

Statement
of
Agreements & Disagreements
of the State Development
and Redevelopment Plan

Prepared by:
The New Jersey Office of State Planning
1101612,1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1. 10 T 3 0 3 U C T I C K

..... 1

2. NEEorrancNS RESULTS, POLIC? ISSUES

I. AGREEMENTS:

A. Explicit Agreements:

BERGEN COUNT?	7
MERCER COUNT?	8
HUDSON COUNT?	11
ATLANTIC COUNT?	12
CAMDEN COUNT?	14
UNION COURT?	19
OCEAN COUNT?	23
HUNTERDCN COUNT?	26
GLOUCESTER COUNT?	28
SALEK COUNTY	29
MaMOOTH COUNTY	30
MDRRIS COUNTY	34
BURLINQGGrK COUNT?	36
PASSAIC COUKPy	39
CAPE MAY COUNT?	46
COUNT?	49
SOMERSET COUNT?	55
SUSSEX CXXWT?	61
CUMBERLAND COUNT?	63
WARREN COUNT?	64
ESSEX COUHT?	66

B. Agreements in Principle: 71

<u>HR</u> RGEN COUHT?	71
<u>MRRTFR</u> COUNT?	73
HUDSON COUNT?	75
ATLANTIC COUNT?	82
CAMDEN COUNT?	83
UNICN COUNT?	85
OCEAN COUNT?	87
HUNTERDCN COUNT?	89
GLOUCESTER COUNT?	94
SALEM COUNT?	95
KCKM3U3H COUNT?	96
M2KRIS COUNT?	103
BURTJNGTCN COUNT?	115

PASSAIC COURT?	----	117
CAPE MARY COURT?		122
MIDDLESEX COUNTS'		124
SOMERSET COURT?		126
SUSSEX COURT?		130
CUMBERLAND COURT?		135
WARREN COURT?		141
<u>ESSEX</u> COURT? -----		146
C. Agreements on Implementation:		151
BEEON COURT?		151
MERCER COURT?		152
HUDSON COURT?		153
ATLANTIC COURT?		155
CAMDEN COURT?		156
UNION COURT?		157
OCEAN COURT?		158
HURIERDCN COURT?		160
GLOUCESTER COURT?		162
SALEM COURT?		164
M3BOJH COURT?		164
MCRRIS COURT?		167
BURLJN3TCN COURT?		177
EASSAIC COURT?		178
CAPE MA? COURT?		179
COUNT?		181
SOMERSET COURT?		184
SUSSEX COURT? ,		187
CUMBERLAND COURT?		191
WARREN COURT?		193
<u>ESSEX</u> COURT?		197
D. Agreement to Identify Concerns!		197
BERESN COURT?		197
<u>MRRCR</u> COURT?		197
HUDSON COURT?		197
ATLANTIC COURT?		198
CAMDEN COURT?		199
UNION COURT?		202
OCEAN COURT?		204
HURIERDCN COURT?		205
GLOUCESTER COURT?		206
SALEM COURT?		206
MCNMOOOH COURT?		206
MCRRIS COURT?		207
BURLINGTON COURT?		207
EASSAIC COURT?		210
CAPE MA? COURT?		210

COUNT?	212
SCMERSET COUNT?	.- 212
SUSSEX COUNT?	---- 212
CUMBERLAND COUNTY.	213
WARREN COUNT?	214
ESSEX COUNT?	217

II. DISASSEMBLES: 218

COUNTS'	218
MERCER COUNT?	218
HUDSCK COUNT?	218
AHANTIC COUNT?	220
CAMDEN COUNT?	220
UNION COUNT?	220
OCEAN COUNT?	221
HUNTERDCN COUNT?	221
GLOUCESTER COUNT?	221
SALEM COUNT?	222
yOWOJm COUNT?	223
M2RRIS COUNT?	224
BURLH*3TCN COUNT?	225
PASSAIC COUNT?	225
CAPE MA? COUNT?	225
MIDDLESEX COUNT?	226
SCMERSET COUNT?	226
SUSSEX COUNT?	226
CUMBERLAND COUNT?	226
WARREN COUNT?	226
ESSEX COUNT?	229

3. MAFPBG ISSUES

I. MAPPIN3 APPLICATIONS:	229
Northwest	230
Northeast	230
Central	230
Southwest	230
	231
II. MAPPINS CONCERNS	231
Northwest	231
Central	231
Southwest	232
Coastal	232

4.	APPENDICES	233
I.	APPENDIX A	233
	APPENDIX B	236
	APPENDIX C	241
	APPENDIX D	244
	APPENDIX E	245

Hhe New Jersey Cross-Acceptance Process

Introduction

In January 1989 New Jersey's 21 counties and 567 municipalities began the first statewide process of intergovernmental planning and coordination in the State's history. Kie process is known as cross-acceptance, and it is the foundation upon which the State Development and Redevelopment Plan was built. The cross-acceptance process involved three phases: comparison, negotiation and issue resolution. This Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns reflects the results of all three phases of the process, which are described below in greater detail.

