appropriate funding to support resiliency projects that will incur greater costs due to higher regulatory standards and higher elevation requirements.	County	Will provide additional text to address comment.	Agree
Transportation/ Infrastructure		15	A greater transparent means of communication needs to be developed between NJDOT and local DPW/Planning/Infrastructure agencies and departments to identify and resolve state road safety issues. The County would like to see language about state road investments and designs that are suitable for adjacent and local needs. Local involvement should be critical to design state roads for suitability to local community needs. For example, in Hudson County, that includes Route 440, Route 139, and Route 1, (Tonnelle Avenue).	County	Will provide language to strengthen sections.	Agree
Transportation/ Infrastructure		15, 17	The Preliminary Plan should identify high-level investment opportunities in NJ Transit facilities, including bus, rail, light rail, and essentials such as benches, adequate lighting, and shelters at transit stops/stations. There should also be a stronger commitment from the state to invest in adding public transportation capacity and coverage within the Urban Centers and throughout PA-1 to enhance public transportation and reduce overcrowding on the commuter routes.	County, Jersey City, Guttenberg, North Bergen	Will provide language to strengthen sections and add additional text.	Agree
Transportation/ Infrastructure		17, 20	The NJTA Turnpike widening proposal for the Newark Bay Extension are completely at odds with equity, pollution, and transportation goals in the plan and should be abandoned. Current capital programs (Gateway, PABT etc.) focus on enhancing transit in the suburbs, but there is no commitment to expanding urban transit-i.e. PATH, HBLR, etc.	Jersey City	Will provide language to improve urban transit needs. Jersey City: "Highway widening" concern.	Agree. (County opposes "highway widening" blanked statement )
Implementation		15, 23	The State Plan should consider including language that would provide educational resources to community members and further hold public engagement sessions across the State. This includes interagency educational resources to support localities in understanding regulations (ex. NJPACT REAL Rules) and available resources to support local efforts (ex. technical assistance and funding programs for Urban Enterprise Zones, Special Improvement Districts, Designated Opportunity Zones, etc.)	County	Revist language and look at emphasizing the need for additional resources and technical assistance. Refer to relevant state agencies.	Agree
General		23	“The poor and minorities” - How does this address the negative outcomes of gentrification concerns in urban community? Also, "minorities" terminology tends to center white racial demographics, as "others", and associates poverty with people of color	County	Will revise language to address comment.	Agree
General		23	Page 19 of PSDSRP: Awkwardly worded sentence, with grammatical errors: “Identify and target for appropriate public policy support those economic sectors with the greatest growth potential and public benefit that can capitalize on the State’s strengths, with special attention to those areas of the State where unemployment is high.”	County	Will revise language to address comment.	Agree
General		23-24	Page 51 of PSDSRP: Goals: Consider revising the following language from “enslaved people” to “enslaved people of African descent” to acknowledge the contributions from the period of history that was a harmful phenomenon for Black/African Americans’ ancestors in the United States.	County	Will revise language to address comment.	Agree

Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Hudson County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY RESPONSE	SPC NE AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		Agree	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area defintion and policy.	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		no problem with recognizing these areas.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	defer to state with what makes most sense; overlay.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State	or strengthen flexibility criteria	Agrees with strengthening flexibility criteria	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	Agrees with keeping as element.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the defintion of Center.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		add expiration dates otherwise agree	agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Agree	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree



### Appendix A: Highlands Council Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	NE AGREE/DISAGREE
Equity		Highlands Memo 3	The goals and objectives related to the themes of equity and relief to "overburdened communities" warrant better articulation.	Clinton Township, Hunterdon County	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	12	Highlands Memo 3	Restrictive zoning, exclusionary zoning and discriminatory practices and policies that facilitate displacement are inconsistent with the Plan. (P. 12) What are examples of these practices? Could this be construed to mean that single-family zoning and not permitting ADUs are considered restrictive zoning or exclusionary? Specificity is warranted.	Clinton Township, Hunterdon County	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	11, 12, 23	Darlene Green 1	The Housing goal seems to contradict the Natural and Water Resources Goals and Priorities, which focus on preservation. Additionally, the text appears to be blind to the Highlands Region, which is a sensitive environmental area, within which certain sub-zones are encouraged to be preserved and/or have limited development. A majority of Tewksbury is within the more restrictive Highlands' subzones (Conservation, Conservation Environmentally Constrained, and Protection Sub-zones) where preservation and conservation are encouraged. The text should be supplemented with a statement that excludes the Highlands Region from the prohibition of concentrated preservation areas.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	23	Darlene Green 2	This housing goal should be revised to encourage housing development outside of environmentally sensitive lands, limit housing development to existing utility constraints, and preclude multi-family development in areas lacking water and sewer infrastructure.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing; Circulation	23	Darlene Green 2	Clarification should be provided on the goal for housing development in areas lacking public transportation. The Township of Tewksbury does not have access to public transportation options. The Draft State Plan does not provide a separate housing goal oriented toward communities lacking public transportation.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	23	Darlene Green 2	Clarification should be provided on what the State views as an "accessory dwelling". The Glossary (page 85) does not include a definition.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	23, 24	Darlene Green 3	Clarification should be provided on what type of zoning would be considered inconsistent with the Plan. Is it single-family zoning, multi-family, or the location of certain zones? Also, would the existing zones that have historically been in place for decades be considered inconsistent? Or would this apply to new zones only?	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	26	Darlene Green 3	Text should be revised to recognize water and wastewater limitations. Suggested text: "In areas where water and wastewater infrastructure is available and capacity remains...." The Draft State Plan also does not provide guidance on how to accommodate new development with limited water and/or sewer capacity or in areas without utility infrastructure. Clarification should be provided.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	26	Darlene Green 3	The Draft State Plan does not define what would be considered "increased residential development densities". As written, that could be interpreted to mean one more unit per acre.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	26	Darlene Green 3	"Up-zoning" is not defined in the glossary. This should be added so municipalities have an understanding when reviewing mechanisms to address affordable housing. Additionally, the last sentence in this statement is incorrect, specifically the word "must". Towns with limited vacant and developable land are permitted to seek an adjustment of their obligation, which would reduce their affordable housing obligation. Furthermore, communities within the Highlands Region must abide by the Highlands Regional Master Plan and cannot up-zone in non-sewered areas. The above-quoted text should be rewritten to address these issues.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	27	Darlene Green 3	Clarification is needed as to what would be considered a "starter home". (how this will be achieved). Revise language.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Housing	27	Darlene Green 4	Restrictive zoning is not defined. Clarification should be provided so municipalities understand if their zoning would be considered "restrictive".	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Economic Development	21	Darlene Green 2	Clarification should be provided on how the State would encourage expansion of "regional food hubs, food processing facilities, agricultural equipment suppliers." Would grants or other funding be available for municipalities to promote this kind of economic development?	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Climate Change	41	Darlene Green 5	Clarification is needed on who would be tasked with conducting "regional, watershed-level planning" under the climate change goal. Would it be the County, each municipality in a watershed, or another entity?	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree

