

# County Informational Meetings

## Abstract; County Informational Meetings

Twenty-one informational meetings, one in each county, were held between February 23 and March 30, 1989 under the auspices of the State Planning Commission and the 21 counties. The purpose of the meetings was to explain the state planning process, in general, and the nature of cross-acceptance, in particular. Participants at each meeting included State Planning Commission members, staff from the Office of State Planning, county representatives, municipal officials and members of the general public. The number of attendees at each meeting ranged from approximately 40 to 250 persons.

State Planning Commissioners and the Office of State Planning staff explained that the legislatively required cross-acceptance process was devised to formulate a growth management plan, one in which local officials and residents can control their municipalities' destinies. The Preliminary Plan provides a framework for rational decisionmaking. The commitment to a rational and comprehensive growth management plan was presented as essential to both continuing economic vitality and conservation of natural resources. Openness, balance of needs and the concept of responsibility were stressed.

The cross-acceptance process was described as a three-phase undertaking with a 6-month comparison phase, which began with the release of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan in January, 1989; a negotiation phase; and an issue resolution phase. It was emphasized that the process focuses upon statewide, county, and municipal strategies and policies; encourages input, including revisions, in a pro-active manner; and improves coordination and cooperation among state departments, counties and municipalities.

County representatives outlined the roles of the counties and municipalities during cross-acceptance, including major tasks and timeframes. Phase-one tasks were reviewed, particularly comparison of provisions of the Preliminary Plan with local planning documents for areas of consistencies and inconsistencies and identification of local needs, priorities and preferences. Opportunities for on-going public participation in the process were explained and the involvement by all interested parties was encouraged.

At each meeting, the audience was encouraged to discuss their concerns related to the Preliminary Plan. Major concerns raised by the public included the effect of the Plan upon land values and housing prices; agricultural issues; future state expenditures in each of the counties; the development permitting process; future legislative review of the Plan; the effectiveness of urban revitalization strategies and implementation mechanisms; the validity of dissenting reports and the effect of noncompliance on the municipalities; difficulties with the cross-acceptance process; the issue of water supply as a growth constraint; the possibility of tier revisions; macroeconomic impacts of the Plan; and perceived threats on, "home rule".

Some members of the general public also expressed doubt over the ability of the state to coordinate planning functions for all state

agencies, but simultaneously feared the loss of state funds for those municipalities deemed incompatible with the Plan. In addition, some audience members inquired as to the availability of maps, matrices, and technical data such as infrastructure costs, water supply studies and population projections. Some questions focused upon the need to explain concepts referred to in the Plan such as carrying capacity analyses and transfer of development rights ~~programs~~. Other participants insisted upon economic impact analyses of the Plan.

The State Planning Commission was reminded also of the need for affordable housing and infrastructure improvements throughout the State. While some persons raised the issue of improving citizen participation in the state planning process, others wondered how the State Plan would affect their property taxes. Specific problems were offered for Commission solutions, such as traffic congestion, loss of open space, the necessity for property tax reform, the protection of watershed areas, and the complexity of the development permitting process. Some audience members wanted specific incentives/disincentives made more explicit at this time. Others wanted to see the Plan's "vision" more clearly. Some people needed reassurance concerning the availability of land for development; others sought guarantees of the availability of land for conservation and recreational use.

The state planning process is on-going. The State Planning Commission will continue to review comments made in response to the Preliminary Plan during the cross-acceptance process and will make revisions based upon careful consideration of those comments. Summaries for each of the twenty-one county informational meetings are enclosed herein.

LIST OF PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS  
February 23, 1989 - March 30, 1989

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>DATE</u>
1. Bergen County Meeting	February 23, 1989
2. Middlesex County Meeting	February 25, 1989
3. Atlantic County Meeting	February 27, 1989
4. Gloucester County Meeting	February 27, 1989
5. Passaic County Meeting	February 27, 1989
6. Cumberland County Meeting	February 28, 1989
7. Burlington County Meeting	March 1, 1989
8. Hudson County Meeting	March 1, 1989
9. Sussex County Meeting	March 1, 1989
10. Somerset County Meeting	March 2, 1989
11. Ocean County Meeting	March 7, 1989
12. Cape May County Meeting	March 8, 1989,
13. Essex County Meeting	March 8, 1989
14. Hunterdon County Meeting	March 9, 1989
35. Monmouth County Meeting	March 14, 1989
16. Morris County Meeting	March 15, 1989
17. Salem County Meeting	March 18, 1989
18. Union County Meeting	March 21, 1989
19. <u>Camden</u> County Meeting	March 22, 1989
20. Warren County Meeting	March 29, 1989
21. Mercer County Meeting	March 30, 1989

Preliminary State Development and Plan  
Bergen County Informational Meeting  
Freeholders Chambers, Hackensack  
February 23, 1989 Attendees: 60

State/County Attendees;

James Gilbert, State Planning Commission  
Candace Ashmun, State Planning Commission  
William McDowell, County Executive, Bergen County  
Chester Mattson, Director of Planning and Economic Development, Bergen  
County  
James Hulsizer, Bergen County Noreen Best,  
Bergen County Robert Atbatomarco, Bergen  
County David Maski, Office of State  
Planning David Ifojsak, Office of State  
Planning Shomas Dallessio, Office of State  
Planning

Opening Remarks: William McDowell, Bergen County Executive

- \* Bergen County supports regional planning efforts.
- \* Open space is a problem in Bergen County. The Freeholders and the County Executive have made a commitment to acquire more open space.
- \* Bergen County is excited to be involved in the Cross-Acceptance process.

State Plan Overview; James Gilbert

- \* Cross-Acceptance is comprised of three phases: 1) Comparison (6 months); 2) Negotiation; and 3) Issue Resolution.
- \* Cross-Acceptance will be extended if necessary.
- \* Mr. Gilbert stated that he began to see the limits of planning and zoning at the local level.
- \* The time for the State Plan has **come**. It is not zoning. It sets up infrastructure parameters. It is growth management, not "geometric" zoning.

State Plan Video: David Maski

- \* Mr. Maski gave a review of the Cross-Acceptance process.

- \* nte end of 1989 is the target date for the adoption of the State Plan.

Bergen County Cross-Acceptance Overview; Chester Mattson

- \* If you pursue infrastructure efficiency, you will get environmental quality. If you pursue environmental quality, you will get infrastructure efficiency,
- \* Bergen County began Cross-Acceptance 1 1/2 years ago.
- \* There are many forms of Cross-Acceptance for the Bergen County staff:
  - > Dealing with the State Plan document;
  - > Appearing all over the County;
  - > Working with the NJ Association of Environmental Commissions;
  - > local/County Cross-Acceptance meetings;
  - > Bergen 2000 seminars on growth capacity, transportation and labor force;
  - > Countrywide straw polls on growth capacity, transportation and labor force;
  - > Business community seminars on growth capacity, transportation and labor force;
  - > Cross-Acceptance Newsletter;
  - > April 19, 1989 hearing for special interest groups;
  - > Bergen County Planning Board meetings. Pen forum on the State Plan from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.;
  - > Kay 31, 1989 public hearing on the Draft County Cross-Acceptance Report; and
  - > Meetings with environmental commissions, business and industry groups. Leagues of Women Voters, the Northern Valley Planning Association, and the Northern Valley Mayors Association.
- \* A typical Cross-Acceptance meeting:
  - > Generally 7 to 9 people attend from a given municipality .

- > Growth capacity is determined. Bergen County's growth allocation to the municipality is examined to see if it makes sense. If not, the municipality is asked what does make sense. They look at vacant land, zoning, planned development and infrastructure capacity.
- > The municipality's master plan is compared with the State Plan.
- > The municipality's planning capacity is examined. Does that municipality have the capacity to plan for growth?

Questions and Comments from the Public;

- \* The League of Women Voters of Northern Valley believes in the rational process of the State Plan, The plan should emphasize public transportation, especially the West Shore Railroad. NJDOT should restore rail service where there is sufficient travel density. The West Shore Railroad would help air quality.
- \* Has the County endorsed increased density in Bergen? The State Plan is focusing future development into areas that are already developed. All new population growth will come to Bergen County since Bergen is colored red on the Map.
- \* Land in Bergen County does not have the capacity for more growth. Development on flood plains is feared.
- \* As existing tiers take effect, the real estate market will change. Property owners will lose the value in lands which would have been developed under a trend scenario.
- \* We must be careful with transportation corridor development so that the corridor does not choke on traffic.
- \* We must look beyond state borders.
- \* If a community does not want to redevelop, does it have to?
- \* A councilman from Northvale was concerned about affordable housing. He felt that you don't necessarily help your community by not building affordable housing\*
- \* The rail line which parallels the West Shore Line is geared toward intra-County commuting.
- \* Small communities should be consolidated. Small communities are an inefficient structure. Has the State given any thought to this?
- \* Is there Legislative review of the final Plan?

In the Cross-Acceptance meetings, is one category of discussion an economic impact analysis?



Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Middlesex County Public Information Meeting  
Freeholders Chambers, Hew Brunswick  
Saturday, February 25, 1989  
Attendees: 40

The following is a brief summary of the Middlesex County State Plan Cross-Acceptance Public Information Meeting. Attached is a copy of the Agenda and the handouts given to the public.

After registration and a welcome by Middlesex County Officials to the approximately 40 people attending, State Planning Commissioner Candace Ashman emphasized 4 major items to be accomplished through the State plan: protection of the economy currently threatened by gridlock, revitalization of the cities to make them more attractive, protection of natural resources such as water, and conserving taxpayers money through more efficient and effective usage of facilities and resources. Commissioner Ashnum emphasized the Plan is not a Master Plan for zoning, but a Growth Management Plan that is looking for local input. She noted that this meeting was being held to talk about the process of the State Plan.

North Brunswick Mayor Paul Matarcera spoke about the relationship between the Middlesex County Growth Management planning process and the "Middlesex Acts on Growth" task force established by the County freeholders. This task force will become directly involved in the cross-acceptance process, and are concerned with how municipalities that border on other towns in other counties will communicate.

Assemblyman Frank Pelly (D-18) mentioned that he attended to listen to others present; yet he recognized that the Legislature, which created the State Planning Act, must follow through to make sure that it is implemented properly.

After Area Manager Jim Hsu gave a brief introduction of the Preliminary Plan, the slide show was presented.

Middlesex County Planning Director George Ververides then gave an overview of the County response to cross-acceptance, indicating the work program is approved by both the county and the State Planning Commission. Each municipality has named representatives, who have already met in earlier meetings. Staff procedures were outlined, with Assistant Planning Director Bill Kruse explained in greater detail the ~~pi-oyi-di~~ Middlesex County intends to use to participate in the cross-acceptance process.

A public comment/question & answer session followed, with attendees asked to identify themselves and inquire about the State Planning process.

questions involved population projections, mechanisms for effective planning (inclining funding), viability of urban strategy, infrastructure improvements, economic impact studies. Plan discrimination between the races, affordable housing, cost to implement the plan, educational funding, State Plan maps and other resources, citizen outreach and participation, time considerations, and effective implementation date of the Plan.

DRAFT

Comprehensive Planning Coals

For Middlesex

County

Prepared By  
Environmental and Growth Management Planning Division  
Middlesex County Planning Board  
February, 1989

(Condensed and Updated from Planning Coals and Policies of Middlesex County, 1979)

- Coal I - Provide an adequate housing stock to meet the needs of the residents of the County.
- Policy 1 \* Allow for development of new housing in types and at densities to serve all age and income groups in conjunction with the ability of the community to provide needed services and provide adequate environmental protection.
  - Policy 2 - Provide balanced housing stock in proximity to employment and transportation facilities.
  - Policy 3 - Rehabilitate or replace substandard housing.
  - Policy *U* - Provide for an adequate buffer between incompatible land uses and new and existing residential development.
- Coal II - Provide adequate facilities and open space to meet the recreation needs of the County's population, to preserve natural resources and to provide amenities and cultural activities.
- Policy 1 - Provide recreation facilities to meet needs of the population and emphasize multiple use projects.
  - Policy 2 - Encourage public access and environmental resource protection in waterfront areas.
  - Policy 3 \* Encourage development of, and services to, support a regional cultural center in New Brunswick.
  - Policy *>t* - Protect and preserve historic and unique structures and areas.
  - Policy 5 - Provide environmental design considerations in land use planning and development review.
- Coal III - Promote the use of public transit or alternatives to the reliance on the private automobile for work and other routine trips.
- iev 1 - Promote mixed use development at densities that allow public transit use

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

CROSS-ACCEPTANCE OBJECTIVES

1. AGREE ON A RESPONSE TO THE TIER DESIGNATIONS OF THE STATE PLAN.
2. AGREE ON POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS BY MUNICIPALITY THROUGH THE YEAR 2010.
3. AGREE ON A COORDINATED RESPONSE TO THE "REGIONAL DESIGN STRATEGY" OF THE STATE PLAN.

