

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY DRAFT PRELIMINARY

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

' Prepared by Office of
State Planning January

29, 1988

PURPOSE

This summary describes the principal features of the January 1988 Draft Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan and how it differs from the April 1987 internal working document. It describes as well some of the concerns expressed about the April draft and how the January draft addresses these concerns. Finally, it sets out the format and schedule for revising the January draft for Commission consideration as the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

INTRODUCTION

Why is a State Plan necessary? New Jersey is not able to construct and maintain public facilities and services fast enough to meet the demands of new growth. As a result, public services are deteriorating throughout the State because:

- growth is occurring in areas of the State in which public agencies had not planned to provide services; and,
- the public sector is reaching the limit of its ability to raise the additional public revenues necessary to construct, maintain and operate new and expanded facilities and services.

In the absence of adequate public services, the very amenities of the State which attract new residents and new businesses are rapidly disappearing. Many believe that if present trends continue, the recent economic resurgence of New Jersey could grind to a halt, along with the traffic on most of its major arteries. It is not a State Plan that will inhibit growth -- it is the absence of a Plan.

What are some of these trends? What are some of the amenities that attract growth but, in turn, are threatened by unmanaged, haphazard growth?

1. Between 1950 and 1985, New Jersey lost half, or 830,000 acres, of farmland. That is an average rate of loss of 24,000 acres per year. In the last two years, however, that rate of loss has almost doubled. In just the last twenty four months. NEW Jersey has lost an additional 90,000 acres of farmland. If this rate were to continue, there would be no farmland in New Jersey in less than twenty years. A sound State Plan would encourage local governments to raise their standards for how these lands develop, to increase their use of farmland preservation programs, and to provide incentives for development to occur elsewhere, where adequate public services are planned.
2. In the area of water resources, so much water has been pumped out of certain major aquifers to supply new growth that these ground water supplies are not being replenished. Saltwater is starting to infiltrate and ruin these major water supply sources. Septic tank effluent In areas without central treatment systems are beginning to damage ground and surface water supplies. In addition, areas served by more than 200 sewage treatment plants are under development moratoria. A sound State Plan would guide development toward existing public water systems which do not threaten these major aquifers. It would also urge State agencies and localities to coordinate densities of development with the ability of the geology

and soil to dilute septic tank effluent, thereby protecting precious ground and surface water supplies. Also, sewer moratoria do not solve water pollution problems, and they have the added disadvantage of restricting the economic development of major growth markets in the State. A sound State Plan would promote growth policies which "free-up" funds that could be redirected to resolve these moratoria.

3. In 1986, New Jersey was among the States with the highest cost of housing in the nation. A sound State Plan would recognize that the real housing bill for a resident is the mortgage payment ~~plus taxes plus commuting costs~~. Accordingly, it would promote policies which encourage housing where services can be provided most efficiently and where the commute to work is cost-effective. It would also urge higher housing densities in appropriate areas to reduce the unit costs of construction.
4. From 1970 to 1985, the six largest cities of the State lost over 13 percent of their population. The State as a whole grew by over 5.5 percent. From 1972 to 1984, these same cities lost almost one-quarter of their jobs while the State's employment grew by over one quarter* The infrastructure in these areas is rapidly deteriorating and will have to be repaired, regardless of whether new growth occurs there or not. A sound State Plan would anticipate cycles in the development marketplace that produce opportunities for urban redevelopment. Accordingly, It would promote policies to revitalize the infrastructure In advance to seize these opportunities when they arise.

5. The level of ozone in the air we breathe has become so high that the entire State of New Jersey has been classified as non-attainment by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency. A major source of ozone is automobile exhaust. A sound State Plan would promote greater use of alternative modes of transportation to the automobile. It would do this by encouraging patterns of growth and community designs which not only shorten auto trip lengths and frequencies, but which also produce intensities of use necessary for efficient public transportation systems in the future.
6. As new growth has sprawled across the central region of the State, auto traffic on Route 1 has become so congested that state transportation experts estimate that unless major improvements are made, it will take over 5 hours to travel between New Brunswick and Trenton by the Year 2005. A sound State Plan would urge localities to guide growth toward areas where adequate services now exist or can be provided efficiently. This strategy would allow State agencies to focus their capital expenditures on repairing existing systems while expanding them, instead of diffusing these expenditures to cover the costs of unplanned facilities to serve inefficient sprawl development on rural lands.

