

Amendments to the
Interim State
Development & Redevelopment Plan
for the State Of New Jersey

April 16, 1992

prepared by; The New Jersey State Planning
Commission

AMENDMENTS

to the INTERIM STATE

DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

THE INTERIM STATE DEVELOPMENT AND
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN, AS AMENDED HEREIN, IS
THE DRAFT OF THE FIRST STATE DEVELOPMENT
AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Recommendations of the Plan
Development Committee
to the New Jersey State Planning
Commission

April 16, 1992

AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERIM PLAN

ALL PAGES AT THE BOTTOM OF ALL PAGES, DELETE THE WORD "Interim"
IN THE FOOTER

SELECT PAGES REVISE THE PHRASE "Strategic Economic Development
Plan" TO READ "Strategic Revitalization Plan"

PAGE iii UNDER "ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS", SECOND LINE, DELETE THE WORD
"Interim"

PAGE v UNDER "TABLE OF CONTENTS"

- READS: III. INTRODUCTION: Overview of the Interim Plan
CHANGE TO READ: III. INTRODUCTION: Overview of the
State Plan
- INSERT: Appendix A: Selected Population and Employment.
Projections to the Year 2010
- RE-ENUMERATE THE APPENDICES (A THROUGH E)

PAGES vii-xi: REPLACE THE TEXT OF THE PREFACE WITH THE FOLLOWING
TEXT (unused text/pages to be deleted; renumber-the
section as necessary)

The State of New Jersey's first State Development and Redevelopment Plan (the "SDRP") is formulated in response to the mandates of the New Jersey Legislature contained in the New Jersey State Planning Act (the "Act"). The Act was signed into law on January 2, 1986. It created the New Jersey State Planning Commission (the "Commission") and required the Commission to prepare and adopt the SDRP. The Act also created a statewide planning process, called Cross-acceptance, to ensure that governments at all levels and the public participate in preparing the State Plan. The Act describes the Cross-acceptance process as:

". . .a process of comparison of planning policies among governmental levels with the

purpose of attaining compatibility between local, county and State plans. The process is designed to result in a written statement of agreement or disagreement and. areas requiring modification by parties to the cross acceptance."

The Cross-acceptance process is made up of three phases: the Comparison Phase, the Negotiation Phase and the Issue Resolution Phase.

THE COMPARISON PHASE

This phase commenced in January 1989 upon release of the Preliminary State *Development and Redevelopment Plan* (the "Preliminary Plan") . During this phase, counties, coordinating with their municipalities, compared the Preliminary Plan to their plans and forwarded written reports to the Commission describing their findings, recommendations and objections. Extensive public comments were received at municipal and county meetings, at State Planning Commission meetings and at meetings of the Commission's subcommittees.

THE NEGOTIATION PHASE

During the Negotiation Phase, representatives of the Commission met with officials of each county, many municipal officials and the public to discuss desirable revisions to the Preliminary Plan and to municipal and county plans. The *Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan* reflects the revisions to the Preliminary Plan agreed upon after the first round of negotiations. Because a large number of substantive and format changes to the Preliminary Plan were agreed upon during initial negotiation sessions, the Commission released the Interim Plan and provided an additional 150 days for counties to review the Interim Plan to confirm that agreements reached were indeed reflected, to see if issues that were deferred during the first round of negotiations had been resolved by the Interim Plan, and to complete their recommendations on the mapping Planning Areas, Centers and Critical Environmental Sites based on the new mapping structure presented in the Interim Plan. Following resolution of these remaining deferred issues and mapping, amendments to the Interim Plan were made.

The "Amended Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan" ("Amended Interim Plan") is the final draft of New Jersey's first State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The draft SDRP reflects all changes to the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (Preliminary Plan), which initiated the Cross-acceptance process, that resulted from the first two phases, the "comparison" phase and the "negotiation" phase, of that process (including changes to the Interim Plan). Municipal and county input on mapping during these first two phases is reflected on the Plan's map, called the RPMM, to the extent that the input conformed to the delineation criteria set forth in the Interim Plan.

THE ISSUE RESOLUTION PHASE

The draft State Development and Redevelopment Plan (or the "Amended Interim Plan") will be the subject of public hearings during the final phase of Cross-acceptance, the "issue resolution" phase. No sooner than 30 days after the last public hearing and no later than 60 days after that hearing, the State Planning Commission is required by the State Planning Act to adopt the SDRP. (The terms "State Plan" and "Plan" are generic terms referring to one or all versions of the SDRP as it is revised during the State planning process and after it is adopted.)

In accord with the State Planning Act, New Jersey's first State *Development and Redevelopment* Plan, including its Resource Planning and Management Map (RPMM), should be used only to guide municipal and county master planning, State agency functional planning and infrastructure investment decisions. It is not appropriate to use the State Plan directly to formulate codes, ordinances, administrative rules or other "regulations." Such regulations should be formulated to carry out the master and functional plans of the responsible agencies. Just as there are many ways that regulations can be formulated effectively carry out these master and functional plans, there are many ways that these master and functional plans can be formulated to be consistent with the State Plan. All New Jersey governments, and appropriate agencies thereof, are encouraged to review their plans with the goal to bring them into "consistency" with Strategies, Objectives and Policies of the State Plan. Using the

State Plan in this manner assures that the integrity of existing planning and regulatory processes is maintained, that planning is coordinated and integrated statewide, that the State Plan does not interfere with the prerogatives of governments and agencies in carrying out their responsibilities and that the State Plan does not delay regulatory or other processes. For further discussion of this matter, the reader is referred to Section VI, *Role of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan*.

PAGE 9 UNDER "A. State Planning Goals and Strategies", FIRST PARAGRAPH, LINES 1 AND 5, SUBSTITUTE THE WORD "State" FOR THE WORD "Interim"

PAGE 19 INSERT NEW SECTION ENTITLED "Growth Projections" IN THE SECOND COLUMN, JUST BEFORE "Centers: The Organizing Principle . . ."; INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING TEXT

The Preliminary Plan contained population and employment projections for the periods 1985 to 2010 and 1988 to 2010, respectively, for the State and the twenty-one counties. These projections, provided by the New Jersey Department of Labor, indicated that New Jersey would add over 1.3 million new residents and over 1.0 million jobs. Already the most densely populated and one of the most industrialized states in the nation, these projections would have New Jersey growing from 7.6 million to almost 9 million people and from 3.5 million to almost 4.6 million jobs by the year 2010. During the comparison phase of Cross-acceptance, many counties identified population and employment projections in their comparison reports. These projections, with a few exceptions, were reasonably close to those contained in the Preliminary Plan.

Following release of the 1990 decennial U.S. Census in 1991, most projections of New Jersey's population and employment for the year 2010 have been revised downward. The Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, for example, as part of its assessment (dated February 1992) of the potential impacts of the Interim Plan, projected a much lower increment of population and employment growth over the 20-year planning period -- 520,000 new people and 654,000 new jobs. According to the Center, New

Jersey's growth to the year 2010 will be slower than in the past due to changing national demographics and the position of New Jersey and the Northeast region relative to their regional and national neighbors.

As the first State Plan is in its final stages of adoption, the New Jersey Department of Labor is in the process of revising its projections with updated Census and other information. Preliminary indications are that these revised projections for population and employment also will be lower than those reflected in the Preliminary and Interim plans and may be closer to those prepared by the Center for Urban Policy Research. Household projections have been prepared in the absence of 1990 Census information and should be regarded as minimum projections until the next triennial review of the State Plan. As counties update their projections using the 1990 Census data, they may want to alter their growth allocations. The Commission will work with these counties during the three-year period between State Plan revisions to revise allocations as appropriate and necessary.

The accuracy of projections of long-term population and employment growth tends to be less precise the smaller the geographic area for which the projection is made. Nevertheless, such projections are necessary for both the public and private sectors to plan and invest today with some reasonable consideration of what the future might hold. For the purposes of the State planning process, for example, a reasonable set of population, household and employment projections is required to guide the allocation of growth among Centers and to estimate future developable land needs within Centers.

Appendix A reflects the various projections of population and employment discussed above. The Commission believes that the projections prepared by the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, as reflected in Table 1, below, are reasonable guides for allocating growth among Centers and for estimating land needs within Centers. If a county develops what it believes to be a more accurate projection, the Commission will consider its use insofar as it bears reasonable relationship to the State total. Also, during each triennial review of the State Plan, the Commission will consider revising Plan projections to reflect changing trends in the State's population and employment growth.