IDENTIFY CENTRAL CITIES, TOWNS, CORRIDOR CENTERS, VILLAGES, HAMLETS.

*ii.* AGREE ON AN INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ANALYSIS BASED UPON DESIRED POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS AND THE "REGIONAL DESIGN STRATEGY".

5\* COMPLETE A DETAILED COMPARISON OF STATE PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, POLICIES AND STANDARDS/GUIDELINES AGAINST COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL PLANS AND ORDINANCES.

COORDINATION WITH ONGOING AREA WIDE OR REGIONAL

PLANNING ACTIVITIES

1. MIDDLESEX ACTS ON GROWTH TASK FORCE/MIDDLESEX COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
PREPARATION OF A COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN
2. AREA WIDE WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS  
AQUIFER PROTECTION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (NJ.D.E.P./M.C.P.B.)
3. COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN (M.C.P.B.)
4. RARITAN BASIN WATER SUPPLY PLAN (NJ.D.E.P.)
3. NEW YORK/NEW JERSEY HARBOR ESTUARY PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN (N.J.D.E.P., N.Y.D.E.C., U.S.E.P.A.)

V3K/dpk

Preliminary state Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Atlantic County Informational Meeting

February 27, 1989

COMMISSIONER: Hon. M. R. Primes  
Larry Schmidt BEP

OSPt Michael Neuman  
Ton Dallessio  
pfii purdie

AUDIENCE: 40 +  
location; Atlantic County Library  
Mays landing

Presentations were made to explain the basis of the Preliminary State Plan and the nature of the cross-acceptance process. There was some difficulty experienced because of some confusion about the State planning process and the Pinelands process. In particular, at least two farmers with longstanding grievances against the Pinelands Commission continued to persist in making comments and asking questions about the State Plan's expected effects on land values.

There were also other questions asked during the meeting:

1. Is the State Planning Commission just an additional level of State bureaucracy?
2. How does the Pinelands region relate to cross-acceptance?
3. Will the legislature appropriate the funding to finance municipal costs associated with participating in cross-acceptance?
4. What is the State Planning Commission's position on the recently introduced Assembly Bill calling for the Economic Impact Assessment Bill?
5. How does the State Plan relate to the CAFRA region?
6. How might the State Plan relate to the proposed Coastal Commission?

There were also concerns expressed at the meeting about the extent to which New Jersey's EEP was committed to the coastal coordination process that was part of the State Planning Process. The County Planning Director responded to this concern by stating that he expected the Coastal Commission would incorporate the coastal policies and coastal tier designation developed during the cross-acceptance process.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Gloucester County informational Meeting Woodbury  
High School, Woodbury February 27, 1989 Attendees;  
150

Presenters: Jim Maguire, Center for Public Dispute Resolution, DPA  
John Maier, Freeholder Director Joseph Manganello, Jim  
Gilbert, SPC Chairman Eli Cooper, OSP Planning Manager  
Robert Scolpino, Planning Director, Gloucester County Chuck  
Rcmick, Assistant Planning Director, Gloucester County

Jim Maguire introduced himself and gave the background of the responsibilities of the Center for Public Dispute Resolution. He explained his role as facilitator for the meeting. He emphasized that the meeting was informational and not to be used as a time for testimony or decision-making. He listed major topics as: farm equity, tier-boundaries, local control, rateables, local input, unplanned growth and lack of time and funds.

John Maier made the opening remarks. He emphasized the importance of the Plan and how it would impact the future. He voiced concerns about the impact in Gloucester in the environment and quality of life and how it was important that the burden of the Plan not fall on the farmers. He also mentioned the concern over funding available for the Cross-Acceptance Process. He stated the county's willingness to participate in the program and stressed that the meeting was the time for individual input. He then introduced the freeholders in attendance.

Joseph Manganello, Freeholder in charge of the Planning Department in Gloucester, invited the residents of the county to take part in the State Plan. He stated how this could be the vehicle for them to paint the landscape for future generations. He asked that they look at all the issues and strive for a balance between the present and future, economic and ecological good, and organized or unorganized development. He asked that everyone participate in the Cross-Acceptance Process.

Jim Gilbert gave a brief history of planning in New Jersey and how the SPC came about. He described the role of the Commission and the process they were currently going through. He emphasized that Cross Acceptance was not mandatory and explained how the plan is aimed at formulating policies that would help state agencies in coordinating their planning activities. He mentioned the funding deficit we could expect before the end of the century in infrastructure costs if current trends continue. He reported that there was a bill before the Senate appropriating over \$7 million to aid communities participating in the Cross-Acceptance Process.

Eli Cooper gave a short presentation about what population growth might mean to Gloucester County and stated how the Plan puts forth a mechanism by which a balance can be sought.

Robert Scolpino, Gloucester County Planning Director, then mentioned that the county had brought hand-outs for those who were interested and stated that there were three major efforts that give direction to their planning: highway planning, sewer, and water supply. He emphasized the importance of looking at growth in relation to their neighbors and other municipalities. He went on to point out that there is a deficiency in local plans in that they are based on land use plans only and do not take into consideration mobility and people. He also pointed out the opportunity before them with the Cross-Acceptance Process.

Chuck Romick, Assistant Planning Director of Gloucester County, the final speaker, showed a timetable for reporting during the process and stated that the county was on a timely schedule. He added that they are anticipating holding other public meetings to discuss these reports with the municipalities. They have also set up six distinct regions within the county of similar tier designations. They will be holding regional public meetings also. The process, as they have designed, will provide a lot of opportunity for input.

meeting then proceeded with the question and answer period. Questions raised were primarily concerned with the equity compensation issue and farmland preservation.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Passaic County Informational Meeting  
Passaic County Administration Building, Paterson  
March 15, 1989  
Attendees: 40

State and County Participants;

Candace Ashman, State Planning Commission  
James Rogers, Director of Planning, Passaic County  
David Maski, Office of State Planning  
David Hojsak, Office of State Planning  
  
John Gilbert, Office of State Planning

Opening Remarks? James Rogers, Director of Planning, Passaic County.

State Plan Overview; Candace Ashmun, State Planning Commission.

mandate of the State Planning Commission is to get agreement between the three levels of government and the residents of New Jersey on how to get to the year 2010.

- \* The State Planning Act calls' for the development of a consensus between local, county and state governments.
- \* She PSDRP is a 3-volume discussion document for Cross-Acceptance. Volume 1 enumerates problems now encountered and presents a vision for the future. Volume 2 proposes policies on how we get to 2010 and achieve our vision. Volume 3 expands on policies in more<sup>1</sup>) detail.
- \* Cross-Acceptance calls for 6 months of comparison between maps, policies and regulations to determine where there are points of disagreement, this will be followed by months of negotiations . Sometime in 1990 the Commission will vote on the final SDRP.

State Plan Video; David Maski, Office of State Planning

- \* Hr. Maski also gave a brief overview of the Cross-Acceptance Process.

Passaic County Cross-Acceptance Overview; James Rogers  
Passaic County Planning  
Department

- \* Passaic County is committed to getting the job done. The County will be assisted by the Planning Association of North Jersey.
- \* Time will be set aside during the County's monthly planning board meetings to discuss the PSERP and Cross-Acceptance.



- \* Mr. Rogers has been meeting with public interest and business groups to discuss the State Plan.

#### meetings i

- \* Each municipal meeting will begin with a discussion of growth capacity. The County will ask each municipality if it wants to grow. If so, how will it grow, and who will pay for that growth\*
  - \* The County and the municipalities will review the tier lines and make adjustments if necessary.
  - \* Corridor centers will be identified by the County and the municipalities .
  - \* The County and the municipalities will identify issues that they expect to face 10-15 years from now.
  - \* The checklists for plan comparison will be filled out during these meetings.
- \* The Cross-Acceptance Report will be generated at the County level. A Draft Report will be sent to the municipalities for content before a Final Report is sent to the Office of State Planning.

#### Questions and Comments from the Publics

- \* Can the State Planning Commission send a resolution to the municipalities instructing them not to base development decisions on the Preliminary Plan?
- \* What are the provisions for changes once the Plan is adopted? If you want to build a shopping center, must you wait 3 years until the Plan is revised?
- \* Is the State Plan just a guideline?
- \* If a town does not agree with the State Plan, will the State withdraw municipal aid, including intergovernmental aid?
- \* What if the State refuses permits (in reference to the Zimcner Bill)?
- \* Are there any plans for the State to give money to towns that agree with the State Plan to bring their infrastructure up to par?
- \* One can understand the rebuilding of the cities, but will other, less dense, communities get State funding?

- \* How much State money does Passaic County get, and will Cross-Acceptance cost more than that?
- \* If a municipality is one of the first in the County to go through Cross-Acceptance, is there a provision for revision later in the process?
- \* How does Cross-Acceptance and the State Plan affect the tax rate? Will a municipality have to fit it into its tax structure? Who funds it, state, county or locals?
- \* What is the basis for tier designation? Factor maps are critical. Sewer information is questionable.
- \* There is a discrepancy between Volumes 2 and 3 regarding steep slopes. Is it 12% or 15%?
- \* Will Cross-Acceptance be extended to 18 months?
- \* Municipalities can agree with the PSDRP in theory, but many municipal plans do not address the details. The PSERP is pretty much what the Final SERP will be.
- \* Are the Cross-Acceptance meetings open to the public?

In addition to the above questions and contents, a realtor provided a set of prepared written questions (attached) for the State Planning Commission to consider.

01<sup>s</sup>-QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRELIMINARY STATE DEVELOPMENT

& REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

\* \* \*

1. How much will it cost to implement this plan?
2. Where will we get this money?
3. How will this plan affect our municipal, county and state tax rates?
4. How will this plan affect the cost of housing?
5. Will businesses locate or expand in New Jersey if it becomes more expensive to operate here?
6. How does this plan assure that New Jersey residents, at all income levels, will have freedom of choice for housing and job opportunities?
7. What tools are needed to fully implement this plan?
8. Why hasn't an infrastructure needs assessment, as required by the State Planning Act, been prepared as part of this state plan?
9. What level of growth and proposed densities are municipalities being asked to cross-accept in this plan?
10. How many hamlets, villages and corridor centers need to be designated to accommodate our projected population growth under this plan?
11. How does this plan propose to overcome existing constraints to its full implementation?
12. What state sanctions can be taken against municipalities which decide not to come into conformance with this plan?
13. If a municipality is not in conformance with this plan, will private and public projects otherwise approved by the town receive needed state permits?
14. What are the long-term local costs of supplying information for plan monitoring and three-year cross-acceptance reviews?
15. If a municipality, which amends its master plan and ordinances to be compatible with the state plan, is sued over the validity of state plan provisions, will the State Planning Commission assume the cost of the litigation and any ensuing liability?

January 27, 1988 QUESTIONS ON STATE PLAN

POLICY QUESTIONS

(1) Do you think the «tat« is reasonable in lt» refusal to use its budget surplus for infrastructure, housing and urban needs?

(2) Do you think there is a significant risk that economic development will skip over Hew Jersey rather than accept the\* constraint\* of this plan? Can it kill the goose that lays the golden eggs?

• (3) Do you think this "push down - pop up" theory of growth management can work at a state level?

(4) How will you at the county (or municipal) level be able to fully participate in cross-acceptance given the deficiencies In plan data, projections, needs analyses, alternatives, costs and Impacts?

(5) To what extent will land-owners be compensated for value reductions to their property due to the plan or its implementation?

(6) What Inducements does the plan offer to encourage private sector pursuit of Its objectives?

(7) Can a mapped tier plan resolve all of the questions It raises, or are the conflicts too intense? ,

(8) Do you think elected representatives should have more »ay in the adoption of a state plan?