In summary, a sound State Plan is needed for New Jersey to assure that the economic vitality and fiscal integrity of the State is maintained through the 1990s and into the Twenty-First century. The Draft Preliminary and Redevelopment Plan represents a first step in the formulation of such a plan. Municipalities, counties, State agencies and the general public will play key roles in shaping this plan for the future of the State.

THE GENERAL APPROACH AND STRATEGY OF THE DRAFT PLAN The State Plan as it is presently drafted seeks to manage growth, not to limit it. The Draft Plan is designed to accommodate the current projection of population and employment to the Year 2010 of the Department of Transportation and the Department of labor. It is where and how this growth occurs-- the pattern of growth in the State -- that is the principal focus of the Draft Plan. The strategy selected by the Commission for managing growth responds directly to certain key provisions of the State Planning Act: First, the Act states that the Plan must identify areas for growth, limited growth, agriculture, open space conservation and other appropriate designations that the Commission may deem necessary;

Second, the Act states that the Plan should encourage development, redevelopment and economic growth in locations that are well situated with respect to present or anticipated public services and facilities and discourage development where it may impair or

destroy natural resource or environmental qualities that are vital to the health and well-being of the present and future citizens of this State;

33iird, the Act states that the Plan should assure adequate public services at a reasonable cost. Taken together, these three provisions provide the framework for growth management in New Jersey, and point the direction for the general strategies necessary to achieve the mandates of the Act.

The Growth Management System

To appreciate why the Commission developed the particular growth management system that it did, one has to understand two recurring themes of the State Planning Act. The first theme is that the economic vitality of the State can be maintained into the future only if the quality of life which attracts new residents and new businesses is preserved. Because quality of life has two components -- the natural environment and public services -- the strategy of the Plan must be to guide growth in ways that protect the natural environment and make the most efficient use of existing and planned public services.

The second theme is that the fiscal integrity of the State and its municipal and county governments can be maintained into the future only if public revenues are adequate to meet the demands of new growth for public services. With new taxes unlikely and substantial increases in existing taxes undesirable, there are only two alternatives:

- obtain private sector financing of new facilities; or,
- reduce the future demand for higher tax expenditures.

Because there are limits on private sector contributions for public facilities and services, developer payments cannot be relied upon solely to raise sufficient revenue to meet future service demands, and there is still the "catch up" costs for existing low service levels. The second general strategy of the Plan must be, therefore, to encourage a pattern of growth that will produce less need for public services than trend growth and reduce the costs associated with meeting that need. In essence, therefore, the Plan must promote a pattern of growth in the State which is guided by the timing and sequencing of public services extensions necessary to support that growth.

Accordingly, the Plan's system for managing growth distinguishes among geographic areas of the State on the basis of the existence, or planned extension, of public facilities and services. Most public services are extended from a central facility or place to outlying areas, or from a first "tier" of service to successively more distant tiers. This notion of extending public services from more intensively developed "tiers" to successively less intensively developed tiers to accommodate new growth is the underlying principal of the Plan's "tier concept" for managing growth.

In summary, the tier concept supports the logic of the State Planning Act. The Act acknowledges that it is not reasonable for the public to incur the cost of new facilities and services in areas of the State where they do not now exist when, 1) there are existing facilities and services capable of serving new growth, 2) there are

facilities which are operating over capacity and need to be expanded anyway, and 3) there are facilities which have deteriorated and need to be repaired anyway. The Tier approach also allows for designation of areas of the State that possess certain natural resources and environmental qualities which must be protected to ensure the economic vitality of the State in the future and to protect the public health, safety and welfare, even *if* infrastructure could be provided there efficiently.