TABLE 1
PROJECTION OF NEW JERSEY POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND
HOUSEHOLDS: 1990 AND 2010

COUNTY	POP		EMP		HHOLDS	
	1990	2010	1990	2010	1990	2010
ATLANTIC	224,327	252,772	139,720	149,314	85,123	105,130
BERGEN	825,380	796,200	458,800	533,700	308,880	324,420
BURLINGTON	395,066	452,742	159,302	240,444	136,554	178,186
CAMDEN	502,824	533,403	216,966	289,036	178,758	200,631
CAPE MAY	95,089	121,728	35,180	31,786	37,856	49,796
CUMBERLAND	138,053	155,700	59,600	76,600	47,118	57,600
ESSEX	778,206	662,079	384,306	355,007	278,752	249,917
GLOUCESTER	230,082	261,356	74,932	100,320	78,845	98,523
HUDSON	553,099	595,500	248,600	311,200	208,739	232,678
HUNTERDON	107,776	136,424	37,965	56,484	37,906	50,442
MERCER	325,824	356,200	197,000	238,400	116,941	130,437
MIDDLESEX	671,780	765,279	364,820	473,750	238,833	295,600
MONMOUTH	553,124	577,231	221,214	288,423	197,570	233,008
MORRIS	421,353	454,258	256,714	304,266	148,751	176,084
OCEAN	433,203	575,069	116,486	159,677	168,147	235,378
PASSIAC	453,060	471,200	196,100	163,600	155,269	169,138
SALEM	65,294	63,700	23,100	23,800	23,794	25,291
SOMERSET	240,279	274,897	144,915	208,165	88,346	108,782
SUSSEX	130,943	180,331	29,954	36,174	44,456	64,353
UNION	493,819	461,533	266,626	235,653	180,076	176,071
WARREN	91,607	102,600	33,100	43,200	33,997	41,003
STATE	7,730,188	8,250,200	3,665,400	4,319,000	2,794,711	3,202,469

Source:
Rutgers University, Center For Urban Policy Research,
Impact Assessment of the New Jersey Interim State Development and
Redevelopment Plan, Report 1: Research Strategy, February 15, 1992,
pp. 121, 122, 124.

Demographic Trends and Growth Allocations

As important as quantitative projections of New Jersey's growth are in guiding allocations of growth, other demographic trends should be considered as well. Recent demographic forecasts suggest that New Jersey's future growth may differ considerably from the growth it experienced during the last several decades. For instance, the aging of the large number of so-called "baby-boomers," the tendency for the baby boomers¹ children to delay marriage and family formation, and longer life spans may result in an increase in the median age of the population from 34.5 years to 41.2 years and a decline in the average household size from 2.7 persons in 1990 to 2.4 persons by the year 2010. Growth in the State's employment is expected to continue, and the number of women participating in the work force may continue to increase, although at a slower rate than that of the last decade. The number of future one-income households and the number of households living on retirement incomes may also increase. The trend over the last two decades away from high-paying manufacturing jobs to service-industry jobs is expected to continue.

If such forecasts hold true, we might expect an increase in consumer demand for smaller housing and for housing with proximity to elderly services and health care. An increase in the number of workers per household may increase demand for mobility between home, job, commercial services and recreational opportunities. • Such trends should affect how we plan the location, pattern and intensity of our communities and how we provide essential public services. Planning officials at all levels should monitor such forecasts and trends and evaluate their relevance in making land use, transportation and related growth decisions.

PAGE 20 -**SECOND** COLUMN

DELETE THE PARAGRAPH BEGINNING "Urban Centers are designated in the Interim Plan"

AMEND THE FINAL **PARAGRAPH**:

READS: Municipalities and counties should use the policies set forth below to identify Centers during the Cross-acceptance process so that these centers can be included in municipal master plans and the State Plan. These policies should be applied to achieve the objectives set forth for the Planning Area.

CHANGE TO READ: Municipalities and counties should use the policies set forth below for the identification and designation of Centers in the State Plan. These policies should be applied to achieve the objectives set forth for the Planning Area.

PAGE 24 IN THE **SECOND COLUMN OF** TEXT

READS: The following policies apply to all Centers to be "identified" by municipalities and counties, working with the State Planning Commission, for inclusion in the Final Plan (i.e., to all Centers except "designated" Urban Centers).

CHANGE TO READ: The following policies apply to all Centers, except designated Urban Centers, included in the State Plan.

PAGE 25 FOR "Policy 11 Redevelopment and Affordable Housing Projects

READS: Locate future, and to the extent practicable existing, redevelopment and affordable housing projects within the community development boundaries of Centers to ensure the adequate and efficient provision of infrastructure in Planning Areas 3 through 5 and to protect the environs of Centers in all Planning Areas. An absence of Centers identified to receive growth in a municipality will not absolve a municipality of its fair-share housing responsibility. The Council on Affordable Housing, working with the State Planning Commission, may identify appropriate Centers necessary to fulfill a municipality's fair share housing responsibilities.

CHANGE TO READ: Locate future, and to the extent practicable existing, redevelopment and affordable housing projects within the community development boundaries of Centers to ensure the adequate and efficient provision of infrastructure in Planning Areas 3 through 5 and to protect the environs of Centers in all Planning Areas. An absence of Centers identified to receive growth in a municipality will not absolve a municipality of its fair-share housing responsibility. Where Centers are not identified, the Council on Affordable Housing, working with the State Planning Commission and the municipality, may identify Centers or other appropriate ways for a municipality to accommodate its fair-share housing allocation and still meet the intent and purposes of the State Plan.

PAGE 25: FOR "Policy 13 Boundaries for Hamlets"

READS: Policy 13 Boundaries for Hamlets

Though Hamlets are not intended to have public water or wastewater systems, they should have boundaries delineated to reflect the geographic limits of community development.

CHANGE TO READ: Policy 13 Number and Sizes of Centers

The number and aggregate size of Centers in each county and municipality should not provide more than a reasonable multiple of the amount of land needed to accommodate the county's or municipality's population and employment growth projections.

PAGE 28 UNDER "Policy 22 Critical Environmental Sites"

READS: Identify and map, during the Cross-acceptance period, Critical Environmental Sites located in any Planning Area for application of (1) Planning Area 5 Policy Objectives; and (2) Statewide Policies pertinent to the environmental resource of concern on the site; include these sites in local plans and ordinances and on county Cross-acceptance maps.

CHANGE TO READ: Identify and map Critical Environmental Sites, which can be located in any Planning Area, that are not under regulatory or site-plan review for application of (1) Planning Area 5 Policy Objectives and (2) Statewide Policies pertinent to the environmental resource of concern on the site; include these sites in municipal and county plans and ordinances and forward to the State Planning Commission for inclusion in the State Plan.

PAGE 29 FIRST LINE UNDER "Intent and Applicability of Priorities",
SUBSTITUTE THE WORD "State" FOR THE WORD "Interim"

PAGE 30: UNDER "Policy 2 Priority for Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair"

READS: The maintenance and repair of infrastructure should be given priority, to the extent of local effort, over all other infrastructure expenditures, except . .-

CHANGE TO READ: The maintenance and repair of infrastructure should be given priority over all other infrastructure expenditures, except those that protect the public's health and safety (see Policy 1). This policy (Policy 2) should not be interpreted to include the expansion of facilities to accommodate future growth or to meet new level of service standards. Consideration should be given to local effort to maintain and repair the facility or service in light of the overall fiscal burden of the locality.

PAGE 30: DELETE "Policy 3 Transfer of Priority for Benefits Received" AND INSERT TEXT AS LAST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 30 UNDER "Intent and Applicability of Priorities", WITHOUT THE TITLE; ALSO AMEND THE TEXT AS FOLLOWS:

READS: Projects or programs that are located outside high priority Centers or Planning Areas identified in the following policies, but which primarily benefit such Centers or Planning Areas, should receive the priority of the Centers or Planning Areas so benefiting.

CHANGE TO READ: Projects or programs that are located outside high priority Centers or Planning Areas identified in the following policies, but which primarily benefit such Centers or Planning Areas, should receive the priority of the Centers or Planning Areas so benefiting. Similarly, projects or programs that are located outside high priority Urban Centers but are within that Center's Urban Complex, and benefit to the larger Urban Complex is clearly demonstrated, should receive the priority of the host Urban Center(s). (This Policy should not be interpreted to mean that funds otherwise available under these priorities to those Centers or Planning Areas so benefiting should necessarily be reduced.)