HOUSING NEED

**Based on the projected population increase, demographic changes, and housing units that will be removed from the housing stock:**

(1) Row many new housing units will be required in New Jersey by 2010? Row is that distributed ever time (e.g., in five year Increments)? .

. (2) How does this breakdown into housing need by various categories?

Single person households,  
Young married households,  
Families with children,  
Single parent households,  
Empty nesters,\*  
Senior citizens,

(Does the plan consider the rapidly increasing housing

draft• it is not possible to estimate the ratio.)

(2) What are the proposals in the plan to decrease the current imbalance between the numbers of jobs and households within designated regions?

(3) If the plan is successfully implemented, how will these ratios change?

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

(1) What analysis is being done of current and projected infrastructure capacity and needs? Analyses released to date are very incomplete.

(2) What are the Infrastructure financing needs and how will they be met?

(3) What Is the extent of existing available and uncommitted capacity for sewer systems which meet water quality standards?

(4) The plan limits growth areas to areas that have existing and proposed sewer systems. Why can we not plan for an extension of those systems before 2010?

#### TAXES

(1) What will be the property tax impact on municipalities by tier? Is it differentiated, for example growth vs. no-growth tier?

#### IMPLEMENTATION

(1) If a municipality chooses not to be in conformance with the state plan and allows growth in a state designated limited growth area\* will state agencies issue required permits?

i

(2) If a municipality does adopt plans and regulations in conformance with the state plan, but then approves a variance which is not in conformance with the plan, what actions would be required at the state level?

(3) What changes are needed (or proposed) in the State Planning Act to effectuate the proposed draft?

What ether statutes and administrative rules will have to be modified and in what ways in order to Implement the plan?

(5) If. in cross-acceptance, communities suggest substantial revisions in the plan, or refuse to accept the Commission's vision of the future, can the plan be implemented piecemeal or partially? If so, what will be the impacts? '

A. Is infrastructure, (water, sewer, transportation systems) adequate In your particular situation?

B. If not, what improvements are required?

8\* Can the urban revitalization strategies in the state plan work without property tax reform and the provision of a new tax source for county and municipal government?

**9\* Other than a statement that the state support\* urban revitalization, what new tools does this state plan give you to make revitalization a reality?**

10, To what extent Is redevelopment of your community hindered by ECRA delays?

QUESTIONS OK STATE PLAN

TIER 3

1. **The \*state plan suggests that the state and municipalities implement a large number of programs and actions to encourage redevelopment of your town, but the plan addresses neither costs nor funding.**
  - A. Does the municipality have the resources to implement additional municipal redevelopment programs?
  - B. How much additional funding will be required?
  - C. - Are local officials willing to raise taxes to pay for the plan\*a efforts?
2.
  - A. To what extent do you think that a perceived poorer quality educational systems in rural towns has hindered redevelopment? •
  - B. What would be required to correct these perceived educational deficiencies?
3. There are many business organizations in New Jersey that are concerned that this plan can have very negative impacts on the overall economic condition of the state. If they are correct and economic development is stifled in vast areas of the state, do you think that redevelopment efforts will be successful in your area?
4. When redevelopment efforts are successful\* one -unfortunate and unintended consequence is displacement which occurs when low Income families can no longer afford to live in an area of increasing property values and rents. This plan does not address displacement.
  - A. What resources or programs are required to address this concern?
5. The state plan assumes that in most instances infrastructure la in place and adequate to serve redevelopment» infill development and new fringe development needs.
  - A. la infrastructure, (water\* aeever, transportation systems) adequate in your particular situation?  
«i \_
  - B. If not, what improvements are required?
6. After 1993 the Council of Affordable Housing will be required to use .the state plan to assign low and moderate income housing obligations. Only growth areas as defined by the plan will have an obligation for other then indigenous poor.
  - A. To what extant are you willing to assume the low and moderate

QUESTIONS ON STATE PLAN

TIER 4

1. **As a tier 4 area, you are to absorb most of the growth and development which is to occur in the state for the next 20 years.**
  - A. **To what extent are you willing to assume this responsibility?**
  - B. Have you planned your Infrastructure\* public facilities\* schools\* etc. to accommodate accelerated growth? Are there ways in which we, in the building community, can work with you to begin to plan expanded support systems?
2. The-state plan does not-indicate the costs of this policy for your area.
  - A. To what extent do you think you will have to absorb increased local costs?
3. To what extent is your infrastructure adequate to support concentrated development?
4. Growth areas are to be limited to those areas that are already developing.
  - A. Do you think this policy will exacerbate problems you are already experiencing, especially due to the unwillingness of the state to use its budget surplus to fund infrastructure improvements and state mandated programs? .
5. How much vacant developable and uncommitted land is available in your area? Do you consider your community (county) close to built out based on approved development applications?
6. After 1993 the Council of Affordable Housing will be required to use the state plan to assign low and moderate income housing obligations. Only growth areas as defined by the plan will have an obligation for other than indigenous poor. To what extent is your community willing to absorb a greater proportion of the region's low and moderate income housing needs?
7. The state plan has a very limited housing strategy relating strictly to the acceptance of Council On Affordable Housing numbers through 1993. To what extent is lack of affordable housing including middle income housing\* a problem in your community?
8. Many major employers in the state are having difficulty in hiring employees due to the unavailability of housing affordable to the average working household.
  - A. Is this employee shortage affecting your area?
  - B. **Do you think the plan responds to this problem?**



QUESTIONS ON STATE PLAN

TIER 6

1. As a limited growth tier you will only qualify for state capital expenditures of a "health, safety, welfare" nature.
  - A. So you expect that you will be denied needed public funding Because of this policy?
2. Does this plan limit your ability to plan for your community's needs?

>
3. Does this plan allow you to balance residential and nonresidential needs for your community?
  - A. ' Do you intend to designate a corridor center(s) within your community?
5. This plan establishes a gross density of one house per twenty acres.
  - A. Are you concerned about compensation for landowners?
  - B. How much do you think compensation would cost?
  - C. If you Implement this plan as proposed\* are you concerned that you could be involved in "taking" litigation?
6.
  - A. Due to the decreased development potential of vacant land, do you expect the 'assessed value of this property to be reduced?
  - B. To what extent will this limit your ability to maintain services? (trash, police, etc.)
7. The plan suggests that small settlements in rural areas be designated as villages.
  - A. Do you have villages to be Identified?
  - B. Can they accommodate any significant development?
8. Many major employers in the state are having difficulty in hiring employees due to the unavailability of housing affordable to the average working household.
  - A. Zs thia employee shortage affecting your area?
  - B. Do you think the plan responds to this problem?
- 9\* The state plan has a very limited housing strategy relating •strictly to\* the acceptance of Council On Affordable Housing numbers through 1993. To what extent is leek of affordable housing, including middle Income housing a problem In your community?

QUESTIONS ON STATE PLAN

TIER 7

1. **As a limited growth tier you will only qualify for state capital expenditures of a "health, safety, welfare" nature.**
  - \* A. Do you expect that you will be denied needed public funding because of this policy?
2. Does this plan limit your ability to plan for your community's - needs?
- 3\* Does this plan allow you to balance residential and nonresidential needs for your community?
  - A. The plan suggests that small settlements in rural areas be designated as villages.
    - A. Do you have villages to be identified?
    - B. Can they accommodate any significant development?
5. This plan establishes a gross density of one house per twenty acres.
  - A. -Are you concerned about compensation for landowners?
  - B. How much do you think compensation would cost?
  - C. If you implement this plan as proposed, are you concerned that you could be involved in "taking" litigation?
6. A. Due to the decreased development potential of vacant land, do you expect the assessed value of this property to be reduced?
  - B. To what extent will this limit your ability to maintain services? (trash, police, etc.)
7. **Many major employers in the state are Having difficulty in hiring employees due to the unavailability of housing affordable to the average working household.**
  - A. Is this employee shortage affecting your area?
  - B. Do you think the plan responds to this problem?
8. The state plan has a very limited housing strategy relating strictly to the acceptance of Council On Affordable Housing numbers through 1993. To what extent is lack of affordable housing, including middle income housing a problem In your community?
- 9\* Is there a need for housing, other than single family detached in your community?

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Cumberland County Informational Meeting FEBRUARY  
28, 1989

CCHHISICNER: Jay Cranmer  
PUBLIC ADVOCATE: Jam IfcGuire  
AUDIENCE: 100 plus  
Location: Cumberland County College  
Vineland

OSP: Michael Neuman  
Bill Purdie  
Beth Guididas

Cumberland County Planning Staff was extremely well-prepared for this well-attended meeting. Members of the freeholder Board and Planning Board were in attendance. An information room was opened 1 1/2 hours before the scheduled meeting for informal discussion and was kept open during the meeting.

moderator was assisted by his two associates from the Center for Public Dispute Resolution within the New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate.

A positive tone was set by statements made by the moderator, Freeholder Director, Planning Board Chair , and County Planning Board Director. All urged municipalities to be actively involved and offer constructive suggestions to the State through the county during the cross-acceptance process.

After presentations by Commissioner Cranmer and State and county staffs, the question period followed. Of greatest concern were issues related to agriculture, in particular, the issue of the impact of the Plan on land values and relatedly on farmland tax assessments.. Other questions focused on the implementation of the Plan. Skepticism was expressed about the State's ability to coordinate planning activities. At the same time, there was fear of the loss of State funding with the implementation of the Plan with respect to municipalities which were incompatible with its opals, objectives, strategies and policies.

After the close of the formal meeting a number of people remained to discuss agricultural issues in greater detail.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Burlington County Informational Meeting  
Freeholders Board Room, Mt. Holly  
March 1, 1989  
Attendees: 100

The following is a summary of the presentations, questions, comments and responses from the Burlington County Informational Meeting.

Opening Presentations

State Planning Commissioner, Jay Cranmer began by emphasizing his commitment to the need for a rational planning process and a comprehensive State Plan which deals with growth management. His perspective as a builder/developer in New Jersey reinforced his belief that such a plan was essential and that it would sustain and encourage economic growth as well as preserve natural resources. Mr Cranmer discussed the fact that housing costs were too expensive and that there was a great need to provide a variety of housing choices. He outlined conditions in New Jersey which indicate the need for statewide growth management such as declining urban centers, declining older suburbs, the need to re-establish a sense of community, the costs of providing new infrastructure and the present patterns of continuing suburban sprawl. Overall, he stressed the need to re-assess how planners plan, and the need for the private sector, counties, municipalities and the State to work together. Mr. Cranmer emphasized that the process needs to maintain "openness" (e.g., the need for public participation), "balance" (e.g., the need to weigh the public/private costs - the need to allow space for farmers as well as builders) , and "responsibility" (the formulation of a State Plan is a legislative mandate) . He also touched on the following points;

- equity issues must still be addressed
- tier boundaries are open to input/changes from the municipalities
- local planning control would continue under the guidance of the State Plan
- rateables issue is important (Sl&RP Commission report offered valid recommendations)
- need to provide more funding for the cross-acceptance process (pending legislation and need to encourage their passage)
- stressed the time frame of cross-acceptance (i.e., the process of comparison, negotiating and resolution will take approximately 12 to 18 months)

Eli Cooper, Area Manager from the Office of State Planning, discussed the overall planning process. Because the slide show was not able to be shown/ Mr. Cooper gave a thorough overview of Volumes I, II and III. Briefly, he reviewed the issues, problems and trends in New Jersey which have led to a recognition of the need for an overall coordinated, comprehensive plan (e.g., traffic congestion, lack of affordable housing,

compromising the environment, commitment to support agricultural economy, need to protect natural resources of State) . The plan as a "vision" was outlined as was the New Jersey Growth Management system; more specifically, the Tier System, the Regional Design System, Statewide Strategies, Monitoring and Evaluation, and the Cross-Acceptance process.

Grund from the Burlington County Planning Office explained the role of the municipalities in the cross-acceptance process and reviewed the municipal regional groupings for the county.

A request was made by the Moderator to the audience to voice their support to the state legislature for the "cross-acceptance time extension bill" and the "cross-acceptance funding bills."

### Question and Answer Session

format for this portion of the meeting was as follows; three questions were posed in succession by members of the audience and then responses, in turn, were given by members of the panel.