In devising a growth management system appropriate to the -unique location, political traditions, public concerns and fiscal objectives of the State, the Commission reviewed the planning systems used by other States, particularly Florida, Hawaii, Oregon and Vermont, but also California and Colorado. Several conclusions were reached:

1. With the cross-acceptance process called for in the New Jersey Act, the New Jersey State planning process assures considerably more direct local participation in the preparation of the State Plan than do the processes of other States; hence, it is more a "bottom-up" process than other States have;
2. Because the New Jersey Act does not require conformance of local and county master plans with the State Plan, whereas the Florida, Hawaii and other Acts do, the New Jersey State Plan is designed as a rational guide for State agency budgeting and decision-making, and for local growth management planning;

3. The planning statutes of other States, such as California, Vermont and Colorado, often focus on specific concerns, such as areas of critical environmental concern, protection of ridgelines or shorelines, etc. The New Jersey Act ~~takes~~ takes a broader, more comprehensive view. It recognizes that recent patterns of growth in the State are at the root of a wide range of concerns, from loss of farmland, wetlands, etc. to the decline of major cities. Our inability to support these patterns with adequate public services threaten the economic and fiscal potential of the State to continue its recent economic resurgence into the 21st Century. The New Jersey Plan, therefore, is not a single-purpose plan-- it is intended to provide a policy framework for managing growth to accomplish a number of public policy objectives.

Infrastructure Needs Assessment

In its initial assessment of infrastructure needs over the planning period, the Commission found that statewide infrastructure needs to support projected population and employment growth to the Year 2010 will be 1.65 times the revenues projected to pay those costs. This "deficit" does not even include the cost of "catching up," or bringing existing service levels up to an adequate level. Also, it does not include off-tract and on-tract infrastructure costs required to service the projected population and employment growth to the Year 2010. These

findings support those of the Governor's Management Improvement Council (1984) and the Municipal and County Government Study Commission (1984) regarding the growing inability of the public sector to construct and operate the capital facilities necessary to meet the demands of new growth and, at the same time, maintain adequate service levels for existing facilities.

Evaluation of Alternative Growth Patterns

In an effort to gain a better understanding of the advantages and disadvantages associated with alternative growth patterns, the Commission studied three very basic forms, or scenarios, in order to arrive at a "Plan scenario":

1. "continuation of trends", which assumes continuation of existing trends of development, much of which would occur on land without existing or planned public services;
2. "concentrated urban growth", which assumes that most of the population and employment entering the State between now and the Year 2010 would locate in the major urban areas; and,
3. "corridors and nodes", which assumes that most of this population and employment would locate in nodes, or high intensity centers along the major corridors of the State, like routes 55, 1, 76, 80, etc., or along major commuter rail lines.

The evaluation resulted In the following major conclusions:

1. to accommodate the most recent population and employment projections under each alternative, land development and infrastructure costs tended to be highest under "trend" (\$13.8 billion) and lowest under "concentrated urban growth" (\$8.4 billion), with "corridor and nodes" falling in between (\$10.6 billion);
2. restricting growth in limited growth (primarily rural) areas does not make growth occur in the cities - - urban growth will require public and private reinvestment in the cities;
3. growth in employment is vigorous under all alternatives;
4. concentration of development in older urban areas would cause a lessening of total population growth during the planning period;

The Plan Scenario

The Plan scenario was constructed in response to these and other conclusions resulting from the evaluation, to the results of a Gallup Poll conducted in December 1986, and to comments received at ten (10) public meetings held across the State. The Commission decided that the Plan should strive to achieve the infrastructure efficiencies of the "concentrated urban" and the "corridors and nodes" scenarios, but still accommodate the projected growth for the State to the Year 2010. This

decision required that more of the growth projected under the "continuation of trends" scenario be accommodated in a manner which does not impair natural resources and environmental qualities in rural areas and does not conflict with other objectives set forth in the Act.

Accordingly, smaller "freestanding towns" with basic infrastructure, such as Clinton, Vineland and Newton, were included in the Plan scenario to absorb growth that would otherwise occur on rural land. Because not all municipalities have such towns and because all municipalities need areas to accommodate growth if it were to occur in them, small "villages" were also included as growth "hubs" in rural areas. Even though many of these villages do not presently have public services, if growth is encouraged in and around them, a pattern of development will ensue which can be served efficiently in the future. Also, this strategy would reduce the development pressure on surrounding agricultural and environmentally-sensitive lands.

In summary, the Plan scenario was constructed around the following points:

- a. most of the projected population and employment growth should be accommodated in existing growing suburbs, major transportation corridors, and towns and small villages, without impairing natural resources and environmental qualities;
- b. incentives and public spending priorities must be formulated to revitalize the declining urban areas of the State;

- c. adequate housing at a reasonable cost can be promoted by providing a variety of locations throughout the State for increased densities coordinated with public service improvements, preferably near existing and planned public transportation and employment centers;
- d. adequate public services at a reasonable cost can best be assured by guiding new growth to areas which have existing or planned public services so that they can be repaired and upgraded at the same time they are expanded.