The Comparison

The cross-acceptance process began with the approval and release of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (Preliminary Plan) by the State Planning Commission, de Preliminary Plan described a vision for 21st Century New Jersey and included policy direction State, county and municipal governments could follow toward making that vision a reality.

Each county was asked to compare the Preliminary Plan to its own plans and regulations. As the official cross-acceptance negotiating entities, the counties facilitated this same comparison and response among their respective municipalities. In addition to findings and recommendations on consistency and compatibility with the Preliminary Plan, the counties were asked to determine whether or not New Jersey Department of labor population and employment projections (by county) were reasonable. If not, the counties were to identify their "preferred" growth levels. They were also asked to identify how the growth would be accommodated in accordance with the vision advanced in the Preliminary Plan, and to identify the necessary infrastructure to support the new growth. The final component of the comparison report was to include recommendations for changes and corrections to the Preliminary Plan map. Municipalities that disagreed with the county imports were invited to submit their own findings and recommendations to the Commission directly.

The first county report was issued in July 1989, just six months after the release of the Preliminary Plan for cross-acceptance. Ten counties had reported on their findings by the end of the year and nine more issued findings by the spring of 1990. The last report, however, was not received until 25 months after the cross-acceptance process began. (Please see

Appendix A, which documents the State Planning Commission's receipt of each of these reports .)

Public participation and intergovernmental cooperation have been – and continue to be – critical components of the process. Forty five days after the release of the Preliminary Plan, each of the counties began co-sponsoring informational meetings with the State Planning Commission to explain the Plan in detail to citizens, public officials and interest groups. Follow up meetings with counties and municipalities continued after these introductory sessions. The Office of State Planning (OSP), which supports the Commission in its duties, participated in literally hundreds of meetings with counties, municipalities, interest groups and civic organizations throughout the State. (Please see Appendix B for a listing of cross-acceptance meetings conducted by the Office of State Planning and the State Planning Commission's Plan Development Committee.)

The Office of State Planning established five State Planning Advisory Committees (SPAC) to structure and ensure public participation in the State planning process. These committees were asked to contribute to the formulation of the State Plan by serving as a microcosm of the larger public debate. Each committee met to establish the boundaries of debate, develop a series of findings and recommendations, foster a consensus-building process, and issue periodic reports to the Office and the Commission.

Over 80 individuals and interest group representatives provided their expertise to review the Preliminary Plan and major policy issues arising throughout the comparison, negotiation and issue resolution (described below) phases of cross-acceptance . Reports of the Housing, Natural Resources and Regional Design System Committees were forwarded to the Commission in November 1990. A report of the Peer Review Committee was completed in May 1991. A report was not produced for the Business and Labor Committee for this phase of the process. The five SPACs are intended to be permanent Committees contributing to the development of the Plan throughout cross-acceptance. (Please see Appendix D for a listing of State Planning Advisory Committee meetings.)

The

As the comparison phase reports were reviewed and analyzed, 64 common issues emerged to signal the need for refinements and improvements to the Preliminary State Plan. Broken down into groups of urban, suburban, rural, regional design and process issues, staff analyses included a statement of the issue; specific Plan strategies and policies affected; the range of concerns reported about the issue; and, alternative remedial actions available to resolve the issue. As the analyses were developed for each county, the Commission appointed its Plan Development Committee (PDC) to function as the negotiating entity on its behalf. The Committee began its efforts with informal meetings with each county, their respective

municipalities and concerned citizens during the early months of 1990 to discuss their comparison reports in greater detail.

While these meetings continued, administrative rules were developed for the next phase of cross-acceptance, negotiation. Approved on July 2, 1990, the rule provided for the creation of "Local Negotiating Committees" (IWCs) to represent the counties during the negotiation process. The IWCs, according to the rule, were to be appointed by the County Freeholder Board and were to have at least three members, at least two of whom were planning board members. The other member was to be a member of the county planning staff. The rule also specified that the Plan Development Committee would continue to function as the Commission's negotiating entity, and that at least three of its members must be present for the negotiating sessions with the counties. A 45-day notice for the negotiating sessions between the IWC and PDC was issued for each county.