The questions, generally, dealt with the following issues:

tax reform- Because of the existing ratable chase and the dependence on the property tax, does the Plan deal with the need for tax reform. . .

tier 5- If a developer constructs his/her own sewer and waterlines on property located in tier 5, can he/her then develop this land. . .

unclear tier delineation Specific tier designations were questioned, especially those in tiers 4, 5 and 6...

equity issue- Does the Plan deal with the need for a guaranteed equity program as a statewide responsibility. . .

transportation Does the Plan address the need for a commitment from DOT to improve roads in areas designated for development (e.g., route 73)

housing costs- The inflationary nature of the Plan re: housing was questioned. (The response emphasized the fact that the Plan ensures predictability which, unlike speculation, is not inflationary. )

conformance of local master plans- If a municipality is in the process of revising its master plan, how closely should it conform with the guidelines and standards in the Plan. . .

Plan revision- Is the ability to modify decisions according to updated data being built into the Plan. . .

legality of Plan- What is the legal or binding effect of the Plan on municipalities...

economic impact assessment- What is the status of the economic impact assessment of the Plan? Was it/ In fact, negative? Who is responsible for doing it...

regional variables- Are the needs of North Jersey similar to the needs of South Jersey, and how is this addressed in the Plan...

ocean pollution- How does the Plan deal with ocean dumping and the problems facing the Jersey shore...

cross-acceptance funding- What is the status of cross-acceptance funding...

development in tier 5- Are there any assurances being given to developers if they own land in tier 5 and anticipate building there...

density BtndflTds- Does the Plan require municipalities to increase density standards"

sanctions re; non-conformance- What sanctions will the State take against municipalities that do not wish to conform...

Shinn's Bill- Does the State Planning Commission support Assemblyman Shinn's Bill re; "the extension of the first phase of the "comparison" process...

county role- Why isn't the county more active in this cross-acceptance process.. .What exactly is the role of the county...

density and zoning issues- The commission was asked to consider a statewide reduction in open space requirements and to consider higher density standards and zoning for employment along 1-295...

tier 1- Cities are already over-crowded. Why direct growth there when the infrastructure is already over-burdened and decaying...

development in low growth tiers- Are there any grandfathering clauses for proposed developments in low growth tiers...

criteria used in tier delineations- Were tier delineations formulated with a recognition of the quality and age of existing infrastructure... (i.e. infrastructure which exists in urban areas)

Preliminary Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Hudson County Informational Meeting March 1,  
1989

LOCATION; Old Hudson County Court House, Jersey City

Attendees; 50

ATTENDEES;

Leonard Lieberman, State Planning Commission  
Lona Mayer, Director, Hudson County Department of Planning and Economic  
Development  
Himanshu Shuklah, Chairman, Hudson County Planning Board  
David Maski, Office of State Planning David Hojsak, Office  
of State Planning Thomas Dallessio, Office of State  
Planning

WELCOMING REMARKS AND MODERATION; Himanshu Shuklah, Hudson County P.B.

OVERVIEW OF STATE PLAN; Leonard Lieberman, State Planning Commission

- \* Three points about the State Planning Process:
  1. OPENNESS. The State Planning Process is unusually open. The Plan is only a preliminary plan. The Public is invited to help shape the Final Plan.
  2. BALANCE. The Plan must balance public and, private interests. Costs must be shared equitably. Short-term considerations must be weighed against long-term considerations.
  3. RESPONSIBILITY. The State Planning Commission takes its responsibility seriously.

STATE PLAN VIDEO; David Maski, Office of State Planning

- \* Mr. Maski also gave a brief overview of the Cross-Acceptance Process.

HUDSON COUNTY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE OVERVIEW; Lona Mayer, Hudson County Department  
of Planning and Economic Development

- \* Cross-Acceptance is a dialog with the product being a report that has substantial input by the municipalities and the public.
- \* Steps Hudson County is taking:

1. Develop a Work Program to be submitted to the State Planning Commission.
  2. Letters sent to mayors requesting municipal Cross-Acceptance representatives.
  3. Public Information Program. Groups have been identified and a mailing list has been completed.
  4. Technical assistance provided by the Office of State Planning will be requested.
  5. Hudson County will develop its own Master Plan at the same time.
  6. There will be a dialog with the municipalities.
  7. The Draft Cross-Acceptance Report will be reviewed by the County Freeholders.
- \* Hudson County will try to complete the Comparison phase of Cross-Acceptance in six months.

Himanshu Shuklah, Hudson County Planning Board

- \* The Planning Board is the negotiating entity for Hudson County.
- \* Legislation will be needed to redirect State infrastructure funding to the cities.
- \* Cross-Acceptance is a potentially positive procedure to provide recommendations to the State Planning Commission. '

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC;

- \* A Secaucus councilman complained about the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission (HMDC). Secaucus has lost home rule. He has lost faith in the State Planning Commission because it is similar to the HMDC.
- \* Does the State Planning Commission's authority supersede municipal zoning authority?
- \* A North Bergen Planning Board member would like to see the HMDC abolished. Are we here to establish a toothless tiger? Is the SPC authority over funding?
- \* The State is encouraging development in Tier 1. Infrastructure is overburdened and the State isn't building more. If the State is encouraging more development, who absorbs the cost? Will the SERP



lead to revenue sharing? Nothing is shown here as to where the money is coming from to go through the planning process.

- \* How were the tier designations made? Why wasn't there overt County participation in tier delineations beforehand?
- \* A woman from Weehawken expressed concern about levels of development and the environment. Some areas of Hudson should be in Tier 1, but North Hudson should not be. The preservation of the Palisades is important. Consider the Palisades as Tier 7.
- \* A woman from Hoboken said that there is a perception of dumping growth in the cities. She thinks that this is a wonderful opportunity to participate and to have input to the process. She complained that the public meeting announcement did not get out in a timely fashion to community organizations.
- \* There was a suggestion that planning issues be taken up in a public relations campaign. Municipalities and the State need to meet with community organizations.
- \* How does housing become available and affordable?
- \* We need more "nuts and bolts" of "The Vision". How do you project housing and local increases in employment? How is employment going to be increased?
- \* What is the timeline for Plan implementation? There are upcoming Waterfront development issues. Large transportation projects are on line. Should we hold off on these until the Final Plan comes out?
- \* Assemblyman Joseph Charles from Jersey City stated that he likes the work of the State Planning Commission. The Plan will benefit areas like Hudson County. Opponents of the Plan say that it will hinder development. One of the criticisms of the Plan is that there has been no economic impact study.
- \* Regarding "The Vision" of the Plan, what do you see happening? Is new legislation needed for "teeth"? Is one of the primary Plan implementation tools the State's reaction to funding requests? Will county and municipal master plans conform to the SERF?
- \* There is a citizen initiative in Hoboken to save publicly-owned land from development and use it for open space. Could there be funding for an open space initiative? There is a fear of overcrowding.
- \* Is there any thought in Cross-Acceptance on how zoning ordinances would be changed?

Would the county master plan supersede the municipal master plan?  
All municipal planning boards should meet with the county planning board at the same time so that everybody knows everybody else's problems and issues.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Sussex County Informational Meeting  
Sussex County Community College, Sparta  
March 1, 1989  
Attendees: 200

Sussex County Informational meeting was held at the Sussex County Community College Theatre in Sparta on March 1, 1989 at 7\*30 P.M under the auspices of the Hew Jersey State Planning Commission and the Sussex County Planning Department. Robert Kull, Area Planning Manager, and Martin Bierbaum, Assistant Director, represented the Office of State Planning. Terri Schick assisted. James Gilbert, Chairman of the State Planning Commission and Julie Gandy, Vice-Chair of the Commission also served on the panel. Jack Bolger, Sussex County Planning Board Chairman, acted as the panel moderator. Fred Suljic, Director of the Planning Board also participated. Freeholders Victor Morrata and Joseph Del Bogno rounded out the panel.

Opening remarks centered upon the cross-acceptance process. Julie Gandy emphasized her experience as a municipal official and her role in communicating local concerns to the Commission. She also spoke on the model resolution authorizing the participation of the county in the cross-acceptance process. Jim Gilbert stressed the concept of quality during the cross-acceptance process rather than inflexible time schedules. During his review of the Sussex County cross-acceptance process, Fred Suljic explained that Sussex County had divided the county into four regions and indicated that each area would participate consecutively rather than simultaneously in the process. Under this arrangement, he indicated that the six-month time limit for the phase-1 comparison phase of cross-acceptance could not be met. A visual presentation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan and the cross-acceptance process was given. A question and answer period followed.

Although over 50 questions were submitted by the audience in both •written and oral form, only approximately 20 questions were answered by the panel members due to time constraints. All unanswered questions were forwarded to the County Planning Board for further consideration. Major concerns centered upon the effect of the Plan on land values, free market practice, future state expenditures in Sussex, permitting process in zones in nonconformance with the Plan, legislative review, possibility of sacrifices in rural areas for the benefit of developed areas, the validity of dissenting plans, and a lack of county input and control in the state planning process both before and during the cross-acceptance process.

In response to the questions, panel members emphasized the on-going nature of the cross-acceptance process and the solicitation of recommendations for specific mechanisms for issue resolution. In addition, the Commission's sensitivity to major concerns was substantiated by the attempts to address the issues in the various drafts of the Plan. It was pointed out that the regional design system allows both economic and population growth throughout the state, without the sprawl that had previously evolved. In fact, 30% to 40% of the anticipated growth in the state is targeted to rural areas. The land equity issue was acknowledged and the specific mechanisms that could alleviate the problem, such as purchase easements, purchase-of-development rights, transfer-of-development rights and rural cooperatives, were mentioned. It was reiterated that the objectives of the Plan were to retain farming as a viable occupation and to minimize conflicts between development and farming.

The audience was informed that the Plan was not a zoning ordinance and it did not call for 20-acre zoning. The State Plan coordinates between state departments and focuses upon a consistent regulatory and spending program. The planning process relies upon local input. In addition, a key component of the Plan was the on-going monitoring of the process. Revisions must be formalized every three years. Consequently, the Commission is not a super-agency without the checks and balances that are incumbent upon all levels of government. The State Planning Commission and the Office of State Planning will negotiate in good faith to ensure that the planning process is a "reach-out effort" for all to work together to manage and direct growth. Dissenting reports will be given serious consideration. If alternative systems to the tier concept such as variable density or constraint systems are different but compatible, they may be acceptable. In fact, Volume III of the Plan mentions constraint planning and as the capacities of the areas to be developed evolve, this information will be considered. It was agreed upon by all panel members that public participation in the planning process is encouraged at all levels.

A list of all questions submitted during the meeting is attached.

## STATE DEVELOPMENT &amp; REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING - March 1, 1989

## Questions/comments from the floor:

1. How will this State Plan benefit Urge property and farmland owners?
- S. Could we have a show of hands as to the number of people who depend on agriculture as their primary source of income.
- "3. Will the state compensate landowners when their property value is reduced as a result of the master plan?
- A. How do you plan on compensating the farmer for land that has been down zoned and becomes less valuable?
5. Most farmland falls into tier 6A & 6B. What provisions have you made to compensate the farmer for the decrease in land values in these areas?
6. Why should farmers be made to give up their only hope for retirement?
7. If you are presently a large land owner, such as a farm owner, how will this plan affect the market value of your property? Also, how will this plan affect your property taxes?
8. If a farmer sells the development rights to his land, what law protects the farmer from full taxation of his property if he becomes ill and can no longer do farming, thus causing him to lose farmland assessment?
9. How can the cross-acceptance meetings be closed without violating the Sunshine Law? If these meetings are closed how is public being "encouraged to participate" ?
10. What will the Plan do about heavy traffic on Route 66 due to development in Pike County, Pa. and traffic on Route 53 due to development in Orange County and Sullivan County, New York State?
11. How does the State intend to implement and enforce "The Plan"? Who (state, county or municipality) resolves exceptions? What happens (in terms of planning) during this State planning study; especially in ecologically sensitive areas?
- IS. - What happens to a municipality that votes against the Plan?
13. Why does Sussex County have to pay the price in lost funds (roads, sewage, etc.) so the inner city areas can have the funds they need?
14. In the new Plan, is provision made to allow establishing a "senior citizen" hamlet if a group of seniors or a builder would like to build one?