The April 1987 Draft Preliminary Plan

At its April 24, 1987 meeting, the State Planning Commission was presented with a first draft of the Preliminary State Plan by the staff. This draft was an "internal working document" designed in response to the above conclusions. It was to be used as a point of departure for the Commission to begin shaping a plan suitable for cross-acceptance with the municipalities and counties. Because the cross-acceptance process was constructed as part of the planning process, not part of the implementation process, any mapping errors (e.g., sewerage areas) were to be corrected during comparison of the State Plan with local and county plans.

The Commission appointed subcommittees to review the various sections of the *April* draft and advise staff on appropriate revisions. The staff undertook additional research and mapping to update the technical data used to support the provisions and maps contained in the draft. Both the Commission and staff received considerable feedback on the *April* draft during this period, from municipalities and counties, legislators, special interest groups and associations. State agencies, and the general public. The January 1988 version of the Draft Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan is the result of this process.

THE JANUARY 1988 DRAFT Preliminary PLAN

The following is a summary of the major provisions of the January 1988 draft preliminary plan. They are presented in the context of changes to the April 1987 document.

1. The January draft maintains the "Corridor Centers Strategy" as a key strategy in managing growth during the planning period. This strategy is discussed further below.
2. The January draft combines old Tiers 1 and 2 (Urban Centers and Older Suburbs) into a new Tier 1. This change reduces the total number of tiers from eight to seven. The new Tier 1, while perhaps not setting forth a totally comprehensive urban policy for the State, does include a more extensive set of recommendations dealing with revitalization issues. Meetings

with the staff of the Department of Community Affairs on these issues were extremely productive, as was correspondence and discussion with the New Jersey Committee on Urban Economic Development. While the January draft combines the "urban center" and "older suburbs" tiers into one tier, it maintains appropriate policy distinctions in funding priorities, etc. between these two urban areas. New strategies and policies are included, particularly for economic development, urban design, transportation and human development. The January draft stresses the need for stronger public transit ties between the major centers and their surrounding suburbs. The growth objective for this new tier is to reverse the projected decline in population and employment levels during the planning period sufficient to restore, at the least, 1985 population and employment levels by the Year 2010.

3. The January draft identifies more land available for development in the growth tiers (old tiers 1-5, new tiers 1-4). Recent data obtained from the DEP, localities and sewer authorities shows more areas served by existing and planned sewers than reflected on the April Plan map. More such areas may be identified by counties and municipalities during cross-acceptance, in which case the map will be appropriately revised.

4. The recommendation in the April document of a minimum lot size of 20 acres for land falling within the three limited growth tiers has been deleted in the January, draft.
 - a. In the "Environmentally-sensitive lands" tiers (old Tier 8, new Tier 7), the January draft recommends that the density conform to what is necessary to protect ground and surface water quality, as determined by a nitrate model; provided, however, that the highest gross density on environmentally-sensitive lands is recommended not to exceed 1 unit per 5 acres for cluster development. It is recommended that municipalities plan to maintain a gross density of 1 unit per 20 acres through purchase of conservation easements, open space acquisition, etc.
 - b. In the "Agricultural Areas" tier (old Tier 7, new Tier 6), the January draft recommends that municipalities regulate at a density for cluster development of 1 unit per 5 acres on all Tier 6 land within a municipality and that they achieve a gross density of 1 unit per 20 acres, including undevelopable land, through the use of farmland preservation programs. To the extent, therefore, that a municipality, county, the State or some other public entity purchases development easements or otherwise removes agricultural land from the development market, the development density of the remaining parcels would rise.