PAGE 30: UNDER "Policy 4 Priority for Distressed Urban Centers"; RENUMBER

READS: Allocate a sufficient amount of available discretionary funds for distressed Urban Centers that have State-accepted Strategic Economic Development Plans, up-to-date master plans and executed agreements for private or public/private investment. In making the determination on "sufficiency," consideration should be given to the desirability and efficacy of projects in other municipalities across the State. If the demand for these distressed urban funds is less than the amount available, the remaining funds should be reallocated for investment in other . projects and programs in accordance with the priorities below:

- (1) Other distressed municipalities in Planning Area 1; and
- (2) Municipalities in other Planning Areas.

CHANGE TO READ: Allocate a sufficient amount of available discretionary funds for distressed Urban Centers and for municipalities (both distressed and receiving benefit transfers) within Urban Complexes, where the Urban Center and Complex have State-accepted Strategic Revitalization Plans (to assure local/State coordination), up-to-date master plans and executed agreements for private or public/private investment. In making the determination on what constitutes "sufficient," consideration should be given to the efficacy (e.g., public project dollars to number of persons benefiting, degree to which the project

implements Plan Strategies, etc.) of projects in accordance with the priorities below:

- (1) Distressed Regional Centers in other Planning Area and other distressed municipalities in Planning Area 1; and
- (2) Distressed municipalities in other Planning Areas.

PAGE 31: READS: The Urban and Community Infrastructure Category

CHANGE TO READ: The Urban and Community Infrastructure Category,
By Planning Area

REVISE CORRESPONDING ITEM (IN BULLET FORMAT) ON PAGE 29

PAGE 32: UNDER "Policy 12 Agricultural Program Priorities"

READS: Funds for farmland retention and agricultural incentive programs should be targeted to the Rural Planning Area.

CHANGE TO READ: Funds for farmland retention and agricultural incentive programs (not including "use assessment, which is available statewide) should be given priority in the following order:

- (1) Planning Area 4 (Rural Planning Area);
- (2) Planning Area 5 (Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area); and
- (3) Planning Area 3 (Fringe Planning Area).

PAGE 32: UNDER "The Additional Priorities Category"

READS: The intent of providing priorities in addition to those specified in categories d. and e. above is to ..."

CHANGE TO READ: The intent of providing priorities in addition to those specified in "The Urban and Community Infrastructure Category and "The Program Category," above, is to ...

PAGE 33 UNDER "Policy 15 Additional Priority for Multi-jurisdictional Planning and Service Delivery"; LAST SENTENCE

READS: Urban Complexes should receive higher priority than other

forms of multi-jurisdictional programs.

CHANGE TO READ: Municipalities and counties in Urban Complexes should receive higher priority than those in other forms of multi-jurisdictional programs.

PAGE 45 SECOND COLUMN, LAST PARAGRAPH, THIRD SENTENCE

READS: The plan and its accompanying action program, described in more detail in the Interim Implementation Report, should reflect **t**

CHANGE TO READ: The plan and its accompanying action program should reflect ..."

PAGE 86 FIRST COLUMN, SECOND PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE: SUBSTITUTE THE WORD "State" FOR THE WORD "Interim"

PAGE 89 FIRST COLUMN, SECOND PARAGRAPH

READS: The State Planning Act recognizes the statutory jurisdiction of the HMDC over the Hackensack Meadowlands. As such, the State Planning Commission must rely on the adopted HMDC Master Plan in the development of the State Plan. The Interim Plan should continue the cooperative planning relationship that has been established between the State Planning Commission and the HMDC. Establishing the HMDC's standing in the statewide funding scheme will be critical for true comprehensive planning in the region. Additionally, the state planning process, namely Cross-acceptance, should serve as a catalyst for closer cooperation between the HMDC and its constituent counties and municipalities.

CHANGE TO READ: The State Planning Act recognizes the statutory jurisdiction of the HMDC over the Hackensack Meadowlands. Accordingly, the State Planning Commission has relied on the adopted HMDC Master Plan in the development of the State Plan. Establishing the HMDC's standing in the statewide funding scheme will be critical for true comprehensive planning in the region. Additionally, the state planning process should continue to promote close cooperation between the HMDC, its constituent counties and municipalities and the State.

PAGE 90 READS: Policy 4 Identification of Planning Areas and Critical Environmental Sites

Identify as part of the Cross-acceptance process areas for growth, limited growth, agriculture, open-space conservation. Centers and other appropriate designations in the coastal area. Identify and delineate Critical Environmental Sites in coastal areas.

CHANGE TO READ: Policy 4 Compatibility Between the State Plan and the CAFRA Plan

Identify Planning Areas, Centers and Critical Environmental Sites in coastal areas.

PAGE 91 UNDER "Policy 11 Infrastructure Investment Prioritization", LAST LINE: SUBSTITUTE THE WORD "State" FOR THE WORD "Interim"

PAGE 93: UNDER INTRODUCTORY TEXT, SECOND PARAGRAPH, AFTER LAST SENTENCE

ADD: The reader should also refer to Section IV, 2. for a discussion of Centers and Planning Areas. (The Statewide Policy Structure/Statewide Policies/Resource Planning and Management) for further discussion of Centers and Planning Areas.

PAGE 93 UNDER "A. Centers"

DELETE THE FIRST PARAGRAPH (CONTINUING ONTO PAGE 94) AND SUBSTITUTE THE FOLLOWING TEXT

The State Plan provides for five types of Centers: Urban Centers, Towns, Regional Centers, Villages and Hamlets. The Centers included in the State Plan are listed in Appendix B and are reflected on the official map of the State Plan – the Resource Planning and Management Map (RPMM).

PAGE 94 UNDER "1. URBAN CENTERS", FIRST PARAGRAPH, FIRST SENTENCE

READS: Existing Urban Centers are designated in the Interim Plan, and they are the largest of the Plan's five Centers.

CHANGE TO READ: Urban Centers are the largest of the Plan's five Centers.

PAGE 94: UNDER "Criteria for Designating Urban Centers"

READS: (5) A job-to-dwelling ratio of 1:1 or higher; and
(6) A history of population and employment levels that are consistent with these criteria.

CHANGE (AND ADD) TO READ: (5) A job-to-dwelling ratio of 1:1 or higher; or

(6) Serves as the primary focus for commercial, industrial, office and residential uses in the Metropolitan Area, providing the widest range of jobs, housing, governmental, educational and cultural facilities in the region and providing the most intense level of transportation infrastructure in the State; or

(7) In lieu of all the above, a history of population and employment levels that are consistent with the above six criteria; and

(8) In conjunction with either of the above two options (criteria 1-6 or 7) , the municipal boundary of the Urban Center is used in the application of the criteria and serves as the boundary of the Urban Center.

PAGE 95: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Towns"

READS: (1) It has a traditional, compact, mixed-use core of development with infrastructure serving the core (e.g., the central business district) and surrounding neighborhoods; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) While smaller than a Urban and Regional Centers, it has a traditional, compact, mixed-use core of development providing all of the commercial, industrial, office, cultural and governmental functions commonly needed on a daily basis by the residents of the Town and its economic region; it has neighborhoods providing a mix of residential housing types, with infrastructure serving both the core and the neighborhoods; and

PAGE 96: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Existing Regional Centers"

READS: (1) It has a compact, mixed-use core of commercial, industrial or governmental services; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) It functions as the focal point for the economic, social and cultural activities of its economic region, often serving as the county seat, with a compact, mixed-use (e.g., commercial, office, industrial, public) core and neighborhoods

offering a wide variety of housing types; and

PAGE 97: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Planned (New) Regional Centers"

READS: (1) It has a compact, mixed-use core of commercial, industrial or governmental services; and

CHANGE TO READ (1) It is planned to function as a focal point for the economic, social and cultural activities of its region, with a compact, highly intense, mixed-use (e.g., commercial, office, industrial, public) core and neighborhoods offering a wide variety of housing types; and

PAGE 97 UNDER "4. VILLAGES"

- FIRST PARAGRAPH: DELETE THE FIRST SENTENCE
- SECOND PARAGRAPH: DELETE THE ENTIRE PARAGRAPH

PAGE 98: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Existing Villages"

- READS: (1) It has a core of compact, mixed uses, including commercial, residential and public uses; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) It is primarily a mixed-residential community with a compact core of mixed uses (e.g., commercial, resource-based industrial, office, cultural) offering employment, basic personal and shopping services and community activities for residents of the Village and its Environs.