15. Can a citizen (individual) approach the State board if they feel that their local public officials development goals do not reflect the goals of the general community?
16. What will happen between now and whenever the finalized State Plan is ratified concerning building & development? Will it become a free for all to beat a certain deadline?
17. Since your Plan classifies most of Sussex as tier 4.5, most people will commute. How does this plan address the severe need for highway improvements of the commuter, ie. Route 13?
18. Will the Plan affect funding for infrastructure and administrative determinations such as amending "201" and "SOB" Plans? Isn't it true that the present plan for Sussex County will adversely affect infrastructure development within the County, which is already lacking to support past growth?
19. To meet density targets will require significant re-zoning many areas. Many landowners may charge that by re-zoning, their land has been "confiscated" \* who will pay?
20. John Warren. Vernon Township Committee - in designating Sussex County a limited growth area & thus redirecting much needed funds to develop our infrastructure to the inner city areas, what consideration was given to the fact that we border Orange County, N.J., N.Y. is the fastest growing County & Pike County is one of Pennsylvania's fastest growing Counties, and the impact their rapid growth has on the adjoining communities in Sussex County. Certainly their growth will have a significant effect on our infrastructure as a pass through County to the N.Y. metropolitan area despite N.J.'s high tier designation of Sussex County.
21. One of the problems we have with the cross-acceptance process is the credibility of State in their negotiating in good faith. One example of this is the fact that we submitted proposed changes after we received our tier maps last year. The new tier maps seem to have ignored the new data that we presented. Is this indicative of how the State is going to listen to us in the future or are we being asked to participate in an exercise in futility. Also, are the towns going to get any dollars for this, process?
22. Why wasn't Sussex County represented in the process which generated the "Draft" Plan?
23. One acre lots were considered discriminatory before, why isn't \* 20 acre building lot discriminating now?
24. If towns do not zone in Accordance with the State Plan will the State Planning Commission object to the issuance of permits at D.O.T. & D.E.P., etc. and prohibit the issuance of State permits for development?

- £5. The Development and Redevelopment Plan seems to be contrary to the basic American right of free market practice. How can Me both preserve the right of free market practice while simultaneously carry out the intent of the Plan?
26. It seems the plan assumes people want to live in cities and urban areas. What is the basis for this assumption?
57. While the Plan's objective to keep Sussex County rural will it not hamper our ability to provide improvement already needed? If the plan is to preclude further major development in Sussex County ' does it not hamper bringing in rateables other than single family homes?
- £8. If the Plan is implemented with the severe restrictions of State funds for infrastructure for B.C. how will the County meet the needs of the 60X of our residents who now commute out of County, the increasing commuters through the County from Pa. and the increasing numbers of tourists drawn to the developing Water Gap Recreational Area? If there is to be a genuine dialogue between the "planners" and the "planees", why do you require written questions rather than verbal questions & answers?
- £9. How do you feel about the sale of development rights?
- 3u. Has anyone thought about setting up a fund to buy development rights?
31. If the State spends less to fund road improvement will that not burden S.C. taxpayers even more! If tax base cannot grow to spread the cost of services won't the Plan result in the citizens of S.C. having to sell and leave?
- 3f?. Will County tax dollars (County Revenues) be drawn out of the County to support urban redevelopment?
33. Will the State of local plans include provision for reimbursing property owners who have lost considerable development value under the *master plan*?
34. What can be done to curb "panic development" (quickly approved, poorly reviewed buildings) taking place to allow as much development as possible, before implementation of the plan for the sake fcf building tax rolls?
35. How will property owners in upper tier (low growth) areas be compensated for the loss in property-value, which is bound to , • happen when development is restricted and discouraged?
36. What does the Economic Impact Statement say will happen to property values of large land tracts in upper tier (low growth) areas?

37. My wife & I bought 4E acres, built a home, figuring we could sell off lots in our old age if we desired. How would new Plan affect our ability to do this?
38. How &, when are you going to cav the landowner for lost value to his land?
39. What has been considered as economical adjustments for loss or gains in property values to current land owners?
40. Is there an economic impact statement on the effects this Plan will have on the State & local communities? If there is one, what does it say? If there isn't one, how can decisions be made?
41. If the Commission is certain that the State Plan is beneficial for our State, why is there a fear of an economic impact study of its effects? Why not openly support such a study?
42. What was the State Planning Department Budget in 19B7? What do you plan it to be in 199£?
43. The County & State have different figures on the current County population - what if the County or town determine growth should exceed the State preferred plan?
44. I have heard statements tonight that areas below tier 3 or 4 will be allowed to develop^, but only after essential infrastructures are planned. I have also heard statements of the value of these areas in terms of natural resource protection and open space; values which accrue to residents of tier 1, 5 and 3 as much as to local residents. !f a community commits to development of infrastructure will economic development still be restricted in the interest of the State in general?
45. Where will the "affordable housing" be? How will it be "affordable"? Will it be subsidized & if so, how will it be subsidized (by tier tax)?
43. As a resident of Sussex County I .have many concerns. As a banker I also have some concerns. 1) we have financed large sums of dollars for residential development - what happens to our collateral value for acreage not yet approved for major sub division - when what was to be a 100 lot sub-division is now a £5 lot sub-division - will this property be grandfathered even though approval has not been granted? S) Our future growth (my bank) is predicated upon future growth of the County. With housing restrictions, this could prove to be a detriment to future growth of the County. What will happen to all Sussex County businesses that are relying on expected population growth to prosper? Will the proposed Plan hinder growth or enhance growth?
44. Why does the economic growth and development of the rural counties have to be sacrificed to regenerate decaying urban centers?



45. If growth is restricted in S.C. how are we to expand the tax base to support the increasing costs of services? Even in no growth areas costs will increase for existing services, how will those increase be funded? How are residents to be compensated for diminished value of their property which will result from development restrictions?
46. What enforcement ability will the State have once the Plan is accepted?
47. Will our legislators have the right to vote in the completed Plan before it is adopted?  
• \*
48. Is the State funding the costs of cross-acceptance to the municipalities and County?
49. William Lasinski. Hardy ton Council - It's my understanding that when the filtration plant on Rt S3 by Smoke Rise is finished, Newark is going to sell off watershed land - why will this be permitted?? this is already semi public land & comparable to green acres.
50. Can we really afford the delays if we extend the Cross-Acceptance process for a year?
51. How can average citizens support State Master Plan? Would it be possible to put a referendum question on the ballot to see if the State Plan is supported or not? (question should be un-watered down version of plan)
52. Has the County Master Plan been compared to the State Plan tier designation areas and is a report of such comparison available to the public?
53. The quality of the recently released tier maps is poor, there are not as many tier numbers on them and it is difficult to judge in some areas what actually is the tier. Can something be done to clear up the confusion? Is the County Planning Department empowered to say what tier a given area is?

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Somerset County Public Information Meeting Somerset  
County Vocational Technical School, Bridgewater Ofcursday,  
March 2, 1989 Attendees: 90

following is a brief summary of the Somerset County State Plan Cross-Acceptance Public Information Meeting. Attached is a copy of the Agenda and the handout given to the public.

After registration and a welcome by Somerset County Officials to the approximately 90 people attending, Candy Ashman encouraged the audience to participate in the process of cross-acceptance.

Jim Hsu then gave a brief introduction of the Preliminary Plan; the slide show presentation followed.

Somerset County Deputy Planning Director Patricia Clark then gave an overview of the County response to cross-acceptance, indicating the woriqarogram is in the process of being approved by both the county and the State Planning Commission. Each municipality is naming representatives, who will be meeting with County officials throughout the cross-acceptance process. Staff procedures were outlined, with Ms. Clark explaining in detail the program Somerset County intends to use to participate in the cross-acceptance process.

A public comment/question & answer session followed, with attendees asked to identify themselves and inquire about the State Planning process.

The questions involved open space, Mt. Laurel housing, growth restrictions /moratoria, negotiation phase of cross-acceptance, planning assistance/funding, property tax reform, transfer of development rights (LERs), need for Plan data, cost of the Plan, traffic congestion, county citizens advisory committee, State permit process, Tier 7 criteria, affordable housing, State building regulations (i.e., along steep slopes, flood plains, etc.), increased densities in urban areas, Plan targets, economic analysis of Plan, and the Plan's effect on property taxes.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Ocean County Informational Meeting

MARCH 7, 1989

location; Ocean County  
Administration Building,  
Tons River

CCMKtSSICriER: Eugene Gross  
AUDIENCE: 40

OSP: Michael Neuman  
Beth Guididas

After a one hour presentation by State Planning Commissioner Eugene Gross, and state and county planning staffs, the final two hours were taken with questions from the audience. The audience was for the most part interested in ways the Plan would be used once adopted. Most of the audience remained throughout the three hours. There were more than 30 questions and Garments.

More specifically, the questions raised by the audience included the following:

1. What are the procedures to be followed during cross-acceptance?
2. Who will make the final decision regarding the adoption of the Final Plan?
3. How will the Final Plan affect State agency permitting?
4. How will the Plan relate to local plans?
5. What has been the nature of local participation into the planning process to the present time?
6. How will the Plan affect existing project approvals?
7. What will the Plan's impact be on land values?
8. When will the State Planning Commission conduct an economic impact analysis?
9. When should municipalities begin to change their plans to make them compatible with the State Plan?
10. More generally, in what ways will the State agencies use the Final State Plan?

In addition, there were concerns expressed about the non-availability of CAFRA Tier maps and the tight time-frame, particularly in light of the non-availability of those maps.

State and county staff responded to these questions and concerns. In addition, county staff stressed that the primary opportunity for public participation during cross-acceptance would occur at the municipal level. A spokesperson from the league of Women Voters also addressed the meeting from the audience. She emphasized that the Plan is an evolutionary process. Afterwards, a number of attendees discussed the impact of the Plan on agriculture.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment plan  
Cape May County Informational Meeting  
March 8, 1989

CCMMISSICNER: Julie Gandy  
Chuck Newcomb

CSPi Michael Neuman  
Bill Purdie  
Beth Guididas

AUDIENCE: 35  
location: Old Court House Building  
Cape Hay Court House

This meeting ran for nearly three hours. It seemed effective in accomplishing the purpose of generally informing the audience of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan and the nature of the cross-acceptance process, often audience was generally receptive. Most of the questions revolved around four fundamental concerns:

1. the short time available to conduct cross-acceptance;
2. agriculture issues, particularly Tier 6 delineations in Cape May County;
3. coastal planning coordination/ particularly on the barrier islands and with respect to agriculture; and
4. water supply as a growth constraint in Cape May County.

discussion also pointed to a strengthening of the county role as cross-acceptance process manager. The county planning director articulated his concern that the barrier islands and mainland resort communities need special treatment. His view was that the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan does not differentiate its coastal policies sufficiently from non-coastal areas.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Essex County Informational Meeting  
Montclair Township Municipal Building  
March 8, 1989 Attendees: 55

Meeting Participants x

Leonard Lieberman, State Planning Commission  
James Crawford, New Jersey Department of Transportation  
John Griffith, Deputy Mayor, Montclair  
Phil TSiigpen, Director of Planning, Essex County  
Janet Biunno, Principal Planner, Essex County  
David Maski, Office of State Planning  
David Ifojsak, Office of State Planning  
John Gilbert, Office of State Planning

Moderator; Phil Ciigpen, Director of Planning, Essex County

Welcoming Remarks: John Griffith, Deputy Mayor, Montclair

State Plan Overviews Leonard Lieberman

- \* Mr. Lieberman stated that he is one of seventeen members on the State Planning Commission.
- \* There are many authorities and State agencies engaged in planning activities independent of one another. This lack of coordination has caused or contributed to the problems we face today.
- \* The State Plan is 2 1/2 years in the making.
- \* Cross-Acceptance is part of the planning process. During this phase, plan comparison is just the first step.

State Plan Slide Show; David Ifcski

- \* Mr. Maski stated that he is the contact person for the Northeastern New Jersey counties.

Essex County Cross-Acceptance Overview; Phil Thigpen and Janet Biunno  
Essex County Planning Department

- \* A cooperative effort between the municipalities, County and State was stressed.
- \* The County is establishing a State Plan Advisory Committee.
- \* Essex County has been divided into four planning regions.