- c. In the "Future Suburbanizing Areas" tier (old Tier 6, new Tier 5), the January draft recommends a density of 1 unit per 5 acres if the development is clustered on smaller lots so that public services can be provided efficiently when services are extended. If development is not clustered, the draft recommends a gross density of 1 unit per 20 acres (including undevelopable land).
5. The map in the January draft is significantly different from the April "Policy Map." First, the January draft does not have both a "Plan Map" and a "Policy Map," as contained in the April document --there is only a "Plan Map" in the January draft. Second, the additional research and mapping since April has produced significant shifts in the classification of lands.
- a. The January draft identifies less land in the environmentally-sensitive lands tier (old Tier 8, new Tier 7), both because of more detailed mapping since April and because environmentally-sensitive agricultural land formerly in this tier has been transferred to the agricultural tier, at the request of the State Department of Agriculture.
 - b. The January draft places a significant amount of land formerly within the agricultural tier (old Tier 7, new Tier 6) into the future suburbanizing tier, as a result of

stricter criteria for identifying agricultural land. The criteria for designation of agricultural land were tightened to better focus conservation policies where there are "communities." Even more land was transferred into the agriculture tier, however, from the environmentally-sensitive lands tier.

- c. The January draft reflects more land area in the future suburbanizing tier (old Tier 6, new Tier 5) because some of the land formerly designated agricultural (see above remarks) has been transferred to this tier for suburban development in the future. Also, greater emphasis is given in the text to the fact that the density in the future suburbanizing tier is 1 unit to 5 acres, unless the developer chooses to ignore the cost savings for home construction and public services associated with cluster development.
- d. If the January map does not designate tiers in areas covered by the Pinelands Commission, the Hackensack-Meadowlands Commission and CAFRA, as well as in public open space land, since the "jurisdiction" of the State Plan excludes these areas.

-6. The "Stable Cities and Suburbs"¹ tier (old Tier 3, new Tier 2), such as the developed areas in Bergen, Morris, Monmouth, and Camden counties, are still growing communities. They have

infrastructure, however, which is becoming increasingly overburdened. The major concerns in Tier 2, therefore, is to keep pace with growth -- to maintain adequate service levels and to balance growth with open space needs. The January draft stresses the need to upgrade overburdened facilities and services in these areas, both to restore adequate service levels for existing residents and to allow additional growth without destroying the quality of life in these communities and neighborhoods.

7. In the April document, the Statewide strategies section focused primarily on environmental strategies. The January draft identifies three distinctive sets of strategies: general, environmental and corridor.
 - a. "Under general strategies, policies are identified for capital facilities financing, lower income housing, transportation, recreational open space needs and deficiencies in planning institutions and processes. The section addressing planning deficiencies is new and focuses on the need for more integrated planning and review processes as well as recommending the preparation of local six-year capital improvement programs tied to local longer-term capital facilities needs assessments.

- b. Under environmental strategies, several significant refinements were made In the January draft. For instance, the definition of critical slopes was changed from a slope exceeding 12 percent to a slope exceeding 15 percent. Also, regarding air quality reviews and mitigation, the April document suggested policies for all development outside of urban areas and surrounding suburbs, whereas the January draft focuses its policies on those areas that have been designated as "air quality improvement areas" by the Department of Environmental Protection. Finally, the January draft recommends development setback in stream corridors which would vary under different conditions, whereas the April document had a less flexible standard.
- c. Under transportation corridor strategies, the April draft included strategies called "corridors and nodes" within old Tier 5. The January draft acknowledges the fact that transportation corridors are located in a variety of tiers, ranging from Tier 2 through Tier 6A. Also, to avoid any misinterpretation that the strategy connoted strip, or sprawl, development along these corridors, the name was changed to "Corridor Centers Strategy" in the January draft and included in the Statewide strategy section. The January draft recommends that growth that will occur in major transportation corridors, such as highway routes 55,

1, 78, B0, etc., and rail routes, be encouraged to locate in high intensity, mixed use "centers" within these corridors. The January draft, however, includes a more extensive discussion of the center concept and the criteria which counties and municipalities should use to identify these centers during cross-acceptance. It recommends that counties and municipalities in major development corridors participate in regional consortia to prepare "Corridor Plans" to guide growth in the corridors and that the State provide some funding for such efforts.

8. The January draft articulates more clearly that growth is expected to occur in rural areas of the State, but it stresses the need to focus this growth where it can be served with public facilities either now or in the future. Towns can serve as one focal point, and rural villages, such as Shiloh in Cumberland County, and Allamuchy in Warren County, can serve as another. Even though such villages often do not have basic services, by locating new growth around them at appropriate densities, thresholds of population can be achieved which will allow provision of services in the future in a cost-effective manner. At the same time, sprawl development, requiring massive new tax expenditures, will be minimized. As in the April document, the January draft urges localities to discourage intensive new development on environmentally-

sensitive land, prime agricultural land and one land where services are not available or planned. *The* January draft discusses in store detail how counties and municipalities, during cross-acceptance, will:

- a. identify the specific villages appropriate to receive new growth; and,
- b. delineate the growth areas around towns and villages that are appropriate for growth.