- READS: (3) It has a population of fewer than 1,500 people; and

CHANGE TO READ: (3) The existing and 2010-allocated population should not exceed 4,500 people; and

PAGE 98: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Planned (New) Villages"

READS: (1) It has a core of compact, mixed uses, including commercial, residential and public uses; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) It is planned to function primarily as a compact, mixed-residential community with a core of mixed uses (e.g., commercial, resource-based industrial, office, public)

offering employment, basic personal and shopping services and community activities for residents of the Village and its Environs; and

PAGE 98 UNDER "5. HAMLETS", FIRST PARAGRAPH: DELETE THE FIRST SENTENCE

PAGE 99 UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Existing Hamlets"

- READS: (1) It has a compact core of low intensity, mixed commercial and residential uses; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) It is the smallest scale of compact settlement in the rural areas of the State, typically located at a crossroads with a small core of community-related functions (e.g., a commons, a luncheonette, a community activities building/area) that clearly distinguishes it from the standard, single-use, residential subdivision; and

- SECOND PARAGRAPH READS: Existing Hamlets that must be retrofitted with public systems to"

CHANGE TO READ: While existing Hamlets presently have no public water or sewer system, if they are planned to accommodate new development, small-scale systems may be required and are encouraged. New development in existing Hamlets, however, should absorb the development that otherwise would occur in the Environs of the Hamlet. The amount or level of new development should conform to the capacities of natural resource and infrastructure systems that would exist in the absence of the water and sewer systems.

PAGE 99: UNDER "Criteria for Identifying Planned (New) Hamlets"

- READS: (1) It has a compact core of low intensity, mixed commercial and residential uses; and

CHANGE TO READ: (1) It is planned to function primarily as a small-scale, compact residential settlement with a compact core of convenience goods stores and community-related functions (including, for example, a commons, luncheonette or a community-activity building(s)/place(s)) that clearly distinguishes it from the standard, single-use, residential subdivision; and

- INSERT AS (4); RENUMBER: (4) It is a municipally planned small,

compact, primarily residential settlement. It

should be planned to absorb the development that would otherwise occur on tracts of land in the Environs. A Planned (New) Hamlet may require a small-scale public water and/or wastewater treatment system. The amount or level of development should conform to the capacities of natural resource and infrastructure systems that would exist in the absence of the water and sewer systems; and

READS: (6) It has a Community Development Boundary that encompasses no fewer than 10 acres and no more than 100 acres.

CHANGE TO READ: (6) It has a Community Development Boundary that encompasses, generally, 10 to 25 acres, unless wastewater systems are not reasonably feasible, in which case the boundary may encompass as much as 100 acres (wastewater systems are preferred and should be installed to assure compact development, unless there are mitigating environmental factors that make septic systems, and the resulting larger lot sizes, preferable).

PAGE 101 ADD THE FOLLOWING TEXT AS THE LAST TWO SENTENCES TO CARRY-OVER PARAGRAPH FROM PAGE 100

The Urban Complex is one of perhaps several (e.g., regional planning commissions) administrative mechanisms to promote such coordinated planning, decision making and implementation (also see the Glossary and following discussion under "Centers"). The Urban Complex presents an opportunity for both counties and municipalities in highly complex metropolitan regions to assure coordinated development of Urban Centers and their highly developed Environs.

PAGE 102 UNDER "Delineation Criteria"

READS: (4) Land area greater than one square mile;

CHANGE TO READ: (4) Land area greater than one square mile; and

INSERT NEW (5); RENUMBER SECTION: (5) A population of not less than 25,000 people;

BEGINNING ON PAGE 102 - FOR EACH PLANNING AREA, ADD AS FIRST PARAGRAPH UNDER "Delineation Criteria"

The following criteria are intended as a general guide for delineating the (Insert name of Planning Area), and local conditions may require flexible application of the criteria to achieve the Policy Objectives of this Planning Area.

PAGE 106: UNDER "Intent,"

INSERT BEFORE LAST SENTENCE: In Centers, infrastructure should be extensions of infrastructure systems in Planning Areas 1 or 2, or be designed and planned to connect to those systems in the future.

PAGE 107: UNDER "Delineation Criteria"

- READS: (4) Does not include land that meets the criteria for Planning Areas 4 or 5.

CHANGE TO READ: (4) Does not include land that meets the criteria for Planning Areas 4 or 5; and

- ADD: (5) Area is adjacent to Planning Areas 1 or 2.

BEGINNING PAGE 108: UNDER "4. RURAL PLANNING AREA (PA4)"

- REPLACE EXISTING TEXT UNDER "General Description" WITH THE FOLLOWING:

The Rural Planning Area includes large masses of undeveloped land interspersed by sparse residential, commercial and industrial development; wooded tracts; rural towns and villages; and most of the State's prime farmland. The Area also includes lands related to other rural economic activities such as resource extraction and fishing. With respect to agriculture, these lands are currently under cultivation and are the State's most productive. They also have the greatest potential of sustaining continued agricultural activities in the future. Their location, current use and high soil quality distinguish them from agricultural lands in other Planning Areas.

In the major farming regions of the State, adequate water resources and large, contiguous tracts of land with minimal land-use conflicts are essential to sustaining successful farming

operations and farmland productivity. Acceptable farming practices can protect prime, fertile soils. Prudent land development practices are required to protect water resources and retain large, contiguous tracts of agricultural land. If a viable agricultural industry is to be sustained in the future, the conversion of some - of these lands to nonfarm uses must be sensitive to the Area's predominant rural character and agricultural land base.

REPLACE EXISTING TEXT UNDER "**Intent**" WITH THE FOLLOWING:

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan responds to the mandate of the State Planning Act to protect agricultural lands. It fulfills this goal by encouraging future rural development in a form that supports, rather than conflicts with, the Area's predominant rural character and agricultural land base. The State Plan recommends a pattern of development in Planning Area 4 that promotes a stronger rural economy in the future while meeting the immediate needs of rural residents. First, the Plan recognizes that the State's economic growth in the future, like that of the rest of the nation, will be considerably slower than in the 1980s. To accommodate an appropriate level of growth, therefore, rural areas will need strong economic centers. These centers will attract private investment that otherwise might not occur. Second, the Plan recognizes the need to locate certain farm services and businesses (e.g., farm suppliers, processors and marketing services) in Planning Area 4, but it encourages and promotes their concentration within Centers supported by the necessary infrastructure and investment. Accordingly, the Plan recommends strengthening the economic capacities of existing centers and strategically locating new centers to minimize the negative impacts of growth on present and future farming operations. Such a pattern of development will strengthen nonfarm rural economies at the same time that it assures maintenance of a strong, viable agricultural industry for the State. It is a pattern that also recognizes the fact that farm families and workers have become increasingly reliant on off-the-farm income.

The relationship between farm and nonfarm land uses in New Jersey has always been a complex one. Many farmers benefit from the close proximity of residential and commercial Centers. These Centers provide ready markets for farm produce. They also provide jobs and income which help to supplement the farm economy. On the other hand, the intrusion of nonfarm activities into agricultural areas can interfere with farming practices and make it more difficult to sustain a viable operation. In the Rural Planning Area, nonfarm land uses must develop at a density and in a manner that minimizes the potential for land-use conflicts. This can be achieved through the Centers strategy and by implementing other kinds of sound land-use planning techniques.

Encouraging appropriate patterns of development in the Rural Planning Area would be considerably enhanced by a number of planning and mitigation tools. Such tools include clustering, capacity-based planning, timing and sequencing, privately coordinated multi-tract development, sliding-scale zoning, transfer of development rights programs, purchase of development rights programs, use assessment and "right-to-farm" laws. Such planning tools help to encourage land use patterns that ensure appropriate development and economic growth, while maintaining ongoing agricultural operations, land values. and the rural character of this Planning Area.

Economic competition throughout the world in the future will be keen. With "quality of life" becoming an increasingly important economic criterion, our pattern of development in the future must be carefully and thoughtfully planned. Rural New Jersey contributes substantially to the State's quality of life and will play an increasing role in its economic growth. New Jersey's rural areas, therefore, must not only offer strong economic centers but an ambiance and character that make living and working there attractive as well. In other words, Centers and their Environs in the Rural Planning Area must complement each other.

The Plan seeks to promote strong economies in Centers while protecting both the agricultural features and the environmentally sensitive features that will maintain the character of the State's rural areas. To accomplish this objective, the Rural Planning Area includes a subarea: 4B -Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area. This subarea identifies productive farmland that also contains valuable ecosystems or wildlife habitats. For Planning Area 4 lands that are not in subarea 4B, the Policy Objectives for Planning Area 4 should be used in planning for Centers and for the conversion of any agricultural and nonagricultural lands in the Environs of Centers. On the other hand, for lands located in subarea 4B, the Policy Objectives of Planning Area 5 - Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area should be used in planning for Centers and for the conversion of such lands located in the Environs of these Centers.