- \* The Work Program includes four countywide municipal Cross-Acceptance representatives meetings. Additionally, the County will hold four subregional meetings.
- \* The County is recommending that the municipalities hold public hearings on the State Plan.
- \* Four public hearings will be held on the County's Cross-Acceptance Report to the State Planning Commission.
- \* The County will develop a monthly newsletter pertaining to the State Plan.
- \* The Essex County executive has promised the County's resources to conduct Cross-Acceptance.

#### Questions and Comments from the Public;

- \* The County and the municipalities should look beyond their borders.
- \* Why wasn't energy addressed in the State Plan?
- \* The rail right-of-way retention policy should be broadened to include energy transportation.
- \* There were several questions about the differences between Tiers 1 and 2 . People were concerned about the pros and cons of being in Tiers 1 and 2. There is a concern about municipalities getting more development than they want.
- \* If some of the Municipal Distress Index criteria do not apply, must a Tier 1 community still be called Tier 1?
- \* The language describing Tier 1 is different from the language describing Tier 2. Were two different groups of people working on these tiers?
- \* Must municipal plans be certified?
- \* The Cross-Acceptance time line in Volume 2 is confusing. Are the county reports due on Day 150 or Day 180?
- \* Is there a benefit to being designated Tier 1 other than funding? Is there any detriment to a Tier 1 designation? Would we get more than we want?
- \* Does a tier designation affect Home Rule?
- \* What happens if a municipality disagrees with the County report, but the State agrees with the County report?

- \* What happens if the State Planning Commission adopts something that a municipality is not happy with?
- \* Doesn't eminent domain play into account during discord?
- \* Is the infrastructure needs figure of \$19 Mil Inn expressed in current dollars?
- \* What is the impact of the State Plan on older, stable suburbs? Is it redevelopment?
- \* The State Plan could be adopted and have no impact on Tier 2. Is this a likely scenario?
- \* Can the State Plan be used to determine if a town gets a resource recovery plant? Will the State Plan be a guideline for resource recovery plant siting?
- \* Is the State Plan a gubernatorial election issue?
- \* What do you expect to see from the counties and municipalities with respect to transportation? ifcw can the County put something into the Plan about transportation?
- \* What about overall transportation issues, for example, the KJ Transit fare increase?
- \* Tfte State Plan will not be effective without stronger state/county/municipal relationships,
- \* We need to see: 1) tax reform; 2) municipal aid; and 3) a framework for infrastructure investment.
- \* The State must be made a partner in the redevelopment process.
- \* What have been the major criticisms of the State Plan?
- \* Once the Plan is finalized, what is the implementation mechanism?

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Hunterdon County Informational Meeting  
County Administrative Building, Flemington  
March 9, 1989 Attendees: 150

Hunterdon County Informational Meeting was held at Hunterdon Central Regional High School in Flemington, New Jersey on March 9, 1989 at 7:30 p.m. under the auspices of the New Jersey State Planning Commission and the Hunterdon County Planning Board. Mr. Herman Panacek, Chairman of the County Planning Board, served as moderator of a panel discussion for the meeting. The State Planning Commission was represented by John Kitchen, Vice-Chairman, Larry Schmidt, NJDEP, and Robert Kull, Northwest Area Planning Manager. John Kellogg, Planning Director, represented Hunterdon County. Teri Schick, Beth Guididas, and Joanne Burns of the Office of State Planning also attended. Regrets were sent by Assemblyman Bill Schluter who was unable to attend because of a conflict in schedule, but sent a letter encouraging the public to participate in the Plan's "bottoms-up" process which he feels respects the rights of landowners. Assemblyman Dick Kamin also sent his regrets.

John Kitchen delivered opening remarks which characterized the philosophy of the State Planning Commission in terms of:

1. Openness--this process is one that is two years old, and since its beginning the Commission has encouraged openness.
2. Balance--the Commission is trying to achieve a balance between the public and private interests by properly weighing each one's needs.
3. Responsibility--the Commission has a special responsibility that they take very seriously for the quality of life that the State Plan brings to the State. If the Plan brings even one more layer of regulatory bureaucracy to the process, then the Commission will feel it had failed.

Mr. Kitchen stated that the Commission is promoting a proactive participative planning process. The three-phase cross-acceptance process (Comparison--six months; Negotiation--six months; and Issue Resolution--six months) was unique to the country, even though the planning process is ongoing in three other states.

Mr. Kull stated that the cross-acceptance process is not one of compliance, but rather one of consensus which means that all sides need to communicate. He added that the Plan is growing in detail and refinement as a result of cross-acceptance so far. He emphasized that it is the job of OSP staff to enforce that level of communication during cross-acceptance. Mr. Kull also stated that the comparison process is lead by the county. This meeting is co-sponsored by the county to show their cooperation in this process. The Slide Presentation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan was shown at this time.



Following the visual presentation, Mr. Panacek introduced the members of the Hunterdon County Planning Board. John Kellogg described the cross-acceptance process in Hunterdon County. Two meetings with municipalities were held at the end of January 1989. Last November the county asked them to appoint up to 4 or 5 members to a cross-acceptance committee to meet with the County Planning Board three or four times to go through the Preliminary Plan. He emphasized that this is truly a "bottom-up" process, and the first time counties and municipalities have input into a final State Plan. The comparison stage is taking longer than expected. The Hunterdon County Planning Board will hold public information meetings the last Tuesday of each month in Flemington. A summary of all the issues raised at the last meeting are available through the County Planning Office.

Members of the general public raised the following issues in the subsequent public question period: (1) landowner and farmer land equity was not protected; (2) the schedule for cross-acceptance was too short; (3) the source of funds to pay for new infrastructure, as well as the backlog of maintenance for existing infrastructure, was unknown; and (4) some State agencies, such as D.E.P. and D.O.T., were alleged to already be making decisions regarding permitting and funding of infrastructure projects based on the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Monmouth County Public Information Meeting  
Monmouth County Library, Manalapan  
Tuesday, March 14, 1989  
Attendees; 80

following is a brief summary of the Monmouth County State Plan Cross-Acceptance Public Information Meeting. Attached is a copy of the Agenda and the handout given to the public.

After registration and a welcome by Monmouth County Officials to the approximately 80 people attending, BIT 1 Mathesius encouraged the audience to support the cognitive, participatory process of cross-acceptance.

Area Planning Manager Jim Hsu then gave a brief introduction of the Preliminary Plan, with the slide show presentation following. Mr. Hsu noted that he was acting both as a manager and a messenger.

Monmouth County Planning Director Robert Clark then gave an overview of the County response to cross-acceptance, indicating the workprogram is approved by both the county and the State Planning Commission. Each municipality has named representatives, who will be meeting with County officials throughout the cross-acceptance process. Staff procedures were outlined, with Assistant Planning Director Bonnie Goldscnlag explaining in greater detail the program Monmouth County intends to use to participate in the cross-acceptance process.

A public carrnet/question & answer session followed, with attendees asked to identify themselves and inquire about the State Planning process.

The questions involved the need for economic impact studies, grandfathering subdivision decisions within Tier 6 areas, the consequences of the Plan on municipalities that don't agree with the Plan, water supply studies, affordable housing, infrastructure cost analyses, State protection of watershed areas, phasing of Plan implementation, compensation to land owners and municipalities, municipal variance-granting process, growth limitation, land availability, transfer of development rights (OERs), growth impacts to adjoining towns, county tools to handle growth, State enforcement of the Plan, growth moratoria, and incentives/disincentives.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Morris County Informational Meeting Freeholders  
Meeting Room, Court House; Morristown March 15,  
1989 Attendees; 100

The Morris County Informational Meeting was held at the Firefighters and Police Training Academy in Parsippany. The meeting was moderated by Halter P. Krich, Jr. , Director, Planning and Development, Morris County. Also representing Morris County was Raymond Zabihach, Assistant Director of the Morris County Planning Board. James Gilbert and Candace Ashmun represented the State Planning Commission, while Robert Kull and Teri Schick represented the Office of State Planning.

Following an introduction by Walter Krich, Jim Gilbert stressed his experience as a local planning official; characterized the SDRP as a growth plan; and stated his belief that the state planning initiative will allow municipalities, for the first time, to take control of their destiny. Additionally, he clarified that cross-acceptance was a three phase undertaking including: 1. a comparison phase; 2. a negotiation phase; and 3. an issue resolution phase. Robert Kull then introduced himself as the Office Of State Planning 's field representative/facilitator and provided an audio-visual presentation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan and the cross-acceptance process.

Raymond Zabihach then outlined the process by which Morris County will participate in cross-acceptance. *The* county has stressed to the municipal cross-acceptance representatives that the comparison reports should reflect the official planning policies of the municipal governing body, Planning Board, Environmental Commission, and Historical Commission. Municipal reports are expected to be completed by July. By August, the county will submit all municipal cross-acceptance reports plus a county-wide report. Public participation will be encouraged through an outreach program led by the citizen's advisory group, Morris 2000. this organization will also prepare a written assessment of SERF, issue it to the Morris County Freeholders for review and as a companion to the county report submitted to OSP.

meeting was then turned over to questions provided from the audience on index cards:

1. What teeth are in the SDRP to require state agency conformance? Will state agency permitting be based on the SHIP?  
State agency coordination is at the heart of the State Planning Act. The State Planning Commission includes several Department Commissioners. The issue of state agency permitting based on the State Plan has not yet been resolved. It is a subject being debated by the Commissioners, and input is being sought from the public. State agencies will be under pressure to bring their functional plans into conformance with the final State Plan. The Governor and the legislature will likely have a role in deciding this issue.
2. What will happen to the SERF with a new Governor?  
The Governor is very important. However, because the people are with this process, it will be hard to ignore or kill this plan. Polls have shown people to be concerned with development; even in southern New Jersey, 49% of those polled were "no growers".
3. How will Tier designation affect the availability of State money to maintain infrastructure?  
While existing infrastructure will be maintained, tier designation along with the regional design system will be used to focus infrastructure monies into centers.
4. Which State Departments have endorsed the SERF?  
All except Agriculture, which abstained.
5. If the SDRP calls for population centers along transportation routes, how can recent cancellation of mass transit service along transportation corridors be accounted for?  
It is the intention of the State Planning Commission to encourage efficient transportation routes. If people were not scattered so widely, we might not be having the service cancellation now.
6. Does participation in cross-acceptance require municipal compliance?  
No^ The Commission needs local input, including suggestions for new policies, for the SERF to be successful. Localities should help to write the plan so that it reflects local values and interests,
7. If the Commission is interested in preserving agriculture, why haven't the recommendations of the agricultural community been included in the plan?  
The Commission has already in fact ~~taxi-rociiripri~~ that the Legislature adopt (1) greater funding for purchase of development rights; (2) enabling legislation and funding for transfer of development rights; (3) legislation and funding for low interest loan programs. There are a variety of tools in the Preliminary SERF that can currently be utilized—clusters, etc. More tools are needed and suggestions from the localities are important.

8. Will State funding for cross-acceptance become available?  
Funding is needed, and the cross-acceptance bill now being considered in the Senate should be passed soon. The neediest communities could be hurt by this lack of funding.
9. Will the "centers" strategy drive up housing prices?  
The SDRP does not intend to limit new construction, it simply sensibly accommodates the anticipated additional 1,300,000 persons who will need housing in New Jersey through 2010. Affordable housing is, in part, a question of process. The Plan will bring predictability to the process at the state level. Predictability will, in turn, help to bring costs down. Also, more efficient development can be cheaper. Finally, mixed use development will hopefully bring down commuting costs, which must be considered a part of housing costs.
10. How long are the three phases of cross-acceptance?  
6 months each.

The meeting concluded with statements by New Jersey Future pertaining to the importance of public participation, and by Morris 2000. Morris 2000 urged the Commission to keep on track, stressing that cooperation among government officials is very valuable in successful growth management programs.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Salem County Informational Meeting  
Salem County Vo-Tech School, Woodstown  
March 18, 1989 Attendees: 150

Office of State Planning and the Salem County Planning Board opened the session with an information center to review maps and plans and ask informal questions. Ofce formal meeting began at 10:30 a.m., with County Planning Director Fred laBastille making opening remarks. Mr. laBastille noted that all 15 municipalities had been contacted regarding the cross-acceptance process and their concerns about the State Plan. At the time of the meeting, only half of the County's municipalities had responded to the queries.