Climate Change	41	Darlene Green 5	It is unclear what entity would be in charge of leading the creation of intergovernmental and community partnerships under the climate change goal. The text should be revised to identify the entity responsible for this priority.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Climate Change	42	Darlene Green 5	Additional text should be provided to clarify how DEP floodplain regulations promote smart growth along river corridors.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	64	Darlene Green 7	The State Plan should address whether communities within the Highlands Region are required to conform to both the State Plan and the Highlands Regional Master Plan or solely mandated to conform to the Highlands Regional Master Plan.	Multi-municipal	will provide clarifying language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Implementation	83	Darlene Green 8	“Municipal planning in New Jersey is outdated. Many local governments lack resources to handle planning related procedures. Regional considerations should adhere to the goals outlined in the State Plan, which should be considered as the framework for decision-making. Regional considerations (regional master planning) help address inequitable municipal planning capabilities.” Tewksbury takes exception with the above statement. The above statement should be deleted from the Draft State Plan or substantially revised. It appears the Draft State Plan suggests municipalities that lack resources be eliminated and governed/regulated at a regional level, rather than a local level.	Multi-municipal	Will revise language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Infrastructure		Highland Memo 5	Infrastructure is identified as a priority, but it remains unclear what exactly the goals are. The Infrastructure goal subsection has 7 sentences, the first three of which are statements setting the background, then two implying the need for transit investment and road maintenance. The second paragraph again starts with a sentence setting the background, followed by one sentence implying a need to build more infrastructure.	Pompton Lakes, Passaic County	Will provide additional language in revised draft plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Highlands Memo 3; Darlene Green 9	The State Plan Policy Map should be revised to illustrate the Highlands Land Use Capability Zones. If the Highlands LUCZs replace State planning area designations, this should be clearly articulated and that the goals of the Highlands RMP supersede. The Highlands colors should be on the map.	Clinton Township, Tewksbury Township, Borough of High Bridge, Holland Township	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	68	Darlene Green 8	Tewksbury recommends a sentence be added to direct communities within a regional planning area to refer to the applicable regional planning agency mapping. Hyperlinks would be useful for citizens and practitioners to easily source this information.	Multi-municipal	Will provide language in revised draft plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	68	Darlene Green 8	Clarify in the plan where one would find the State Plan Policy Map.	Multi-municipal	Will add the map in revised draft plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Highland LULZ	There is no direct correlation between the LUCZ and the State Planning Areas. However, the intent of the seven LUCZ designations is similar to the intent of the seven SPPM Planning Areas. The following table (attached document) displays the SPPM Planning Areas and the equivalent LUCZ designations. An equivalent LUCZ designation will replace the SPPM Planning Area designations for Highlands Region communities when referenced in various statewide rules such as the wastewater management planning rules. The intent and guiding criteria of the Land Use Capability Zones are described after the summary table.	Highlands Council	Will provide language in revised draft plan.	Agree
Mapping		Highland Memo 4	We have found a number of substantial errors in the Highlands interactive mapping for the Township of Hanover and would like to meet to discuss how these might be corrected.	Township of Hanover, Morris County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	No comment
Mapping		Highland Memo 4	Mapping changes may need to be made after working through the Mt Laurel 4th Round obligations. (this may have already been addressed)	Harding Township, Morris County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree
Mapping		Highland Memo 4	The LUCZ Existing Community-Environmentally Constrained Subzone does not align with the State Plan's PA-5 Environmentally Sensitive area. Consider realignment via State Plan Map change.	Netcong Borough, Morris County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree
Mapping		Highland Memo 4, 5	Washington Township is in the process of completing a mapping update with the Highlands Council staff for a site (Block 19, Lot 8) that is expected to be designated a Round Four site. The site was previously developed for industrial development with infrastructure improvements in place, but the development was never completed. In the Highlands Council's 2024 updates to the LUCZ Map, the site had a Protection Zone designation that was found to be inconsistent with the development history and existing land use characteristics of the site. (completed)	Washington Township, Morris County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree if necessary

Mapping		Highland Memo 5	For Alpha Borough, the existing Community Zone mapping is currently split between State Planning Area 1 (most of the Borough), 2 (southern half of industrial district), and 4 (western quarry site/potential redevelopment area). Future Planning Area Mapping should consider a single planning area classification of appropriate scale of development for all non-farm existing community in the Borough, and Center designations delineated appropriately.	Borough of Alpha, Warren County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree if necessary
Mapping		Highlands Memo 2	An extension of the Frenchtown sewer service area into Alexandria Township along CR 513 (Everittstown Road) is designated in the Conservation Zone.	Alexandria Township, Hunterdon County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree if necessary
Mapping		Highlands Memo 2	The State Plan map depicts a center that spans areas of Clinton Township and adjacent municipalities. This State Center should be updated to reflect the boundaries of the Township's designated Highlands Center areas.	Clinton Township, Hunterdon County	Will review post adoption of the state plan.	Agree
General			Steep slopes, tree replacement criteria, stormwater planning and design, affordable housing (add term: cost generative feature to glossary)	Multi-municipal	Will revise and clarify language in revised plan.	Agree, but want to be part of the discussion

**Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Highlands Council)**

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	NE RESPONSE	SPC NC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		No comment	
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		No comment	
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		No Comment	
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area defintion and policy.	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		No comment, except skylands but need to wait on definition of area	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	Should be a layer on the map on locator map.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	Agree and add plan conformance is equivalent to state plan endorsement and MOU	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	No comment	
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State	strengthen the flexibility language on criteria	No Comment	
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	No comment	
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	No comment	
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	No comment	
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the defintion of Center.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	still have a role for CES. Good idead to retain CES	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Agree	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree

**Appendix A: Warren County Cross Acceptance Response Items**

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC Negotiating Committee Response	County/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
State Agency Coordination		5	Funding should be made available to enable new policy implementation. Streamlining NJDEP and NJDOT permitting at all levels should be incentivized through State Plan compliance and consistency.	Warren County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map		6	Change portion of Planning Area 4 to Planning Area 3; the area meets the density requirements for a PA3, lacks major infrastructure investments, however there is a planned sewer service extension and it is currently located in a sewer service area. It also serves as a transition between the metropolitan Belvidere and surrounding rural municipalities. These proposed planning area changes are along State Route 46."	Warren County, White	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		5, 9	The State Plan should not require a minimum area for Planning Area designations. PA2 and PA3 should not have to be a minimum of 1 square mile in size. Many small towns in rural counties like Warren County meet all of the other standards beside the area requirements for the Planning Area designation. These requirements can hinder development in areas that would otherwise be capable of economic growth due to their population size and infrastructure.	Warren County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	AGREE
General		8, 9	The County believes there should be regional planning guidance for the siting of warehouses and cannabis facilities. Warehouses should be located near existing infrastructure and major transportation routes, while cannabis operations should be kept away from residential areas, public parks, playgrounds, fairgrounds, and other community-centered spaces.	Warren County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	(Add data centers) AGREE
Infrastructure		39	The State Plan needs to address water quality impacts of older developed areas still on septic systems. Needs better State agency support for infrastructure related to sewer for areas of failing septic systems or where septic density does not conform to current regulations.	Blairstown	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	AGREE
Climate Change		39	Address ways to better protect existing developed areas from climate change-related impacts as retrofit and redevelopment is not always necessarily viable given regulatory changes.	Blairstown	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		6	Change portion of Planning Area 4 to Planning Area 2; the municipality meets all of the Standards for Planning Area 2, including the area requirements. While it slightly exceeds the density guidelines of 1000 per square mile (1742 people per square mile), future growth would adhere to the type of development is anticipated in a PA2. Belvidere has infrastructure in place that can support development that meets the Policy Objectives of the Planning Area. In addition, the entire area of proposed changes is in a sewer service area. In addition, Belvidere meets all of the requirements for a town center designation and part of this request is for Belvidere to be designated as a town center in accordance with the standards set forth in the State Plan draft.	Warren County	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		23, 38	The Town wishes to change the PA4 area to PA2, as well as designating the entire Town as a center to better reflect the existing built-out conditions and opportunities for future growth.	Belvidere	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE

State Planning Policy Map		7	A Node designation would benefit the municipality. The area is a shopping center along a State highway Route 57, and is primarily commercial in nature. This designation would accommodate for future economic growth. The proposed node would meet the requirements as dense, single-use corridors (commercial).	Warren County	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		128	Mansfield does not have any center or downtown area due to its low-density development pattern. The Township is also mostly preserved land, accounting for approximately 22 percent of Mansfield (4,188 acres). However there is a portion of the Township that is recommended for Node classification as it contains a concentration of facilities and activities.	Mansfield	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		7	Change portion of Planning Area 4B to Planning Area 3; the area meets the density requirements for a PA3, has some infrastructure including sewer, water, and is part of a sewer service area. They are serviced by the HMUA. This designation corresponds to the State Plan draft's goal intention of a PA3 to serve as a transition between more developed areas and rural ones.	Warren County	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		128	There is a section in the eastern portion of the Township that can be designated as a node and the sewer service area should be changed to PA3.	Mansfield	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		7	A Node designation would benefit the municipality in the area provided in the map in Appendix K. The area is a shopping center along a State highway Route 57, and is primarily commercial in nature. This designation would accommodate for future economic growth. The proposed node in the Appendix K would meet the requirements as dense, single-use corridors (commercial).	Warren County	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		128	Mansfield does not have any center or downtown area due to its low-density development pattern. The Township is also mostly preserved land, accounting for approximately 22 percent of Mansfield (4,188 acres). However there is a portion of the Township that is recommended for Node classification as it contains a concentration of facilities and activities.	Mansfield	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		7	Portions of the sewer service area along Route 46 should be designated as nodes. The node boundaries would adhere to the future PA3 areas requested in the Appendix M, and meet the requirements as dense, single-use commercial corridors. This designation would accommodate future economic growth. - Source: White Township Negotiating Committee.	Warren County	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE
State Planning Policy Map		152	The Township's documents are generally consistent with the State Plan. However, the Township desires to change the PA4 planning areas to PA3 to better reflect opportunities for future growth.	White	Mapping amendments will be addressed after SDRP adoption.	AGREE

Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Warren County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY AGREE/DISAGREE	SPC RESPONSE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		AGREE	AGREE
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		AGREE	AGREE
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		AGREE	AGREE
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		(County Solid Waste Mgmt Plan alignment) AGREE	AGREE
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy.	State		AGREE	AGREE
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		(Warren County does not wish to have DWG become a national park; should remain rec area. SRA definition should not make National Park designation.) AGREE	AGREE
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	(Overlay would be appropriate; shown on SPPM.) AGREE	AGREE
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	(CA & PE) AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	(Concern for development in park areas; DEP may apply standards making improvements more difficult. Consider changes made due to new acquisitions. May not be appropriate to put all in same category. Map them as an element.) DISAGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	(May be problematic to apply to floodplain boundaries; RLP properties may be appropriate.) DISAGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	(Prefer to address adjacency & minimum size.) AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center.	State		AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	(Centers should not be permanent. 10 year expiration makes sense, considering notice is given.) DISAGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		AGREE	AGREE

State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	AGREE	AGREE
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		AGREE	AGREE
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	AGREE	AGREE
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		(Recognize County Planning Act. Add language regarding CPA, MLUL.) AGREE	AGREE



### Appendix A: Ocean County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	COUNTY/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
Implementation		4	Municipalities need the ability to zone and regulate. There is a surplus of areas in the county where the planning area designation really limits any development, but the municipality may have this same area zoned as a business district and would like to it be an economically viable part of the community.	County; Berkeley	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Implementation		5, 51	State Agency Coordination - Coordination needs to be improved between the State agencies, specifically with the alignment of goals and objectives. Coordination should also be improved with local planning efforts. Programs such as the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, Neighborhood Revitalization Tax Credit Program, and Main Street NJ programs require better integration with local planning. Align DCA funding criteria and priority scoring directly with State Plan objectives such as redevelopment, transit-oriented development (TOD), climate resiliency, and equity goals. [REAL Rules]	County; Lacey	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Implementation		21	Develop a centralized platform where agencies can share data, reports, and progress metrics transparently & provide dedicated grants for flood mitigation and stormwater management improvements to towns that have a demonstrated history of repetitive flooding.	Beach Haven	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Implementation		69	Grant funding opportunities should be made available to implement the goals and priorities outlined in the State Plan. [Add Plan Endorsement]	Manchester	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Implementation; Environment		20	Enhanced Flood Management Strategies: Incorporate additional funding for stormwater systems and natural flood mitigation measures and roadway elevation.	Beach Haven	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Environment		4	Coastal resiliency - Coastal resiliency is a reoccurring topic listed by many municipalities in Ocean County as a topic the SDRP should include. [Resilient NJ]	County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Circulation		114	Lack of mass transit in municipalities: "Page 30-31 (of PSDRP) talks about transit in higher development areas, but what about towns that may not be considered high density"	Little Egg Harbor	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Infrastructure; Equity		102	The plan fails to recognize funding incentives for critical infrastructure improvements, such as replacing lead and galvanized steel service lines in communities not classified as overburdened. It also overlooks waste flow solutions and potential waste to-energy alternatives. Additionally, it lacks a strong foundation for emergency response planning and crisis management, including homelessness solutions beyond housing availability. To ensure comprehensive and equitable development, these gaps must be addressed to better serve municipalities with unique geographic and demographic challenges.	Stafford	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing; Environment		69	Conflicting goals - The current pressure to develop the state with more housing to meet these affordable housing obligations seems to be in conflict with many of the goals of preserving the environment.	Manchester	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		33	While it is beneficial to protect environmental resources, the excess environmentally sensitive areas will concentrate development and could possibly suppress future growth in the Township. [Berkeley, Toms River wish to retain centers]	Berkeley	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		56	The draft SDRP references the Smart Growth Explorer but acknowledges that it is not part of the SDRP. SDRP should include specific criteria to identify areas where growth should be encouraged, rather than referencing an online tool that is not part of the SDRP.	Lakewood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping; Revitalization		26	Beachwood borough recommends that the SDRP include a center or node along the route 9 and route 166 corridors to better serve our residents, promote the provision of goods and services, and redevelop portions of the town that are underutilized. The current mapping in the SDRP does not align with Beachwood's goals to revitalize the route 9 and route 166 corridors. These areas are the economic hub for Beachwood and should be in a center or node to accommodate the revitalization of this area, to include commercial and housing. These areas provide for livable walkable community.	Beachwood	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping		12	Re-designation of the Barnegat Town Center and Barnegat Commercial Node as they previously existed, for which the Township has filed an application for Plan Endorsement, is necessary to meet its land use vision of center-based development.	Barnegat	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping		20	The PA 5B is consistent for this Barrier Island town however some of the areas on the map that show Post State Plan Development are incorrect. i.e. the map shows a parcel as being developed since 2002, however, the lot is just being used for winter boat storage which is likely being interpreted as "new structures"	Beach Haven	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree

Mapping		27	The mapping needs to be updated to reflect Beachwood and County parks and recreation areas	County; Beachwood	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping		114	Designation of town centers along the Route 70 and Route 37 corridors – Planning area changes to make PA2 areas consistent with the proposed centers and the adopted SSA (Plan does not talk about SSA in specific planning areas)	Manchester	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping		74	The Township notes that re-designation of the Waretown Town Center as it previously existed, for which the Township has filed an application for Plan Endorsement, is necessary to meet its land use vision of center-based development.	Ocean	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping		93	Smart growth area, PA5 area, designated center - listed to be discussed in negotiating agenda. [Page 90]: "The Borough is identified on the State Plan Policy Map as a PA5B Environmentally Sensitive Barrier Island Planning Area and the Statewide Maps as a Smart Growth Area. The Borough is currently working with the Office of Planning Advocacy to renew its center designation to accommodate growth in compact forms of mixed-use development and to protect environs outside center boundaries."	Seaside Heights	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree

Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Ocean County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY/NE AGREE/DISAGREE	SPC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		Agree	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy. [add to glossary]	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		No comment	
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	Online layer alone will be sufficient	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	Mapped, but not PA	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	Support for keeping PA designations, but implementing new policies	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	Support new subcategory	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center. [Distinguish between SPC/CAFRA centers]	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Maintain expiration, but make redesignation easier/make expectations clear/implement periodic review; consider no expiration; give towns ability to opt out; consider biennial report changes; remove barrier of expiration/renewal	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		Consider dynamic list (web-based)	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Agree	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree

Appendix A: Bergen County Cross Acceptance Response Items						
PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	COUNTY/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
State Plan Policy Map		5-6	At issue here pertaining to the State Plan is that the State Plan Policy Map discusses Centers/Nodes within Planning Areas. What is the benefit for a municipality to designate Centers, Cores, and Nodes in PA-1? PA-1 should be prioritized for growth and redevelopment by its very nature as a built-out landscape and economy – equal to “centers” within less intensely developed Planning Areas (in other words, where so-called “centers” have a clear delineation apart from their “environs” – not the case in PA1 landscapes). These designations have limited to no significance in already-developed landscapes with no discernable “hinterland” or environs surrounding it – such as ours. This has created some issues in certain associated situations, including the Project Prioritization and scoring for transportation projects at the <u>NJTPA</u> , where they use Designated Centers as a prioritization tool, but do not consider PA-1 relative to projects that are serving redevelopment areas. This seems counter to the whole concept of the PA-1 Metropolitan Planning Area as a “growth area” where infrastructure investments and improvements should be prioritized, rather than those opening up virgin land to development intensity. [Improve coordination]	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		7	The State Planning Commission, with its representatives from each of the operating agencies, may wish to meet together on a more regular basis with the counties and municipalities to discuss issues and concerns facing the respective counties and regions – especially where multiple state agencies are involved in overarching issues (e.g., infrastructure, housing, climate change and environmental issues, permitting, investment/prioritization, etc.).	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		8	How will the C1 water bodies and their associated buffers be illustrated on the State Plan Policy Map? Will the mapping be performed by the Department of Environmental Protection, or is each municipality responsible for insuring that buffers are mapped appropriately? Should we assume that an area mapped as C1 waters and their associated buffers is a critical environmental feature, to be designated as either CES or PA-5 depending upon its size and geometry? Further, is it appropriate that the Planning Area designation for sewerred and developed areas upstream in the C1 watershed be PA-1? Do we wish to encourage further development – dense development as implied by the PA-1 designation as a “growth area” – in an area feeding the potable water supply and groundwater recharge?	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		9	Is it appropriate that areas without sewers be mapped as PA-1? While many of these areas received this designation decades ago (during the first round of the State Plan), there is no intention, nor the financial wherewithal in most cases, to develop this infrastructure. Should these areas remain in a PA-1 designation – which implies that additional growth at higher densities should be encouraged – without the necessary infrastructure to support such development?	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Climate Change		9	To effectively reduce GHGs in the New York/New Jersey MSA, a densely populated region intricately connected through a network of highly trafficked transportation, energy, information, and economic corridors, the region needs substantial intrastate and interstate coordination and investment.	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	9	Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. Bergen County submitted a series of map amendments during the 2004-2005 Cross-Acceptance Process that reflected the desire of municipalities (especially in such a densely developed PA-1 landscape as Bergen County) to have their municipal parks, recreation sites, open space, and green corridors mapped as parkland on the State Plan map.	Bergen County	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
General		10	Coordination with other Regional Agencies. Communication and coordination with other regional agencies (not just the State Agencies, as discussed earlier) is critical for overarching planning issues, trends, and priorities, including the Priority Climate Action Plan mentioned above relative to NYMTC and the regional MPOs. Such coordination is especially critical with Climate Change as a new priority goal for the State Plan.	Bergen County	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Infrastructure		numerous	While the state plan promotion of mass transit opportunities statewide is generally appropriate, a “one size fits all” approach by the plan or the legislature enacting regulations not requiring any parking on site, should be based upon specific local statistical information.	numerous	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		numerous	Streamlining the NJDEP minor application process...	numerous	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing		numerous	...as well as providing more realistic affordable housing regulations that recognize sound planning needs balanced preserving non-residential ratables enabling municipalities to balance costs of services, is recommended.	numerous	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree

General		numerous	The State Plan includes goals to protect environmentally sensitive areas which is fine, but there should be a caveat that these broad intentions are subject to site-specific features that warrant some flexibility when planning for individual site development. The State Plan should also include a detailed statement regarding the need to balance all statewide objectives to ensure that the emphasis on any one goal does not adversely impact other important goals that should carry equal weight with respect to a 'goals evaluation' process. This is particularly critical to ensure that a 'one size fits all' approach does not serve to negatively impact sound planning at the local level.	numerous	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		12	The state plan includes goals to protect environmentally sensitive areas. These broad statements regarding encouraging development and redevelopment in the various planning areas, should include a specific statement that these goals have broad intentions for the areas designated and that they are subject to the specific environmental limitations of stream, riparian, wetland and floodplain limitations as well as important groundwater recharge areas for the continued recharge of aquifers. In addition, the development statements of the state plan should include text that make specific reference to the need to balance statewide objectives with local municipalities master plan goals and objectives.	Allendale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Executive Summary	12	19	"Zoning encouraging employment growth that does not provide for a proportional increase in housing is inconsistent with the Plan." This should be revised to recognize that it is not always possible to provide for such a proportional increase.	Closter	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	23	Given the Borough's predominant rural and suburban character, rather than urban character, the Borough seek a change from PA1 to PA2 and PA3.	Franklin Lakes	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Housing	18	46, 76	The Borough recommends that the state does not adopt a one-size-fits-all approach to accessory apartments or home-based businesses.	Midland Park, Tenafly	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	23	63	Accessory dwelling units should not be implemented Statewide as a blanket proposition but should remain optional with State incentives.	Riveredge	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Equity		63	State Plan goals and policies regarding equity and impacts to overburdened communities warrant greater specificity.	Riveredge	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	63	As indicated in the State Plan Map survey response submitted by the Borough, the State should consider revising the current PA-1 designations for Van Saun County Park and floodplain and wetland areas associated with the Hackensack River. Otherwise, the remaining areas of the Borough designated as PA-1 are appropriate.	Riveredge	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		71	The "intent" for Area 1 is that it provide for "much of the state's future growth" while simultaneously "preventing gentrification and displacement, rebalancing natural systems and protecting and enhancing the character of existing stable communities." These priorities cannot comfortably co-exist...The State Plan should not look solely to Area 1 for the state's growth, instead facilitating Smart Growth in other urban and larger suburban corridors.	Rutherford	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Executive Summary	11-12	Montvale letter	Montvale seeks clarification on the statement "provide for a proportional increase in housing". What does proportional mean? The text should be revised to define or explain the quoted phrase.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	23	Montvale letter	This strategy seeks to build housing blind to environmental limitations and utility constraints. Housing development must work within the confines of environmental limitations and utility constraints. This strategy should be revised to encourage housing development outside of environmentally sensitive lands and limit housing development to existing utility constraints.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	26	Montvale letter	This text should be revised to recognize water and wastewater limitations. Suggested text, "In areas where water and wastewater infrastructure is available and capacity remains...." Additionally, the Draft State Plan does not define what would be considered "increased residential development densities". As written, that could be interpreted to mean one more unit per acre.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	29	Montvale letter	"Boost transit ridership through Transit-Oriented Development. Appropriately sited housing is proven to boost transit ridership while reducing congestion and air pollution." The last sentence above is not qualified. A report or study should be cited, otherwise it appears to be a net opinion.	Montvale	Study will be cited.	Agree
Infrastructure	31	Montvale letter	Clarification is needed on what "planned higher-density development" includes. Is it a specific density range or just above the average permitted density in a municipality? The Borough has two Overlay Zones near the train station, which permit residential uses above the ground floor at densities of 12 and 15 units per acre. Would this be considered "higher-density"?	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Infrastructure	33-34	Montvale letter	Clarification is needed on what "higher intensity mixed-use" includes.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Revitalizing & Recentering	36	Montvale letter	It is unclear who is supposed to identify new centers – the State, County, municipality? The document should be revised to indicate what entity will be responsible for this task.	Montvale	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree

Revitalizing & Recentering	38	Montvale letter	These buffers, especially around commercial development along the west side of Chestnut Ridge Road and Paragon Drive, are essential to protecting adjacent residents from noise, visual, and privacy impacts of the commercial development. Modifying these buffers could have a negative impact to adjacent residents. The Draft State Plan should be revised to add details on how buffers should be modified, while continuing to provide adequate screening to adjacent residents.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Climate Change	41	Montvale letter	The Borough supports this priority. However, clarification is needed on who would be tasked with conducting “regional, watershed-level planning” – the County, each municipality in a watershed, or another entity?	Montvale	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Climate Change	41	Montvale letter	The Borough supports this priority, but is unclear what entity would be in charge of leading the creation of intergovernmental and community partnerships. The text should be revised to identify the entity responsible for this priority.	Montvale	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Natural & Water Resources	47	Montvale letter	It appears the areas adjacent to the Borough’s C1 streams and within the 100-year flood zone would qualify as a Critical Environmental Site. However, the Interactive Locator Map designates this area in the Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1). It is unclear what entity is responsible for determining Critical Environmental Sites and how the Borough could modify the Locator map to identify these areas.	Montvale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Montvale letter	The document mentions a “State Plan Policy Map” 17 times, but nowhere in the document does it inform readers where to find said “State Plan Policy Map”. In fact, page 120 specifically states that the “Smart Growth Explorer is not part of the official State Plan Policy Map”. Therefore, it is unclear where one would find the State Plan Policy Map.	Montvale	SPPM will be added.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Montvale letter	The Borough is suburban in nature and believes it should be reclassified to Suburban Planning Area (PA2) as the intents of the Draft State Plan for PA2 areas better relate to the existing conditions of the Borough.	Montvale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Implementation	83	Montvale letter	“Municipal planning in New Jersey is outdated. Many local governments lack resources to handle planning related procedures. Regional considerations should adhere to the goals outlined in the State Plan, which should be considered as the framework for decision-making. Regional considerations (regional master planning) help address inequitable municipal planning capabilities.” Montvale takes exception with the above statement. The above statement should be deleted from the Draft State Plan or substantially revised. It appears the Draft State Plan suggests municipalities that lack resources be eliminated and governed/regulated at a regional level, rather than a local level. It is unclear how a municipality would be determined to “lack resources” and who would make the determination.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		Montvale letter	It is unclear throughout the report what goal/priority is implemented by the State, County, municipality or the private sector. The text should be clarified, or a matrix provided in the appendix.	Montvale	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		Montvale letter	The Planning Goals, Strategies, and Priorities Goals should be numbered to enable practitioners and citizens to easily refer to statements within the report as opposed to referring to a page number.	Montvale	References, instead of numbering, will be implemented.	Agree
General		Montvale letter	The Draft State Plan proposes several goals. However, it is unclear if certain goals are prioritized over others. For example, does the Housing Goal to provide more housing supersede the goal related to Natural and Water Resources (protect, maintain, restore the state’s natural and water resources/ecosystems)?	Montvale	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Montvale letter	The State Plan Policy Map should be enhanced with an overlay for flood hazard areas to recognize the danger stream corridors face.	Montvale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Montvale letter	Montvale requests that the Borough’s designation of PA1 be amended to PA5 for areas containing environmental features, including C1 streams, wetlands, required buffers, and within the 100-year flood zone to encourage the protection of these environmental resources.	Montvale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Montvale letter	Montvale requests that its designation of PA1 be amended to PA2 outside of the aforementioned environmental features. PA2 reflects the Borough’s existing conditions and planning goals. Designating Montvale as PA1 is encouraging overdevelopment of the community. This classification undermines the Borough’s master plan documents, zoning ordinance, and planning goals.	Montvale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	104	This area should be PA5. Highlighted areas are an AE Flodoplain, wetlands, and riparian buffers surrounding C1 waterways. These areas are delineated on the FIRMs, in Westwood’s Hazard Vulnerability Assessment, in the NJ Flood Mapper, and on the reference layers of the State Plan.	Westwood	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree

General	see comment	99	Page 59 of The Plan states, “Apply design principles to create and preserve spatially defined, visually appealing, functionally efficient places in ways that establish a recognizable identity, create a distinct character, and maintain a human scale.” Page 61 urges, “Consider the scale and character of the surrounding fabric.” Page 69 encourages “Contextually appropriate density” and planning “to maintain or enhance the existing character.” Westwood has done all of this and more, in its own unique way in response to local context, as have many of the State’s municipalities by local planning. Why must municipalities then strive for greater consistency to fit into the State’s proposed cookie-cutter mold [with broad aspirational goals without balancing them with a locations character, contextually appropriate density and balance of land uses] when we are already meeting the spirit of The Plan [through incremental planning]?	Westwood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		101	Yet there is relentless pressure for Trenton to pre-empt local zoning and impose urban residential densities on every town in NJ. The State Development and Redevelopment Plan, as drafted, fuels this one-size-fits-all approach.	Westwood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Climate Change	41	101	Westwood’s achilles heel is flooding, which has been exacerbated by climate change. While the State understandably seeks to protect its water resources, its methodology is compounding the effect of shifting weather patterns, resulting in increased inundation of historically flood-prone properties. <u>DEP rules for the operation of reservoirs and dams do not include flood mitigation</u> . The inland flood regulations are contradicted by such legislation as the pending ‘stranded asset’ bill, which would allow the redevelopment of shopping centers and office complexes without regard to environmental considerations.	Westwood	Referral to DEP can be made. New language can be considered.	Agree
Climate Change	41	102	Unfortunately, The Plan itself contradicts these tenets: “Housing built in areas at higher flood risk should . . .” (pg 29). It recommends reducing impervious surfaces (pg. 55) yet encourages the mandating of ADUs (pgs. 23) which increase impervious surface. [Balancing competing needs/goals. Soften language.]	Westwood	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		103	The communities throughout NJ cannot be held to the same standards across all our regions and individual municipalities, and the shortcomings of some should not be forced as the solutions to all, particularly those who have shown consistent commitment to "comprehensive planning."	Westwood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
General		99	Furthermore, we are concerned by The Plan’s unrealistic concepts that defy not just sound planning principles but at times sound fiscal responsibility. Asking municipalities to “focus on redesigning underutilized areas for private development and investment” (pg. 12) diverts limited tax funds to a task that is the responsibility of the developer. Transitioning to a “100% clean energy system” is admirably aspirational, but with no support infrastructure in place and no clear schedule for implementing a framework to achieve this goal, encouraging municipalities to change zoning at this time is a waste of resources. [Balance of aspirations.]	Westwood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Hillsdale letter	Hillsdale requests that its designation of PA1 be amended to PA2 outside of the aforementioned environmental features. PA2 reflects the Borough’s existing conditions and planning goals. Designating Hillsdale as PA1 is encouraging overdevelopment of the community. This classification undermines the Borough’s master plan documents, zoning ordinance, and planning goals.	Hillsdale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	Hillsdale letter	Hillsdale requests that the Borough’s designation of PA1 be amended to PA5 for areas containing environmental features, including C1 streams, wetlands, required buffers, and within the 100-year flood zone to encourage the protection of these environmental resources.	Hillsdale	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A		Alpine is requesting a Planning Area designation change from PA1	Alpine	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree

Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Bergen County)						
PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY/NE AGREE/DISAGREE	SPC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		Agree	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy.	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		Would like to see definition, but no disagreement	
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	SRAs should not be mapped on SPPM; layer on locator map is ok	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	SDRP should recommend Rule change	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	Should not be PA if a hinderance to developing recreation areas; should be mapped regardless; show State/county/muni land; follow ROSI; preserved farmland should also be mapped	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	PA4C should be implemented	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Perhaps this could be reviewed with every SDRP readoption; centers should otherwise not automatically expire	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	CEAs is preferred, keeping CES is beneficial	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Agree	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree



## Appendix A - Union County Cross Acceptance Response Items

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	CAR PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	SPC NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE RESPONSE	County/NE AGREE/DISAGREE
General		90	Scotch Plains strongly opposes state mandates to abolish or reduce minimum parking requirements statewide	Scotch Plains	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Executive Summary	11	72	Representatives of the State Office of Planning Advocacy at several cross-acceptance public meetings stated that the new State Development and Redevelopment Plan is intended to be an advisory document. If so, the Plan's advisory status should be clearly stated at the front of the Plan indicating its purpose and intended use.	Summit	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Executive Summary	12	32	"Zoning encouraging employment growth that does not provide for a proportional increase in housing is inconsistent with the Plan." This should be revised to recognize that it may not always be possible to provide for such a proportional increase in built-out municipalities like Fanwood due to lack of available and developable land. Currently, this language could make even minor zoning amendments or redevelopment plans for non-residential uses inconsistent with the draft State Plan.	Fanwood	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Executive Summary	12	89	zoning that provides for an increase in employment growth and housing should also provide a proportional increase, preservation, or enhancement of open space and recreation	Scotch Plains	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Economic Development	20-21	89	encourage county and municipal governments to include housing-to-recreation ratio analyses	Scotch Plains	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	23	17	The Preliminary State Plan makes housing a top priority. Berkeley Heights would recommend that as more housing opportunities are planned in the Township to satisfy its affordable housing obligations, more state funding and grants are awarded for the preservation of open space, recreation, green acres or other conservation programs to address the secondary impacts and needs of the new residents.	Berkeley Heights, Westfield	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	27	70	The Preliminary SDRP states that "restrictive zoning" codes which "ban multifamily development or ban ADUs" are inconsistent with the Plan as a general proposition with no discussion of context or consideration of the diversity of municipalities in New Jersey. The State should be discouraged from implementing any one-size-fits-all approach that supersedes local zoning to implementing such policies...The State should not universally permit ADUs without due consideration to unintended consequences and impacts associated with increased sprawl, impervious coverage, traffic and parking demands, school impacts, utilities, open space, employment and municipal services. [Taxes on ADUs?]	Summit	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	27	70	Multifamily development and ADUs should be developed in appropriate locations where they can be accommodated with sufficient land, transportation networks, utilities, municipal services and open space which do not diminish the quality of life of existing communities. The implementation of multifamily and ADU land use policies should remain optional at the discretion of municipalities and incentivized through funding and affordable housing credits. The Preliminary SDRP should be made clear that the term "restrictive zoning" should not be interpreted to mean a prohibition of single-family zoning. The SDRP should be nuanced with acknowledgment of the diversity of communities in New Jersey and strive to minimize impacts to fully developed and stable areas of the State.	Summit	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Housing	27	90	provide tax credits and state aid incentives to accomplish the construction of more missing middle housing	Scotch Plains	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Infrastructure	30	111	SDRP should consider improvements to NY Penn Station, and one-seat-rides for rail commuters	Westfield	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
SPPM	68	72	There is very little policy discussion in the new SDRP that is specific to the State's various planning areas which is a departure from the 2001 SDRP that contains individual policies and objectives for the respective planning areas. The new plan merely defines the various planning areas with little nuance as to how they should be treated differently from a policy perspective or with regard to variation of communities that exists within the planning areas.	Summit	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree

Glossary	86	89	SDRP should provide more specific guidance on targeted densities	Scotch Plains	Clarifying language will be considered for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Research Briefs	136-137	90	SDRP should address lack of dedicated NJ Transit funding and establish "one-seat-ride" on the Raritan Valley Line	Scotch Plains	Will consider revision for revised draft final plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	69	The State should consider amending the State Plan map to include undeveloped parcels adjacent to the Passaic River located along the City's northwest boundary as environmentally sensitive within Planning Area 5. See Summit's Survey123 submission to Union County via the online portal.	Summit	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	75	A portion of the Township's land within the PA1 (western boundary, eastern boundary, and existing park/recreation area ) is impacted by waterways and/or bodies of water. Because of this, the land is associated with wetlands and the AE Flood Zone and, as such, is not developable. It is worth considering an adjustment of the planning area designation for these locations.	Union Twp	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	81	[see map]	Summit	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree
Mapping	N/A	82	[see map]	Summit	All proposed mapping revisions will be considered after the adoption of the new State Plan.	Agree

## Appendix B: Statewide Policy Issues (Union County)

PSDRP GOAL/SECTION	PSDRP PAGE	DESCRIPTION	JURISDICTION	NOTES	COUNTY/NE AGREE/DISAGREE	SPC AGREE/DISAGREE
General		Add definitions requested from public comment to glossary	State		Agree	Agree
General		Formatting of document will be done for revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
General		Clarifying language requested from public comment will be added to revised draft final	State		Agree	Agree
Pollution and Environmental Cleanup	48	Waste Management and Recycling: add language on illegal dumping [Environmental justice & facility siting]	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	61	Remove the term "Areas of Critical State Concern" and incorporate concepts into a revised Special Resource Area definition and policy.	State		Agree	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Recognize the following as Special Resource Areas: The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, The Skylands Region, The Sourland Mountain Region, The Great Swamp, Peter J. Barnes III Wildlife Preserve, and Rancocas Creek.	State		Clarify that we are not calling for a regional planning entity to be established in each SRA. Consider additional watersheds for this recognition.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning	62	Special Resource areas be mapped on the State Plan Policy Map.	State	Currently, Special Resource Areas are not mapped.	Include as layer on SPPM and online locator map. Consider standalone map.	Agree
Comprehensive Planning		Plan Endorsement: The process of pursuing Plan Endorsement/Center Designation by a municipality and the benefits for receiveing endorsement are not balanced.	State	While Plan Endorsement is in the Plan generally, the specifics of endorsement are in the Guidelines and Benefits documents, respectively.	Streamlining PE is good idea.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove adjacency criteria.	State	Example: a PA2 will not need to be next to a PA1.	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Planning Areas: remove land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria.	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	77	Designate Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas as an official Planning Area	State	The 2001 Plan does not consider Parks, Open Space, and Natural Areas a Planning Area.	Map element, not PA.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that reflects developed areas that are subject to current and future climate risk.	State	Example: PA1B and PA2B	Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map		Create a new Planning Area that recognizes a Rural Planning Area (PA4) that has development.	State	Example: PA4C	Flexibility preferred/no comment.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Addition/reintroduction of Cores within Centers	State	This concept was introduced in the 2001 Plan and removed in the Preliminary Plan.	Support, as long as terms are clearly defined.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	Centers: Revise the definition of Center.	State		Support, as long as terms are clearly defined.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map/Comprehensive Planning	78	Centers/Plan Endorsement: Remove Center Designation expirations	State	Centers/cores/nodes expire after 10 years unless you are one of the few permanent centers.	Centers should not expire unless communities ask for center designation removal. Reconsider boundaries with next SDRP adoption.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	78	The State Plan should include a list of identified Centers	State		Agree	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Critical Environmental Site: if the land greater than 1 sq. mile criteria is removed that CESs should become critical environmental areas.	State	CESs in the 2001 Plan were meant for areas less than 1 sq. mile.	Understand need for additional flexibility.	Agree
State Plan Policy Map	76	Separate Critical Environmental Site and Historical Cultural Site (HCS)	State		Clearly define both terms.	Agree
Implementation		Implement the State Plan as a guide.	State	SPC received many comments on having the State Plan not impose on local zoning and regulation changes.	Agree	Agree
Implementation		Strengthen language regarding coordination between the State Plan, State Agencies, and municipalities/Counties.	State		Agree	Agree