UNDER "Centers"

READS: New development in the Rural Planning Area should be consistent with Statewide Policies and should be in discrete Centers ...

CHANGE TO READ: New development in the Rural Planning Area should be consistent with Statewide Policies and should be encouraged in discrete Centers ...

UNDER "Delineation Criteria"

READS: (4) Served by rural two-lane roads and individual well and septic tanks, except for community infrastructure in Centers; and

CHANGE TO READ: (4) Undeveloped wooded tracts, vacant lands, and large, contiguous tracts of agricultural lands predominantly served by rural two-lane roads and individual wells and septic tanks; and

REPLACE TEXT FOR POLICY OBJECTIVES (1), (2) AND (3) WITH THE FOLLOWING, RESPECTIVELY:

(1) Land Use: Enhance agricultural viability and rural character by guiding development and redevelopment into Centers. Ensure that the location, pattern and intensity of any development in the : Environs maintains existing low-density development patterns that complement the rural character and landscape, and maintain large contiguous areas of open space. Any development in Planning Area 4 should be designed using creative land use and design techniques to ensure that it does not conflict with agricultural operations, does not exceed the capacity of natural and built systems and protects areas where past public investments in farmland preservation have been made.

(2) Housing: Encourage the production of reasonably priced housing for all segments of the population within Centers, recognizing the special locational needs of agricultural employees.

(3) Economic Development: Promote economic activities within Centers that complement and support the rural and agricultural communities and that provide diversity in the rural economy and opportunities for off-farm income and employment.

PAGE 115 IN THE FIRST COLUMN, FIRST PARAGRAPH, FIRST SENTENCE

READS: The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is to be prepared and adopted by ..."

CHANGE TO READ: The State Development and Redevelopment Plan has been prepared and adopted by ..."

PAGE 118 IN THE FIRST COLUMN, SECOND PARAGRAPH, FIRST AND FOURTH LINES:
CHANGE THE WORD "FINAL" TO "Final"

PAGE 118 UNDER "B. Infrastructure Needs Assessment", REPLACE THE TEXT OF THE ENTIRE SECTION (i.e.. Section B.) WITH THE FOLLOWING TEXT (Some of the former text for this section of the Plan remains the same; some text, however, shifts to amendments reflected in Part II, Subsection A, Page 19, above, for "Growth Projections)

A key element of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan is the "infrastructure needs assessment." The adequacy of a state's infrastructure to meet future demands for service defines its future quality of life and its capacity to grow and prosper. The State Planning Act requires that the State Plan include an infrastructure needs assessment that:

¹¹. . . provides information on present and prospective conditions, needs and costs with regard to State, county and municipal capital facilities, including water, sewerage, transportation, solid waste, drainage, flood protection, shore protection and related capital facilities." (N.J.S.A. 52:18A-199(b))

The official infrastructure needs assessment of the State Plan is entitled *Infrastructure Needs Assessment for the State of New Jersey, New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan*, and it is included in the State Plan by reference. The following is a summary of the findings of the assessment.

Long-term assessments of infrastructure needs, by their nature, include broad assumptions about the life cycle of various capital facility items, trends in costs for maintenance and replacement of these items and continued availability of various sources of revenues in the future to meet these costs. While the science of such assessments is far from perfect, the information that the process yields gives dimension to the relationship between future service demands and the capacity of governments and the private sector to raise the revenues necessary to meet these demands. It provides some direction in the search for appropriate financing techniques to support future infrastructure. This information is also useful in developing broad cost indices for models to assess the costs of alternative growth patterns for local and regional planning purposes. As the information compiled through needs assessments becomes more useful, the ability of governments at all levels to refine their assumptions and techniques will improve. Over time, these assessments will become increasingly precise, allowing governments to make more informed choices on how to maintain a reasonable balance between facility demands and facility capacities as growth occurs.

ANALYZING ALTERNATIVE GROWTH PATTERNS

Because New Jersey is located in one of the great

megalopolises of the world, between two of the largest cities in the nation, it is at the center of economic and social change. The magnitude of this change will depend largely upon national and international forces beyond the state's control. The manner in which this change affects the quality of life in the State, however, is very much in our control and is the focus of the State Plan.

If New Jersey is to grow and prosper without compromising levels of service in public facilities and services, state and local governments must either find ways to increase revenues to meet capacity demands or find ways to reduce future capacity demands. The State Plan recommends that some reductions in future demand are achievable if growth occurs in more efficient, compact forms. In other words, property taxes and development fees could be less onerous in the future if the pattern of growth and development in the state allowed for the provision of infrastructure more efficiently – qualitatively, quantitatively and fiscally. The State's pattern of growth must be responsive to market forces in order for New Jersey to maintain economic prosperity in the future and to encourage private sector investment in jobs, housing and infrastructure. It must also be efficient both in terms of preserving the quality of life in the state and in terms of meeting service demands.

During its formulation of the Preliminary Plan, the State Planning Commission evaluated three broad alternative patterns of growth:

- CONTINUATION OF TRENDS

This alternative assumes that existing development patterns will continue without any change in governmental efforts to guide growth in different patterns. It would likely result in a continuation of out-migration from urban areas and surrounding suburbs, in continued sprawl and its attendant traffic congestion, in continued aging and deterioration of urban infrastructure and new demands for expensive infrastructure in suburban and rural areas, in continued loss of farmland and other open spaces and in continued encroachment upon aquifers, surface waters and wildlife habitats.

- URBAN CONCENTRATION

This alternative would revitalize the State's major urban centers, contain sprawl and conserve natural resources by restricting growth in rural areas and redirecting growth toward urban areas. It would likely result in a substantial loss of population growth statewide compared to trend development.

- CORRIDOR AND NODES

This alternative would limit sprawl outside existing urban areas and corridors by concentrating growth into high-intensity, mixed-use * Anodes¹¹ in the major transportation corridors where development pressures are strongest. It would likely result in less sprawl in suburban and rural areas, but also would result in less revitalization of urban centers and continuation of the financial burden of growth in suburban areas where many facilities are already operating over capacity.

The Commission concluded that the Plan must revitalize the urban areas with incentives in those areas, not by restricting growth in rural areas. It concluded also that controlling sprawl in suburban and rural areas must be achieved by restructuring the pattern of growth in New Jersey away from sprawl toward a system of compact "Centers." Recognizing that most of the opportunities for economic growth are in the State's major transportation corridors, the Commission selected a corridor development strategy to organize growth into more compact forms. Development in these compact forms should not compete with Urban Centers and should make public transportation services in the corridors more feasible in the future. The Commission wanted a rural development strategy that organizes future rural growth primarily around existing settlement patterns. This approach would reduce development pressures on agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands.

The Plan identifies "Centers" as the organizing principle for the form of growth that would allow New Jersey to grow and prosper on a sustained basis without eroding the State's quality of life. It is an alternative to traditional sprawl in which future growth and development would be organized in and around "Centers" that provide a focal point for regional activities and include a mix of uses, accommodate alternative modes of transportation, achieve economies of scale and provide for economic, social and cultural interaction. This pattern of growth reduces the following items:

- Demand for public facilities and services;
- Demand for land, particularly environmentally sensitive land; and
- the cost of housing.

ESTIMATING INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Like many other states. New Jersey experienced a suburban growth boom following World War II. Infrastructure investment after 1950 shifted from urban areas and their surrounding suburbs

to newer suburban areas and outlying subdivisions in rural areas. Instead of balancing the maintenance and repair of existing facilities and services with the construction of new facilities, urban infrastructure was allowed to fall into disrepair. Further, the manner in which the State invested in infrastructure in suburbanizing areas contributed to the state's present infrastructure needs problem. More lanes were added to the State's highways instead of extending public transportation systems to discrete settlements. Public agencies allowed septic tanks and new public wastewater treatment systems in scattered and remote locations instead of extending existing urban systems to lands contiguous to existing development. Schools and hospitals were built in suburbanizing areas while central education and health facilities deteriorated.

The entire nation is experiencing a deficit in infrastructure maintenance and capacity, and the problem will not be easy to overcome. Even though New Jersey, its local governments and the private sector have spent billions of dollars over the past two decades to maintain the quality of public services and to construct new facilities, it has not been enough. The State is currently experiencing serious problems in maintaining adequate levels of service on its highways, sewerage and other systems.