TECHNICAL REPORTS SUPPORTING THE JANUARY 1988 DRAFT A number of technical reports have been prepared as background and supporting documentation for the January 1988 Draft Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan. These reports cover the selection of a growth management system. State planning in New Jersey and in other states, evaluation of growth scenarios, the Gallup Poll, summaries of public meetings, criteria for identification of environmentally-sensitive and agricultural areas, the infrastructure needs assessment, trends and conditions in the State, and growth projections.

In addition to these reports, several other ~~reports~~ will be forthcoming in the near future.

1. The firm of Hammer, Siler, George Associates, the economic consultants for the Plan, is undertaking a survey of key

business firms and leaders to provide additional supporting documentation on market trends and conditions in the State. The result of this survey will be completed and released before the Commission revises the January draft in response to State agency and public comments.

2. During February 1988, a report comparing infrastructure costs under trends and under "Plan" will be released. This analysis will use vacant developable land, by tier, as input. Between August 1987 and January 1988, the staff of the Office of State Planning, with considerable assistance from the Department of Environmental Protection, mapped vacant developable land throughout the State at a scale of 1 inch to 2,000 feet, on 1985 aerial photoquads. In January 1988, the staff of the Office have been reviewing these maps with the counties to eliminate any glaring errors in tier delineations. As a result, some boundary adjustments had to be made which delayed preparation of the report beyond the date of the January draft. It should be recognized, however, that because the counties and municipalities will be identifying growth areas in and around towns and villages during cross-acceptance, as well as amending growth tier boundaries to reflect updated sewer areas, the February report will not be conclusive regarding whether or not a sufficient amount of land is available to accommodate growth. A more conclusive report can and will be

produced after cross-acceptance. If there is an insufficiency, based on tier delineations and densities evolving from cross-acceptance, then new growth service areas will have to be identified in consultation with counties and municipalities.

3. During February 1988, a report describing the past, present and future growth trends in the 21 counties of the State will be released.

PROCESS TO BE USED AFTER RELEASE OF THE JANUARY 1988 DRAFT PLAN The present schedule calls for the Commission authorizing the Office of State Planning to release the Draft Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan at the Commission's meeting of January 29-30, 1988. The purpose for releasing this draft is to solicit the input of the general public, special interest groups, State agencies and others on the directions and approaches recommended in the Draft, prior to the Commission's consideration of the Draft as the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Following a 60-day review period, the comments received will be used to revise the Draft. The 60-day period will begin on February 16, 1988, in order to allow sufficient time for distributing the draft.

Upon approval of the Preliminary Plan for cross-acceptance, the counties and municipalities, and other interested parties, will be sent copies to begin the cross-acceptance process. Over a period of six months, the counties, working with the municipalities, will compare the

Preliminary Plan Kith county and municipal plans and regulations. Any remaining inaccuracies in napping «and other data, as well as inconsistencies in strategies, policies, standards, etc., will be noted and included in written reports to be submitted by the counties to the Commission at the end of the six month period.

These ~~reports~~, describing the counties¹ findings, recommendations, and objections to the Preliminary Plan will be reviewed by the State Planning Commission. If a municipality disagrees with the County report, it may submit its own report. Based upon its review of these reports, the Commission will sake appropriate revisions to the Preliminary Plan, negotiating as necessary through the counties to reach agreement on needed and appropriate changes to local or county plans to achieve compatibility. If local policies or standards are equally effective in achieving State goals and objectives as those in the Preliminary Plan, changes are not necessary at the local level.

When the optimum compatibility is achieved between plans at all levels, consistent with the objectives and mandates for the Plan set forth in the State Planning Act, the Commission will release a Draft (Final) State Development ar0"Redevelopment Plan. This draft of the final Plan will undergo extensive review through at least six public hearing. Based upon comments received during these public hearings, the Commission will again revise the Draft, undertake additional negotiations if necessary, and then consider it for adoption as the final State Development and Redevelopment Plan.