In addition to the Plan Development Committee's outreach to local and county officials that preceded the negotiation process, the State Planning Commission sponsored training in "interest-based" bargaining for each of the county planning departments. Unlike position-based bargaining, which is common to traditional labor-management negotiations, this training focused on techniques that could be used to solve problems and facilitate consensus-building among the various interests working to craft the State Plan. Finally, in preparation for the actual negotiation sessions, the Committee agreed to establish various types of resolutions to the issues arising in cross-acceptance.

The Committee was particularly concerned about the focus of negotiations as a result of the pre-negotiation sessions. The discussions with local officials frequently strayed from specific policies and strategies proposed in the Preliminary Plan to more philosophical concerns, such as home rule. Another frequent concern voiced at these sessions involved how the State Plan would be implemented, yet the Commission was given no implementation authority in the State Planning Act. While these were certainly legitimate issues of concern, this drift away from actual substance threatened any productive discussion of the Plan itself. This problem was overcome through an administrative framework developed by the Office of State Planning for facilitating the negotiation sessions.

Five types of agreements resulted from the negotiation sessions. Described in detail below, these resolutions are organized by county in this Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns. Explicit agreement indicates that specific wording or mapping changes were resolved to the satisfaction of both parties; agreement in principle signals that a consensus resolution was agreed upon, and specific language would be developed in conjunction with the drafting of the Interim State Plan; agreement to deal with an implementation issue assures local officials that, while beyond the scope of the Commission's authority, the issue would be addressed in an "Implementation Report" that will accompany the release of the Interim Plan; and, agreement to identify concerns provides for

including the general philosophical problems as a matter of public record in this Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns. Agreement to defer permitted the Plan Development Committee the opportunity to canvass each of the counties and develop alternative policy options to solve the problem. In those instances where the issues could not be resolved within the framework described above, the I2C and PDC simply agreed to disagree. These agreements to defer were re-negotiated and subsequently resulted in 41 agreements and 6 disagreements. (See section on rrmt-imotion of Negotiations.^

At least three negotiation sessions occurred with each county. All of the sessions were held in the counties; municipalities were commonly represented on the UC appointed by the freeholders. Only one county, Essex, had municipal negotiating committees organized to represent views that differed from the county's. The process for each began with meetings between the Office of State Planning and the county planning staff to reach preliminary agreement on as many issues as possible and to establish the agenda for future negotiating sessions between the IMC and PDC. Public sessions between the IWC and the Office of State Planning staff followed and the agreements and disagreements resulting from the inter-staff sessions were reviewed. If the INC supported the inter-staff agreements, negotiations on the disagreements continued. In those cases where the Office of State Planning staff did not feel it had sufficient guidance from the PDC, the issue remained a disagreement or was deferred for further discussion at the subsequent IMC/PDC negotiation session. Agreements were either confirmed or revised at the UC/PDC negotiation session. Once again, discussion continued on the disagreements in an attempt to reach an alternative resolution. Each of the deferred issues were discussed in detail as well. The negotiation results for each county session were recorded and published in a Negotiation Update for each county.

Once again, public participation and education played an important role in the negotiation process. Each of the UC/OSP and IHC/PDC meetings were open to the public. Public comment was encouraged and vigorous at the negotiation sessions. The Negotiation Update for each county was made available to the public and served to set the agenda for three regional public forums, which were held specifically to hear public reaction to the Preliminary Plan and the negotiation process. And the State Planning Advisory Committees were kept apprised of the latest developments.

This negotiation structure proved to be remarkably successful. The 64 major issues were presented and discussed according to the unique perspective of each local Negotiating Committee. In total, 548 resolutions were negotiated among all 21 counties. Of these 487 agreements broke down as follows:

- o 123 explicit agreements; o
- 186 agreements in principle;

- o 124 agreements on implementation items;
- o 54 agreements on items resolved as concerns; and
- o 54 agreements to defer.

Only 7 of the 548 resolutions resulted in disagreement. Fifty-four issues were deferred with 18 of the 21 counties. These deferred items fell into five categories, including; Tier 1; Tier 5; Agricultural Issues/Tier 6 Equity; Environmental Issues/Tier 7; and. Volume III guidelines. Due to the policy changes involved in these deferred items, mapping issues were deferred pending the outcome of negotiations.