For the above reasons, there are certain infrastructure costs that will not change in the future, regardless of how fast or slow the State grows in the future. These costs are those that will be required to bring existing facilities and services up to appropriate service standards. These costs are called "backlog" and "rehabilitation" costs. Table 2, reflects these costs in the aggregate, called "accumulated" costs.

The assessment of infrastructure needs to date revealed, the following information.

- Two-thirds of the projected total infrastructure costs to the year 2010 is for "accumulated" costs of repair and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure systems. Only one-third of projected total costs is required to support New Jersey's projected population and employment growth to the year 2010.
- Most "accumulated" costs are required to improve local infrastructure rather than regional/state infrastructure.
- More than 40 percent – \$49 billion – of the total infrastructure need is for roads, bridges and tunnels. Nearly two-thirds of this amount is required to overcome existing deficiencies.
- Of the \$116 billion in total needs, \$63 billion (or 54

percent) will be needed for local

TABLE 2: "ACCUMULATED" INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS*

INFRASTRUCTURE ITEM	ACCUMULATED COST (billions)
Transportation and Commerce	\$45,425
Roads, Bridges, Tunnels	30,785
Public Transportation	4,605
Freight, Incl. Ports	1,980
Aviation, Incl. Air Freight	3,965
Other Transportation Facilities	150
Energy	3,480
Farmland Retention	460
Health and Environment	17,220
Wastewater Disposal	3,990
Water Supply	3,000
Storm Water Mgt.	1,640
Shore Protection	1,330
Open Space and Recreation	3,265
Solid Waste Mgt.	3,995
Public Safety and Welfare	14,355
Primary/Secondary Education	13,415
Higher Education	840
Arts	100
TOTAL "ACCUMULATED" COST	\$77,000

* Accumulated infrastructure costs combines "backlog" cost, or the cost of facilities and services that should have been constructed but were not and "rehabilitation" costs, which includes major maintenance and repair.

infrastructure. Almost half of this amount is required for roads, bridges, and tunnels serving local community needs.

- Of the \$96 billion in total revenues projected for trend patterns of growth, almost half will derive from present State and local revenue sources used for statewide infrastructure programs, almost one-third from local revenue sources presently used for local infrastructure and about one-fifth from private sources.
- In summary, if the State continues to grow in the same pattern it has grown in the past ("trend"), there is a projected \$20 billion shortfall in revenues that will be available to meet infrastructure needs to the year 2010.

In considering alternative patterns of growth that would lead to achievement of State planning goals, the Commission found that the future costs of infrastructure tend to vary with each pattern. The pattern of growth that emerged from the Cross-acceptance process was reflected in the Interim Plan, and an assessment of the impacts of that Plan, by the Rutgers University's Center for Urban Policy Research, clearly demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of the Interim Plan's pattern of growth. The assessment reveals that much of the \$20 billion dollar shortfall in revenue over the next 20 years can be erased if growth occurs as recommended in the Plan. The assessment used projections of 520,000 new people, 654,000 new jobs and 408,000 new households for the State between the years 1990 and 2010.

The Center concluded that the pattern of growth recommended in the Interim Plan compared to trend growth patterns may result in considerable savings for New Jersey taxpayers:

- A savings of \$740 million in road costs during the planning period;
- A savings of \$440 million in water- supply and sewer infrastructure costs during the planning period;
- A savings of \$200 million in school facilities during the planning period; and
- A savings to municipalities and school districts of \$400 million in operating costs each year by the year 2010.

MONITORING AND EVALUATING PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS

Many public plans are adopted and carried out in the absence of a continuing program to evaluate how realistic the original policy assumptions were, how effective implementation programs are, and how changing economic and social trends are affecting the

efficacy of the plan to achieve planning goals. The state Planning Act anticipated the need to continually monitor events and trends and to evaluate their effects on Plan strategies and policies and, in turn, to evaluate the effects of the Plan on events and trends. Accordingly, the Act requires a "monitoring and evaluation" program as a component of the State planning process. This program will provide the information needed by the State Planning Commission to evaluate the effectiveness of the Plan in achieving State planning goals and to revise the Plan every three years to improve its performance. The program is described in the report *Monitoring and Evaluation Program for the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan*, and the report is included in the state Plan by reference.

The report on monitoring and evaluation describes in detail the many variables that will be continually monitored and evaluated following adoption of the state Plan. These variables relate to the following areas of concern:

- Economic growth and change (e.g., income and employment growth, business earnings, formations and expansions; housing costs and prices; and agricultural production);
- Fiscal conditions (e.g., Infrastructure capacities, needs and costs; revenues vs. expenditures)
- Environmental quality (e.g., changes in major environmental qualities, loss of environmentally sensitive lands, acres of open space and agricultural lands);
- Intergovernmental coordination (e.g., quantity and quality of agency interaction)
- Community life (e.g., housing affordability, quality of public services)

The monitoring and evaluation program will serve also as a "smoke alarm," detecting unusual or unforeseen events and trends that suggest immediate review of public policy. In response to such detections, the Office of State Planning will undertake, request other agencies to undertake, or commission special studies to determine the causes and effects of variations from expected trends and Plan intent.

The monitoring and evaluation program will draw from resources and interagency relationships that either are largely in place, although some may need to be expanded. To establish and maintain the program, it will be necessary to expand consultation among State agencies, improve the quality and quantity of data collected among governmental levels, upgrade analytical models maintained by the Office of State Planning, and initiate special studies.

PAGE 124 UNDER "1. The Citizens of New Jersey", FIRST PARAGRAPH, FOURTH LINE: DELETE THE WORDS "When adopted,"

PAGE 124 UNDER "2. State Agencies", FIRST PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE
READS: . . . membership, has been encouraged . . . CHANGE
TO READ: . . . membership, was encouraged . . .

PAGE 126 FIRST COLUMN, FIRST PARAGRAPH, LAST SENTENCE
READS: The State Planning Commission will explore policy options to enhance and protect these areas for inclusion in the final State Plan.
CHANGE TO READ: The State Planning Commission will explore policy options to enhance and protect these areas during the continuing State planning process.

PAGE 127 FIRST COLUMN, SECOND PARAGRAPH
READS: It is the intention of the State Planning Commission to formulate a State Plan ...
CHANGE TO READ: The State Planning Commission has formulated a State Plan . . .

PAGE 120 MOVE TABLE 1 TO APPENDICES AS NEW APPENDIX A

PAGE 133 REPLACE PRESENT APPENDIX B WITH *ATTACHMENT 1* (ATTACHED)

PAGES 143 ADD THE NEW PUBLICATIONS REFLECTED IN *ATTACHMENT 2* (ATTACHED)

PAGES 131 - 166 RE-ENUMERATE APPENDICES (A THROUGH E)

PAGE 153 ADD THE FOLLOWING DEFINITION TO THE GLOSSARY

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM means a voluntary program as defined in the Agriculture Retention and Development Act (N.J.S.A. 4:ic-11 et seq,) "which has as its principal purpose the long-term preservation of significant masses of reasonably contiguous agricultural land within agricultural development areas . . . and the maintenance and support of increased agricultural production as the first priority of that land," including programs for the purchase of development easements and deed restrictions and programs for financial assistance subject to approval by the state Agriculture Development Committee.

PAGE 154 REVISE THE DEFINITION FOR HAMLET IN THE GLOSSARY

READS: HAMLET means a small cluster of homes, not a subdivision, located at a crossroads, with a compact nucleus and a distinct identity, as described in the State Plan (See STATE PLAN)

CHANGE TO READ: HAMLET means an existing or planned settlement, predominantly residential, that accommodates development in a more compact form than might occur otherwise in scattered clusters and single-tract, standard-design subdivisions on nearby individual tracts of lands. A Hamlet has a compact, mixed-use core that may offer limited community and convenience-commercial services, with a mix of housing (also see "Hamlets," Section V, A, 5.

PAGE 162 FOR "STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROGRAM", IN THE GLOSSARY

READS: STRATEGIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROGRAM means a . . .
. . .

CHANGE TO READ: STRATEGIC REVITALIZATION PLAN AND PROGRAM means a
. * . * . .

ADD (as last sentence): The Strategic Plan for an Urban Complex should include:

1. A description of the interrelationships that exist within the complex;
2. Overall strategies to promote regional efficiencies and revitalization efforts;
3. Strategies for creating interjurisdictional coordination and cooperation; and
4. Strategies to target public investments within the complex for greatest efficiency and impact.