Freeholder John Lake also made some welcoming remarks and stressed that he was present to listen to the discussion. Mr. Harry Chamberlain, County Planning Board Chairman said the Board was very interested in participating in the process and was looking forward to the dialogue.

The meeting was then turned over to James McGuire from the Center for Dispute Resolution, who said he heard a number of concerns expressed during the information session. Listing these concerns, he noted that equity, tier boundaries, local control and input into the process, the time frame and funding were the issues of chief concern to this group. He described the process for collecting and responding to questions and then turned the meeting over to State Planning Commissioner Julie Gandy for her opening remarks.

Commissioner Gandy gave a broad overview of the goals of the State Planning process and said the Commission was concerned about such issues as farmland equity. She stated that as public policy changes, there are winners and losers; the winners remain silent while the losers seek to protect their rights. She said that the Commission has provided the tools necessary to mitigate the concerns of the property owners and was confronting the equity issue head-on.

Ms. Gandy also asked if there were any elected officials in the audience and noted that Senator Haines had arrived. The Senator took the opportunity to come to the podium and address the audience. He stated his clear opposition to the Plan and his belief that it was yet another opportunity for the State to take away local control. He also stated his belief that the "downzoning" of farmland amounted to a taking without just compensation, and he would oppose such efforts on behalf of his constituency. Senator Haines then left the meeting.

Eli Cooper addressed the meeting, stating that the Commission is very concerned about the rights of farmers and in broadening the options available to them. He said that farmers only have two choices right now:

planting seed or planting basements. He said that the State Plan has been designed to provide more options for farmers; and is trying to protect farming communities from suburban intrusions.

Mr. Cooper also stated that the Plan is intended to strengthen home rule by providing a framework for decision making. He explained that currently, all levels of government operate independently and the Plan is an attempt to have each agency marching in the same direction/ working toward common goals, rather than at cross-purposes. He also stated that the Plan recommends design systems that won't derive tax increases. In summary, Mr. Cooper reviewed the time-line expected for completion of the cross-acceptance process.

Mike Reeves, Salem County's Asst. Planning Director, then outlined the County's role as negotiating entity for the Salem municipalities. He stated that he has met with each municipality and that the County has established a citizen advisory board and published the map in the local papers. He then reviewed the steps the County will take to complete the comparison phase of cross-acceptance, She County expects to have a public hearing on its draft report on or about June 10. The County will issue a report to the Commission on July 10.

Question & Answer Session (Please note that all members of the audience did not state their names)

Specific questions and answers as recorded are listed below. It is probably best, in this instance, to report on the general mood of the audience and the nature of the discussion. The farming community quite clearly dominated the meeting and had little use for a structured dialogue. Questions were asked without any real expectation of receiving an answer, many of them rhetorical in nature; others simple statements of distrust of anything having to do with State government. It seemed clear that -there were pockets of people who were generally interested in learning more about the Plan, but were intimidated by the hostility that permeated the room. Most of the comments had to do with farmland equity and some did seem genuinely interested in the TOR/PER concepts proposed by Mr. Cooper and Ms. Gandy. Taking the lead in negative questions and fanning the embers of hostility was a woman (not identified) from the Salem County Board of Realtors.

She first question was in regard to the options available to farmers other than selling or staying, requesting further information on TDK/FDR and fee simple purchase programs. Trying to provide a broad answer, Mr. Cooper began to lay out a number of alternatives. One audience member began shouting at Mr. Cooper to "answer the question." Mr. Cooper then proceeded with an explanation of the three programs proposed by the Commission.

Commissioner Gandy noted that TER and PER programs could work and said the State Plan envisions that the cost of these programs would be distributed throughout the whole State, rather than being the burden of a single

municipality. She cited Evesham ^township's experience, which is now paying the interest off a bond issue the voters approved to pay for open space and agricultural retention.

The next question was in regard to changes in tier designations. County Planner Mike Reeves responded that it requires an emanation as to why it should be changed and that would be included in the County's cross-acceptance report.

question again turned to PER and 7TH ptucuum and how they work, and Mr. Cooper was able to provide a fuller explanation. A woman representing the real estate community asked whether or not it was true that tax dollars would pay for these programs or for traditional development costs. She stated that it was up to the local people to decide how to spend their tax dollars, not the State.

Edith Davis wanted to know *why* someone would offer her \$25,000 per acre for her land. While Mr. Cooper tried to provide an answer, it was inaudible due to shouting from the audience.

Joe Gearing, a builder, complained about the potential for new regulations from the state in addition to those imposed by local planning boards. He stated that he did not see the need for a State Plan.

Another audience member wanted to know why new development didn't result in a broader tax base to pay for itself. Mr. laBastille said that studies have shown that most do not, and in fact drive taxes higher to pay for services.

Another fanner asked who would determine the value of his land for the transfer or purchase of his development rights. Mr. Cooper said that independent appraisers would survey the property and come up with a number.

Another fanner asked what options they would have down the road, and stated that he thought the Plan is merely a ploy to take the fanners' land.

Many people seemed to feel that Salem County would have the last open space and farmland in the State and the Plan was just a way to preserve this land to their detriment, so that "yuppies from the North would have a place to take their four wheel drive trucks. "



Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Union County Informational Meeting

March 21, 1989.

U3CATICK: Union County Administration Building, Elizabeth

35

STRJE AND COUNIY PARTICIPANTS;

Fred Vereen, State Planning Commission  
Larry Schmidt, KJ Department of Environmental Protection  
Arthur Russo, Chairman, Union County Planning Board  
Robert Levy, Attorney, Union County Planning Board  
Brian Fahey, Chairman, Union County Board of Chosen freeholders  
Richard Muller, Union County Division of Planning and Development  
Gary Weltchek, Union County Division of Planning and Development  
David Maski, Office of State Planning  
David Hojsak, Office of State Planning

Beth Guididas, Office of State Planning

WELCOME; Brian Fahey, Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders

MODERATOR; Arthur Russo, Union County Planning Board

OPENING REMARKS: Arthur Russo, Union County Planning Board  
Robert Levy, Union County Planning Board

- \* Mr. Russo stated that the purpose of the meeting is for general information on the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.
- \* Hr. Russo stated that comments will be made by the Planning Board.
- \* Mr. Russo assured the audience that this is not the public's last contact with the County concerning the State Plan. She County will have other meetings life this as needed.
- \* Mr. Russo referred to a December 23, 1988 letter from the Union County Planning Board to John Epling in which it was stated that the six-month Cross-Acceptance period was not long enough. Mr. Russo then referred to Mr. Epling's response which he, Mr. Russo, called a new interpretation on Cross-Acceptance. The six-month comparison process is not the total extent of Cross-Acceptance. The next phase is "negotiation" and then "issue resolution", for a total of up to 18 months. Hr. Russo is not sure of the reason for the extension of the Cross-Acceptance process; it is probably because others complained about its shortness.
- \* Mr. Russo referred to another issue raised in the December 23 letter, that being the fiscal impact model and a speech given by

Leonard Lieberman. The Planning Board has asked for a fiscal impact with the Plan and without the Plan, the Planning board has received correspondence from the Office of State Planning, dated February 7, 1989, stating that the fiscal impact study will be conducted after the Cross-Acceptance process, not during, as Mr. Idebennan has stated.

- \* Mr. Levy stated that the final Plan will be prepared by the State after Cross-Acceptance and that there is a lack of procedure for it. There is an inherent vagueness in Volumes 1, 2 and 3. No specifics are given as to what will occur when a final Plan takes effect. If the time for specifics will occur too late in the process for municipalities to have any impact. We need a legislative approach which will allow municipalities to have an impact on the Plan.

STATE PLAN OVERVIEW\* Fred Vereen, State Planning Commission

- \* Mr. Vereen stressed the preservation of the quality of life in New Jersey.
- \* There will be disagreements throughout the planning process and that we are here to resolve those disagreements. The problem with our disputes is that they can cost money and affect lives.
- \* Three points about the State Planning Process:
  1. OPENNESS. The State Planning Process is unusually open. The Plan is only a preliminary plan. The Public is invited to help shape the Final Plan.
  2. BALANCE. The Plan must balance public and private interests. Costs must be shared equitably.
  3. RESPONSIBILITY. The State Planning Commission takes its responsibility seriously.

STATE PLAN SLICE SUMMARY David Uaski, Office of State Planning

LOCAL COUNTY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE OVERVIEW: Richard Muller, Union County  
Division of Planning and  
Development

- \* In October, 1988, the Planning Board passed a resolution to participate in Cross-Acceptance.
- \* In November, 1988, the Planning Board was authorized by the Board of Freeholders to conduct Cross-Acceptance.

- \* The County planning staff received Volumes 1 and 2 in December, 1988 and Volume 3 in January, 1989.
- \* The County will attempt to complete the comparison phase of Cross-Acceptance within the 6-month time frame.
- \* On February 25, 1989, the County held a meeting with its municipal Cross-Acceptance representatives. Seventeen of 21 municipalities were represented.
- \* Over the next three months, the County will continue to meet with its municipal representatives.
- \* By the end of June, 1989, a draft County Cross-Acceptance Report will be prepared.
- \* In July, 1989, the County report will be sent to the State Planning Commission.
- \* Union County has only two tiers, Tiers 1 and 2.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE UNION COUNTY PLANNING BOARD:

- \* Where will development occur if you restrict it in rural areas?
- \* What is the State Planning Commission's response if we say that we want zero growth in Union County?
- \* The Plan says that 2/3 of the State is closed off to development. It seems that the growth will go to Tiers 1 to 4.
- \* If we assume Tier 2 will be the focal point of some growth, how will the Plan address a town whose zoning does not accommodate growth?
- \* If a town is targeted for growth/ how do you get there? What is the State going to do?
- \* Will the State Planning Commission accept a county's lower level of growth?
- \* The 1.3 million population figure: Is this inevitable, manipulatable, or something that the State will allow? What figure is the State Planning Commission looking for?
- \* Four ways of Plan implementation are seen: 1) disuse of land through zoning; 2) withholding of services; 3) withholding of infrastructure funding; and 4) making the Plan legally binding. How will the State Planning Commission enforce the SERF? How do you control growth?

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ESCM TO THE PUBLIC;

- \* A woman was disturbed by Mr. Russo's comments calling for an economic analysis of the State Plan. She sees it as slowing up the planning process. Has anyone determined the cost of not planning? She stated that we will be revising the Plan along the way anyhow. How can you have an economic analysis of something that is not a definite,?
- \* Most of Union County's Tier 2 towns are fully developed. Has anyone done a study of the Plan's impact on a fully-developed county? We are fully developed and are satisfied with the way we are. Has anyone done a study to make sure that the characters of our towns will not change?
- \* We won't have any say on the Final Plan and are concerned about that.
- \* Are there any efforts to reconcile the goals and objectives of the SDRP with the goals and objectives of CQAH?
- \* The State legislature won't have any say on the Plan. The electorate will have no input.
- \* What do you envision as amendments to the state land use law? The State Plan will become a State Board of Adjustment.
- \* What percentage of development will go to Tiers 6 and 7? Is there a breakdown by tier as to where development will go?
- \* Can policies be changed through Cross-Acceptance?
- \* Where are villages and hamlets going to be? Page 48 of Volume 2 says that there will not be any new villages and hamlets in Tiers 6B and 7.
- \* Why is there a need for a state plan if you are going to let municipalities keep their plans?
- \* The SDRP is being used as a zoning tool locally.
- \* The State will fund or not fund based on its resources. A community will determine what it wants to build or not build. State agencies can do what they want to in Newark without the Plan. The Plan is just another level of bureaucracy.
- \* Why hasn't an infrastructure needs assessment been done as part of the Plan?