These deferred issues represented a temporary resolution of the issue and were revisited with each of the counties upon the release of the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Accordingly, the Commission provided for a 150 day negotiation period following the release of the Interim Plan in order to resolve the issues and record these outstanding items as either agreements or disagreements. Warring issues were also resolved during that period.

At the same time, the Interim Plan underwent an assessment of its economic, fiscal, intergovernmental coordination, housing affordability, environmental quality, community life and public service delivery impacts. These impacts were measured against trend development patterns. The results of the study were publicly released and reviewed during the last phase of cross-acceptance.

Continuation of Negotiations

Resolution of the issues that were deferred pending the development of the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan, as well as a discussion of the issues arising during the process of negotiating the mapping of the Interim State Plan with counties and municipalities, took place during the extended negotiation phase.

Counties and municipalities were provided with the opportunity to apply the Interim Plan's mapping criteria, following a 30-day review of the Interim Plan. At the close of that review period, a 150-day period for continuing negotiations began. During that period, negotiations on the deferred issues and mapping were held. (See Appendix E.)

Fifty-four issues were deferred with 18 of the 21 counties; there were no deferred issues in Bergen, Camden and Cumberland Counties (Volumes I, V and XIX, respectively). In total, these discussions resulted in an additional 41 agreements and 6 disagreements, bringing a grand total of 582 agreements and 13 disagreements on policy issues to final resolution through the cross-acceptance process. The resolution of each of the specific issues is discussed in detail below.

Nineteen of the 21 counties forwarded their mapping interpretations of the Interim Plan to the Commission. (Monterdon and Sussex Counties did not provide maps during this period.) Generally, the Commission found the mapping applications acceptable, and these are reflected in the Amended State Development and Redevelopment Plan Map.

Two types of issues relating to mapping did surface during the negotiations, which resulted in inaccurate application of the mapping criteria by counties and municipalities. These inaccuracies are described in this report, and are characterized as either mapping application errors or mapping concerns.

Four of the five State Planning Advisory Committees met during this extended period of negotiations to review the Interim Plan and its accompanying documents. Findings and recommendations of the Business and Labor, Housing, Natural Resources, and Resource Planning and Management SPACs were compiled in reports released in April, 1992. (Please see Appendix D for a listing of State Planning Advisory Committee meetings.)

Issue

The issue resolution phase began in April, 1992 upon the adoption of the amendments to the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan. An administrative rule was formulated to further describe the process. The State Planning Act provided some guidance on the structure of this phase. It required the Commission to hold no less than six public hearings prior to the adoption of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Accordingly, the State Planning Commission held 21 public hearings, one in each county. A supplemental All-Plan Impact Assessment was also released by the Center for Urban Policy Research.

The State Planning Act also specified that the Plan could not be adapted sooner than 30 days or later than 60 days after the last public hearing. Also, these public hearings could not be held until the impact assessment was released.

In addition to receiving testimony from interested individuals at the public hearings, the State Planning Commission also considered comments from the Business and labor, Housing, Natural Resources, and Resource Planning and Management State Planning Advisory Committees. These committees met to review the amendments to the Interim Plan and its accompanying documents, and to provide insights to the Office of State Planning and the State Planning Commission. Throughout the cross-acceptance process, more than 100 individuals met during 40 SPAC meetings to contribute public input to the development of New Jersey's first State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

X.

Bat1 ir?H-

I: HWOTI UUKTX

1. Negotiable Item #7 - Economic Development

AT ISSUE: It is the County's position that the use of local development corporations (IDCs) as an economic development tool should not be limited to Tier 1 communities . IDCs have been used effectively in several Tier 2 communities.

HESO2P: The PDC and INC agree that the absence of IDC policies in other tiers does not necessarily preclude their use and that the PSDRP will be reviewed to clarify the issue.

2. Negotiable Item #8 - Economic Development-State Facilities

AT 1SSK: The County is concerned that State funding for cultural facilities will be limited to Tier 1 communities. It is the County's position that existing cultural facilities should not be denied access to future State funding regardless of their tier designation.

RESORT: The PDC and UC agree that the plan should not imply that existing cultural facilities would be dropped or abandoned. The County should cite specific policies to the contrary for the PEC to review and revise as needed.

3. Negotiable Item #10 - Water Supply

AT ISSIE: It is the County's position that private water companies should be required to prepare a capacity analysis for use by the municipalities. Such an analysis should not be a municipal burden since most municipalities do not supply their own water. A capacity analysis by private companies is not suggested by the PSEKP. The County feels that only the NJDEP or suppliers can determine capacity, not the municipalities.