READS: URBAN COMPLEX means an Urban Center and two or more municipalities within the surrounding Metropolitan Planning Area that exhibit a strong intermunicipal relationship based on socioeconomic factors and public facilities and services. Urban Complexes are coterminous with municipal boundaries, but not necessarily with county boundaries.

CHANGE TO READ: URBAN COMPLEX means an Urban Center and two or more municipalities within the surrounding Metropolitan Planning Area that exhibit a strong intermunicipal relationship, based on socioeconomic factors and public facilities and services, that is defined and coordinated through a Strategic Revitalization Plan. Urban Complexes are nominated jointly by a county or counties and the affected municipalities and are coterminous with municipal boundaries but not necessarily with county boundaries.

Attachment 1

Designated Urban Centers

Atlantic City	Camden
Elizabeth	Jersey City
Newark	New Brunswick
Paterson	Trenton

Existing Towns Identified by Counties and Municipalities.

The following list includes Towns identified by counties and municipalities for inclusion in the State Plan. Towns may be smaller than, or extend beyond, a single municipality. The list does not include the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission area or the Pinelands area outside of the CAFRA area. This list includes Towns within the CAFRA area.

ATLANTIC COUNTY	Gibbsboro
Absecon	Pine Hill
Brigantine	CAPE MAY COUNTY
Buena	Avalon
Margate	Cape May City
Pleasantville	Sea Isle City
Somers Point	Stone Harbor
Smithville	Villas
Ventnor	Town Bank/North Cape May
BURLINGTON COUNTY	GLOUCESTER COUNTY
Bordentown City	Clayton
Burlington City	Deptford
Florence/Roebling	Glassboro
Moorestown	Pitman
Pemberton Borough	Swedesboro
Wrightstown	Williamstown
Beverly	HUNTERDON COUNTY
Maple Shade	Clinton
Riverton	Lambertville
CAMDEN COUNTY	Frenchtown
Berlin	Milford

High Bridge
Lebanon
Clinton Township

MERCER COUNTY
Hightstown

MIDDLESEX COUNTY
Rt. 33 (Monroe)
Dean-Dayton/Monmouth Junction
Spotswood Boro
Kendall Park
Route 18 (Old Bridge)
Heathcote
Rt. 1 Corridor (North Brunswick)
South River Boro.
Rt. 130 Corridor (North Brunswick
and South Brunswick)
Central Old Bridge
South Edison
Sayreville
Carteret
Lawrence Harbor (Woodbridge)
North Edison
Sewaren (Woodbridge)
Middlesex
Dunellen
South Plainfield
Metuchen
Colonia (Iselin)
Milltown
Jamesburg
Avenel (Woodbridge)
Ford (Woodbridge)
Highland
Morgan (South Amboy)
South River

MONMOUTH COUNTY
Farmingdale
Keyport
Manasquan
Matawan
Neptune

MORRIS COUNTY
Roxbury Twp.
Landing
Mt. Arlington
Rockaway Boro.
Denville
Butler
Pequannock
Pompton Plains
Madison
Chatham

OCEAN COUNTY
Barnegat Light Bay
Head • Beach Haven
Island Heights
Lakehurst Lavellete
Long Beach
Mantoloking Ocean
Gate New Egypt Point
Pleasant Beach Point
Pleasant Boro Seaside
Heights Seaside Park
Ship Bottom SurfGty
Tuckerton Mystic
Island

PASSAIC COUNTY
Little Falls
Haledon
Hawthorne
Pompton Lakes
Wanaque
Bloomingdale
West Milford Town Center

SALEM COUNTY
Pennville Twp. -urban
Carneys Point - urban
Penns Grove Boro.

Elmer Borough/Fringe #26 and 31
Woodstown Boro/Fringe South

SOMERSET COUNTY

Basking Ridge/Lyons (Bernards)
Bernardsville
Bound Brook
Hillsborough Town Center
Manville
North Plainfield
Raritan
Somerset (Franklin)
South Bound Brook

SUSSEX COUNTY

Branchville
Ogdensburg Lake
Mohawk area
Stanhope

UNION COUNTY

Fanwood
Garwood

WARREN COUNTY

AUamuchy
Alpha
Belvidere
Washington

Existing and Planned Regional Centers Identified by Counties and Municipalities.

The following list includes Regional Centers identified by counties and municipalities for inclusion in the State Plan. Regional Centers may be smaller than, or extend beyond, a single municipality. The list does not include the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission area or the Pinelands area outside of the CAFRA area. This list includes Regional Centers within the CAFRA area. In some cases, Regional Centers are identified by points and locations on highways, interchanges, intersections or the name of unincorporated places.

BURLINGTON COUNTY	NJ Turnpike Int. 9 / Route 18 N. (East Brunswick)
Mount Holly	Routes 9 and 18 South (Old Bridge)
Planned Center (Chesterfield)	NJ Turnpike Int. 8A (Monroe/South Brunswick)
CAPE MAY COUNTY	Forrestal Center (Plainsboro)
Rio Grande	G.S. Parkway Exit 120 (Old Bridge)
Wildwood	
Ocean City	
Cape May Courthouse	
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	MONMOUTH COUNTY
Bridgeton	Asbury Park
Millville	Eatontown
Vineland	Long Branch
	Red Bank
	Freehold Boro.
	Neptune (Rt. 66/GSP Area)
GLOUCESTER COUNTY	MORRIS COUNTY
Elk	Morristown
Logan	Rockaway Town Square
Woodbury	Randolph
HUNTERDON COUNTY	OCEAN COUNTY
Flemington	Toms River
Annandale	Stafford/Manahawkin
	Lakewood
MERCER COUNTY	Jackson
Princeton Boro 1-295 (HopeweU)	Jackson/Great Adventure
	Manchester
MIDDLESEX COUNTY	PASSAIC COUNTY
Perth Amboy	Passaic
Metro Park /Woodbridge Center	Clifton
Raritan Center (Edison)	Wayne

SALEM COUNTY Salem
City/Urban Fringe -
Mannington

SOMERSET COUNTY
Somerville (including parts of
Bridgewater and Raritan)

SUSSEX COUNTY
Newton
Franklin
Hamburg
Sussex

UNION COUNTY
Plainfield
Cranford
Linden
Rahway
Summit
Union
Westfield

WARREN COUNTY
Hackettstown
Phillipsburg

Existing and Planned Milages Identified by Counties and Municipalities.

The following list includes Villages identified by counties and municipalities for inclusion in the State Plan. The list does not include the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission area or the Pinelands area outside of the CAFRA area. This list includes Villages within the CAFRA area. In some cases, Villages are identified by points and locations on highways, interchanges, intersections or the name of unincorporated places.

ATLANTIC COUNTY	Leesburg/Dorchester
Belcoville	Fairton
Corbin City Port	Fortescue
Republic	Greenwich
Longport	Heislerville
	Mauricetown
	Newport
BURLINGTON COUNTY	OtheUo
Moorestown Township Village	Port Norris
Medford Township Village	Port Elizabeth
Columbus	Rosenhayn
Crosswicks	Shiloh
Georgetown	Laurel Lake
Jobstown	Delmont
Juliustown	Cumberland/Hesstown
NewGretna	Dividing Creek
	Centre Grove
CAMDEN COUNTY	Springtown
Sicklerville	Roadstown
	Proposed (Stow Creek Twp.)
CAPE MAY COUNTY	Sea Breeze
Cape May Point	
Dennisville	GLOUCESTER COUNTY
Marmora	Clarksboro
South Seaville	Franklinville
Del Haven	Hurffville
Whitesboro/Burleigh	Malaga
Goshen	MicMetown
South Dennis	Mt. Royal
Tuckahoe	MullicaHill
	Newfield
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	Wenonah
Cannel	
Cedarville	HUNTERDON COUNTY
Deerfield	Hampton

Glen Gardner
Califon
Oldwick
Whitehouse Station
Pittstown
Bloomsbury
Riegel Ridge
Sergeantsville
Stockton
Ringoos
Three Bridges

MERCER COUNTY

Hopewell
Pennington
Princeton Junction (West Windsor)
Lawrenceville (Lawrence)
Robbinsville (Washington)
Tirusville (Hopewell)
Marshalls Corner
I - 295 & Princeton Pike (Lawrence)
Province Line Rd. North of Rt. 1
(Lawrence)

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Cranbury Village Applegarth
(Monroe) Kingston (South
Brunswick) Helmetta Boro
Monmouth Junction