- \* He can't get information tonight on costs. What is the Plan going to cost us?
- \* The Plan can be implemented through unofficial ways (e.g. permit issuance).
- \* There are many concerns as to what the Plan will be once it is adopted. Will it be regulatory, or a guideline for local planning boards to follow?
- \* What if a developer wants to come in and intensify development in Tier 2? What will the Plan say about this (residential character)? Can the State Plan be used to fight this?
- \* Has there been any consideration of the property rights of people who own land in areas where the SDRP says that you cannot build?
- \* We have regional problems not being properly addressed through local zoning. The SERF is a good attempt at addressing regional problems.
- \* What is required of each municipality to conduct Cross-Acceptance?
- \* There are two ways for the Plan to work: 1) state agency cooperation; and 2) developer willingness.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS; Alfred Linden, Union County Planning Director

- \* He has only two staff members to conduct Cross-Acceptance and is concerned about its cost to the County.
- \* The State Plan legislation has been onerous.
- \* The problem in the future is what the State Planning Commission will do down the line.
- \* Mr. Linden stated that he is an agent of the County and the municipalities; he will never be an agent of the State.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Camden County Informational Meeting  
Gloucester Township Municipal Building  
March 22, 1989  
Attendees: 120

The Camden County informational meeting was held at the Gloucester Township Municipal Building on Chewes Tending Road. Approximately one hundred people attended. The following is a summary of the presentations, questions, and comments.

Opening Presentations

Jim Kaguire, from the Center for Dispute Resolution began by explaining his role as moderator. He outlined the purpose of the session, some of the issues and concerns of the public, as well as the agenda for the informational meeting. He emphasized that the following concerns would be addressed; local control vs. decision making on the State level, the extent to which the commission would except the input of the public and municipalities, the question of rates, that South Jersey be allowed to grow and develop, the traffic problem, the lack of affordable housing, and the lack of time for the cross-acceptance process as well as the lack of funding with which to accomplish this process.

Freeholder Director Robert Andrews explained that this was an opportunity to ask questions and to participate in a "desirable" process. He state that there was also a "risk" involved, in that this was a mandate from the State, which required the expenditure of local funds . He reiterated the concerns about the time frame, and the extent to which the process would fit the growth needs of Camden County and its municipalities.

Freeholder Carroll, who is in charge of the Department of Policy and Planning, said that the State Plan is a proposed solution to problems which exist in New Jersey. He assured the audience that no municipality's views would be ignored.

Frank Spencer, County Planning Board Chairman explained that they would assist in interpreting the mandates for the process. He felt that this process of "self-examination" was beneficial and would allow to focus more clearly, on their own needs.

State Planning Commissioner, Jay Cramner, outlined the task with which the Commission had been charged, he discussed the changing trends which led to the needs for a comprehensive growth management policy and the need for better coordinated action to improve the quality of life in New Jersey. Among other things, he re-emphasized the need for all of us to work together, to make this a "pro-active" process, and to improve the level of cooperation and coordination among State Department Heads.

cross-acceptance time frame- Although the cross-acceptance process is 18 months, why is the key phase only 6 months when it should involve many meetings with the public and with the county. . .

At this point, Mr. Cramer stated that he would ask for a formal resolution from the Commission on 3/31/89 which would clarify the length of the cross-acceptance process.

county report- At what time, exactly, will the county report be due. . .

funding for problems stated in Plan- If the Plan is implemented and if the problems it intends to ameliorate still exist, where does the State intend to get the revenues to fund solutions, . .

Shinn Bill- What is the position of the Commission re: the Shinn Bill."

liability of municipalities- Can the Commission do anything to reduce the liability of municipalities re; the Plan...

extension of cross-acceptance- Why doesn't the Board of Freeholders pass a resolution supporting an extension for the cross-acceptance process...

infrastructure- How does the SPC intend to do anything about the cost of funding infrastructure needs...

urban areas\* If the interstate highway system aided in the decrease of are we going to force people back to them. . .

receptivity of communities re: growth- What if rural towns do not wish to become any more developed? What if tier 1 communities prefer not to become redeveloped. . .

plan density- What is the translation of 100 per square mile in terms of dwelling units per acre. . .

SPC treasury- Why was the State Planning Commission located under the Department of Treasury? Will the State withhold funds from counties and who do not comply with the Plan. . .

"time frame- Has the SPC surveyed the County Planning Boards re: how such time they need for cross-acceptance. . .

Eli Cooper, Area Manager from the Office of State Planning began by discussing the impact of the automobile on growth and development in the State. He discussed the planning process and encouraged members of the audience to attend the next Planning Commission meeting. He also addressed each one of the issues and concerns outlined by Mr. Maguire in the opening remarks.

Following Mr. Cooper's remarks, the Office of State Planning slide show was presented.

Doug Griffiths/ Director of Camden County Office of County and Regional Planning discussed, in depth, the role of the county and municipalities during cross-acceptance. He explained that DVRPC was also assisting in the process by providing technical assistance to some of the smaller townships. He emphasized that the county would play an objective role during this process. Among other items, Mr. Griffiths discussed the current agenda and priorities of his office as well as the county growth management plan on which his office was working.

### Question and Answer Session

The format for this portion of the meeting was as follows; three questions were posed in succession by members of the audience and then responses were given by members of the panel. Each question and response were recorded on news print at the time they were posed.

The questions, generally, dealt with the following issues:

role of semi-autonomous authorities- What was the role of semi-autonomous authorities such as PATCO/ the Transit Authority, The Delaware River Port Authority, during the cross-acceptance process. There was a concern that these agencies have not been responsive to the needs of South Jersey...

negotiation phase of cross-acceptance- During the process of reconciling issues of transportation, who has the final say? Are legal battles foreseen...

economic impact of Plan- Considering the realities of taxes and limited budgets, how can members of the panel support a Plan which has not analyzed its economic impact on 567

cross-acceptance time frame- Will the Commission extend an extension of the cross-acceptance process beyond July 9, 1989...

time frame- Why is this cross-acceptance process being pushed through in 6 months? Will the Plan being adopted within the next 6 months. . \*



Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment plan  
Warren County Informational Meeting Warren Hills  
Regional Senior High School, Washington  
March 29, 1989  
Attendees: 220

Warren County Informational meeting was held at the Warren County High School Auditorium in Washington on Wednesday, March 29, 1989 at 7:30 p.m. under the auspices of the New Jersey State Planning Commission and the Warren County Planning Board. Robert Kail, Areas Planning Manager, represented the Office of State Planning. Teri Schick assisted. James G. Gilbert, Chairman of the State Planning Commission and Charles Newcomb, representative for Commission member Brenda Davis, also served on the panel. James Swick acted as moderator and Russell Miles, Warren County Planning Director, participated as the County representative. Approximately 220 people attended.

Welcoming remarks were given by Assemblyman Schluter, who spoke in support of the State Plan and the cross-acceptance process. Freeholder John Polhemus warned that home rule might be usurped by adoption of the State Plan, adding his concern that the Plan was not a grass roots approach to planning the State. Freeholder Kenneth Miller echoed Polhemus' sentiments, adding that he did not see any basic change in this Plan since its inception. Freeholder Miller offered Assemblyman Haytaian's regrets for not being able to attend the county informational meeting because of a conflict in his schedule. However, he asked the group, on Assemblyman Haytaian's behalf, to support A-3799, a bill recently released from the Senate Committee which stresses the need for an independent economic assessment, as well as environmental, housing, and quality of life assessments. Freeholder Ann Stone also sent her regrets for not being able to attend the meeting.

James G. Gilbert gave a brief overview of the State Plan beginning with the history of planning in the United States and in New Jersey through the State Planning Commission. While the Commission has a sense of urgency to respond to avoid gridlock, Chairman Gilbert stressed the quality of the cross-acceptance process rather than its time frame. It is the first time the process is being implemented. It is a "bottom up" process and encouraged the public to participate.

Robert Full explained his role as an Area Planning Manager as the liaison for Warren County with the State Planning Commission. Russell Miles explained the structure of the cross-acceptance process within Warren County- The Commission's slide presentation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan and the cross-acceptance process was given. A question and answer period followed.

Questions were submitted on index cards and similar questions were grouped by the Moderator. A summary of questions submitted during the meeting was compiled.

Questions and Comments discussed by the panelists involved the following issues:

Planning and Implementation;

o Public support for Warren County's involvement in the cross-acceptance process; o The need for an improved process for public and public

participation at the local level in State Plan cross-acceptance issues; o lack of certainty as to how local concerns would be considered in revisions to the State Plan; o Concern as to who has the final decision in how local land use

"conflicts" are resolved in the State Plan; o The need for adequate representation (Sussex/Warren/Hunterdon area, farmers) of local interests among the membership of the State Planning Commission; o Concern as to what sanctions, funding allocations, or permit

authorities will be used against public or private projects to enforce the State Plan; o The need for the State Planning Commission to assist in litigation in

defense of municipalities implementing provisions of the State Plan; o Local support for additional State funding for counties and municipalities to support their participation in the cross-acceptance process.

Economic and Financial;

o Concern that the State Plan would divert State and local resources away from local needs toward potentially costly and ineffective urban redevelopment programs; o Concern that development limitations would reduce property tax revenues

and require higher county, municipal, and school tax rates to support necessary public facilities and services; o Concern that development limitations will reduce the viability of

agriculture; o Concern that businesses will not locate or expand in New Jersey where

it becomes more expensive to conduct operations; o An Infrastructure Needs Assessment should have been prepared as part of the Preliminary Plan.

Development:

o Concern that development limitations would depreciate property values without compensation to the landowner; o Concern as to how households on low or fixed incomes would be affected

by the State Plan, including whether lower cost units would actually be provided or whether the State planning process would be used to circumvent "Mount Laurel" housing obligations; o The extent to which

regional development forces, such as the completion of I-78 and through traffic from Pennsylvania, were accounted for in the State Plan.

Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan  
Mercer County Public Information Meeting  
Mercer County Community College, West Windsor  
Thursday, March 30, 1989 Attendees:  
Afternoon - 25; Evening - 60

The following is a brief summary of the Mercer County State Plan Cross-Acceptance Public Information Meetings held during the afternoon and evening of March 30, 1989. Attached is a copy of the Agenda and the handouts given to the public.

After registration and a welcome by State Planning Commissioner and Mercer County Executive Bill Mathesius to the approximately 25 people attending the afternoon session, Commissioner Candace Ashtun encouraged the audience to participate in the State Planning process.

Area Planning Manager Jim Hsu then gave a brief introduction of the Preliminary Plan/ with the slide show presentation following.

Mercer County Planning Board Chair Ingrid Reed indicated two questions the County would ask: 1) Should Mercer County accept the growth projections? and 2) How to achieve the goal of more compact development?

Donna Lewis of the Mercer County Planning Division then gave an overview of the County response to cross-acceptance, indicating the workprogram is approved by both the county and the State Planning Commission. Each municipality has named representatives, who will be meeting with County officials throughout the cross-acceptance process. Staff procedures were outlined, with Donna explaining in greater detail the program Mercer County intends to use to participate in the cross-acceptance process.

A public comment/question & answer session followed, with attendees asked to identify themselves and inquire about the State Planning process.

The questions involved Plan revisions (outside the three year requirement), Plan procedures for change, equity, Tier 6 designations, coordinating Tier 6 with the purchase of development rights program, developer participation, time considerations, communication with bordering towns/counties, transfer of development rights (ICRs) programs, carrying capacity analysis/ urban crime, N.Y. Commuters, and farmland preservation.

At the evening session, after registration and a welcome by Mercer County Freeholder Carolyn Bronson to the approximately 60 people attending/ Candy Ashman again encouraged the audience to participate in the State Planning process. N.J. Department of Environmental Protection Assistant Commissioner Arthur Kbandrup provided further State Planning insights.

Assemblyman Anthony "Skip" Cimino (D-14) emphasized that the State Planning process offers a new way of looking at how New Jersey will be in the late 20th Century and the early 21st Century. As a member of the Assembly Select Committee on Land Use and Planning, Assemblyman Cimino noted that the Legislature is looking at issues related to the State Plan/ including the cross-acceptance funding bill and the economic analysis bill. She Assemblyman concluded by stating that the State Plan is easy to understand and mirrors the Mercer County Plan of 1986.

Jim Hsu, Ingrid Reed and Donna Lewis gave presentations similar to that given in the afternoon session.

A public raiment/question & answer session again followed, with attendees asked to identify themselves and inquire about the State Planning process.

The questions involved time deadlines, coordination of the State Plan map with municipal master plan maps, Municipal land Use law time requirements, availability of maps, matrices, Tier 7 development, concentrated development, protection of rights, Agriculture representation on Commission, economic impacts of the Plan, "Master Plan" vs. "Growth Management Plan", land development as pension plan, working with Council on Affordable Housing (CCfth), revitalization in cities increasing cost of affordable housing, infrastructure costs, mixed-use corridor centers, and with municipal, county. State and regional plans.