MONMOUTH COUNTY

Adelphia (Howell)
Allentown
Ardena (Howell)
East Keansburg (Middletown)
Englishtown
Hance Park (Tinton Falls)
Leonardo (Middletown)
Leonardville (Middletown)
Lincroft (Middletown)
Pine Brook (Tinton Falls)
Reevytown (Asbury Ave. & GSP,
Tinton Falls)
Roosevelt

Town Center (Rt. 35 & Kings
Highway, Middletown)
Hornerstown (537/539, Upper
Freehold)
New Canton (M95/Old York Rd.,
Upper Freehold)
No Name 1 (524/Doctors Ck., Upper
Freehold)]
No Name 2 (539/Elisdale Rd., Upper
Freehold)
Pullentown (I-195/Sharon Station Rd.
Upper Freehold)
Wrightville (I-195/Imlays Rd., Upper
Freehold)

MORRIS COUNTY

Berkshire Valley
Mendham
Millington
Sterling
Gillette
Green Pond
Mt. Freedom
Marcella
Hibernia

OCEAN COUNTY

Barneгат CassvUle
Cedar Run
Forked River
Stafford Forge
Waretown West
Creek

PASSAIC COUNTY

Upper Ringwood (Ringwood)
Upper Greenwood Lake (West
Milford)
Oakridge (West Milford)

SALEM COUNTY

Proposed Village (Rt. 657)
Proposed Village (Rt. 540)
Willow Grove

Sharptown Quinton
Village AUoway
Village Monroeville
Olivet/Centerton
Daretown
Brotman/Norma
Pedricktown
Hancocks Bridge
Pole Tavern
Elsinboro Village
Laytons Lake
Hannersville
Oakwood Beach
Yorktown Canton

SOMERSET COUNTY

Bedminster
East Millstone (Franklin)
Far Hills
FINDERNE (Bridgewater)
Flagtown (Hillsborough)
Gladstone
Kingston (Franklin)
Liberty Corner (Bernards)
Martinsville (Bridgewater)
Middlebush (Franklin)
Millstone
Neshanic Station (Branchburg)
North Branch (Branchburg)
Peapack
Rocky Hill
Branchburg Town Center
Franklin Park (Franklin)
Hillsborough Village
Montgomery Village
Pike Run (Montgomery)
Pluckemin (Bedminster)
Watchung Center
Warren Town Center

SUSSEX COUNTY

Stillwater
Fredon

Springdale
Lockwood
Andover Sussex
Hills Highland
Lake Vernon
Center
Glenwood

WARREN COUNTY

Asbury
Blairstown
Broadway
Buttsville
Columbia
Hope
Lake Tranquility
New Village

Existing and Planned Hamlets Identified by Counties and Municipalities.

The following list includes Hamlets identified by counties and municipalities for inclusion in the State Plan. The list does not include the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission area or the Pinelands area outside of the CAFRA area. This list includes Hamlets within the CAFRA area. In some cases, Hamlets are identified by points and locations on highways, interchanges, intersections or the name of unincorporated places.

ATLANTIC COUNTY	Bunnvale
Cobin City East	West Portal
Vineland Five Points	Vernoy
Thompsontown	Pattensburg
	Cokesbury
	Little York
BURLINGTON COUNTY	Mountainville
Chesterfield	Mt. Pleasant
Hedding	Pottersville
Jacksonville	Everittstown
Masonville	Jutland
Sykesville	Baptistown
	Cherryville
CAPE MAY COUNTY	Quakertown
Green Creek	Readington
Petersburg	Stanton
Beesl/s Point	Croton
Swainton	Barbertown
Seaville	Mt. Airy
Palermo	Rosemont
	Invale
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	Rocktown
Proposed (Millville City)	CloverHiU
	Reaville
GLOUCESTER COUNTY	Wertsville
Unnamed - Harrison (Rt. 623)	Woodville
HUNTERDON COUNTY	MERCER COUNTY
New Hampton	Windsor (Washington) North
Planned Hamlet - Penwell	Crosswicks (Hamilton)
Planned Hamlet - Bethlehem Twp.	Groveville (Hamilton)
Woodglen	
Norton	MIDDLESEX COUNTY
	Matchaponix (Monroe)

Mounts (Monroe) Tracy
(Monroe) Gravelhill (Monroe)
Cranbury Station (Cranbury)

MONMOUTH COUNTY
Arneytown (Upper Freehold)
Cream Ridge (Upper Freehold)
EUisdale (Upper Freehold)
Imlaystown (Upper Freehold)
New Sharon (Upper Freehold)
Ramtown 1 (Howell)
Ramtown 2 (Howell)
Extonville (Upper Freehold)

MORRIS COUNTY
Meyersville
Green Village
Long Valley
Ironia

OCEAN COUNTY
Nugentown
Marshall's Corner
Vanhiserville Hamlet
1 (Plumsted) Hamlet
2 (Plumsted) Hamlet
3 (Plumsted) Hamlet
1 (Jackson) Hamlet 2
(Jackson) Cedar
Bonnet Island

PASSAIC COUNTY
Lake Kampfe (Bloomingdale)
Lake losco (Bloomingdale)
Glenwild Lake (Bloomingdale)
Newfoundland (West Milford)

SALEM COUNTY
Elk Terrace Forest
Lane Auburn
Hagersville Rd.

SOMERSET COUNTY

Blawenburg (Montgomery)
Centerville (Branchburg)
Clover Hill (Hillsborough)
Griggstown (Franklin)
Harlingen (Montgomery)
Neshanic (Hillsborough)
Belle Mead
Skillman (Montgomery) South
Branch (Hillsborough) Zion
(Hillsborough/Montgomery)

SUSSEX COUNTY
Swartswood Five
Points Woodrup
Gap Middleville
Quaryville
Colesville
Beemerville Barry
Lakes Lake Conway
High Breeze
CHRwood Lake Lake
Panorama Pleasant
Valley Tall Timbers
Drew Lakes
Lake Wallkill Lake
Glenwood

MTAQiMEMI 2

Additional Publications from the New Jersey Office of State Planning as
of April 1992

- 72 Communities of Place, the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan for the State of New Jersey. New Jersey State Planning Commission, July 12, 1991.
- 73 Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. New Jersey Office of State Planning, September 27, 1991.
- 74 Agriculture and the State Planning Process Bmlding Consensus Step by Step. New Jersey Office of State Planning, October 1991.
- 75 Peer Review, State Planning Advisory Committee. New Jersey Office of State Planning, November 1991.
- 76 The Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan, Q & A. New Jersey Office of State Planning, November 1991.
- 77 Interim Report of the New Jersey State Planning Commission on Implementation Issues. New Jersey State Planning Commission, December 6, 1991.
- 78 Mapping and Growth Accommodation Guide, Technical Assistance Manual. New Jersey Office of State Planning, December 1991.
- 79 Employment Trends and Projections, (draft) New Jersey Office of State Planning, rev. February 1992. (Technical Reference Document).
- 80 Description of the OSP Income Models, (draft) New Jersey Office of State Planning, January 1992. (Technical Reference Document)
- 81 Examination of Residential Locational Theories and Factors that Affect Tenure, (draft) New Jersey Office of State Planning, January 1992. (Technical Reference Document)
- 82 Assessment of Trend Infrastructure Needs to 2010. New Jersey State Planning Commission, January 1992
- 83 Impact Assessment of the New Jersey Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan. 2 vols. Center for Urban Policy Research (OJPR), Rutgers University. February 28, 1992.

- 84 Impact Assessment of the New Jersey Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan, Executive Summary. Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR), Rutgers University, February 28, 1992.
- 85 Business and Labor, Report #1. State Planning Advisory Committee, April 1992.
- 86 Housing, Report #2. State Planning Advisory Committee, April 1992.
- 87 Planning for Natural and Cultural Resources, Report #2. Natural Resources State Planning Advisory Committee, April 1992.
- 88 Resource Planning and Management, Report #2. State Planning Advisory Committee, April 1992.
- 89 Monitoring and Evaluation Program for the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, (draft) New Jersey state Planning Committee, April 1992.
- 90 Assessment of Infrastructure Needs to 2010 New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, (draft) New Jersey State Planning Commission, April 1992,
- 91 Amendments to the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan for the State of New Jersey. New Jersey State Planning Commission, April 1992.
- 92 Amended Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. New Jersey Office of State Planning, April 1992.
- 93 Amended Interim Report of the New Jersey State Planning Commission on Implementation Issues. New Jersey State Planning Commission, April 1992.