KESOUT: The PDC and IMC agree that Policy 1.1, Page 35, Vol. II will be revised to include all water purveyors.

4. Negotiable Item #14 - Stream and Scenic Corridor Standards

USBBE: The County contends that the PDSRP's setbacks and buffers are unattainable in developed areas. The state Plan needs to develop suburban standards which recognize and preserve stream and scenic corridors within the parameters of a developed area.

KESDHfc The PDC and IWC agree that upon further clarifying discussions , existing PSDRP policies and guidelines adequately address this issue but that alternative policies or guidelines submitted by the County will also be considered.

5. Negotiable Item #15 - Air Quality-Energy Conservation

KE TSSKks It is the County's contention that the PSCKP does not adequately address energy conservation issues.

RESQUF: The PDC and UC agree that additional energy conservation policies submitted by the County will be considered for inclusion in the Plan.

6. Negotiable Item #16 - Planning Education

XS XSSCE: In reference to Comprehensive Planning Policy 1.5, Guideline b, it is the County and municipal position that planning education for municipal officials should be voluntary. The County agrees that planning courses and seminars should be made available to planning officials if they so desire to attend, but making this training mandatory would be asking too much of people who volunteer their time to serve on local planning boards.

KESOHT: The PDC and INC agree that the State should promote and support planning ^duration so as to be consistent with Policy 1.5 in the Comprehensive Planning section of Volume II of the PSCKP. It is agreed that Volume III was intended only to be a set of guidelines and not to be mandatory in nature.

TOOK Us mm ciuuv

1. Negotiable Item #9 - Tiers 6 and 7 Rural Development Area Character

AT ISSUE: The County was concerned about coverage percentages offered in Volume III of the Preliminary Plan being equated with zoning. Other mechanisms are available to protect environmental areas and agricultural areas.

BESOUTs The FDC and LNC agree that Volume III guidelines are not mandatory and were not meant to be interpreted as zoning ^{ar^} they should not be applied on small parcels of land. In addition, «mlT, gmriwirniprrrfcailTy-semgit-i-QP» ai t*>g (ESS) exist in all tiers and can be protected and recognized in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan through the application of the Plan's Statewide Strategies for Natural and Cultural Resources.

2. Negotiable Item #5 - Council on Affordable Housing's (COAH) Use of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan

AT ISSUE: The County prefers to see wetlands, stream corridors, greenways and blueways recognized as potentially undevelopable land areas in Tier 4, and believes that COAH should not use these areas as a basis for fair share housing allocations.

KKSUUFt The FDC and IXC. agrees in principle that housing policies in the Interim Plan, including COAH allocations, need to be carefully weighed along with environmental constraints. Both parties also agree that the Interim Plan would include language that developable and undevelopable land exist in all tiers.

3. Negotiable Item f 3 - Social Welfare Issues in Tier 1

AT ISSEE: In terms of Tier 1 issues, Mercer County is concerned about the City of Trenton. In order for revitalization to truly occur in the State's capital, a number of important social welfare issues need to be addressed. Obese issues have not been given adequate attention in the PSDRP.

RESO2F: The FDC and the IMC agreed that the social welfare issues should be deferred until the PDC hears more from other counties.

Plan

A new Statewide Policy Section in the Interim Plan "Urban Revitalization" has been included and addresses this issue. Policies for Revitalization and Human Resource Development address issues such as human services, public health, education, employment training and public safety and crime prevention.

EESOUF: The FIX and HC agree that human service needs have been adequately addressed in the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #8 - Tier 6 Implementation

ISSDB: Mercer County believes that mechanisms such as TDR and development of new villages in Tier 6 could help to resolve the equity issue.

KESOUF: The PDC and the I24C agree to defer the issue regarding siting new villages, in Tier 6 until the PDC has consulted further with other counties. The parties also agree that any transfer programs should be planned within a regional framework with the boundaries defined and the villages providing the buffers to farms (not visa versa) .

m state Plan Response:

A new mechanism for managing growth in Centers is included in the Resource Planning and Management section of the Statewide Policies. Growth should be allocated to existing Centers first, and planned for new Centers second. This applies to all Planning Areas.

TCR is one of several tools which the Interim Report of the State Planning Commission on Implementation Issues recommends.

KESUFFS: The PDC and IWC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses the means for establishment of villages in Planning Area 4.

5. Negotiating Item # 10 - Tier 6

AT I59Es Mercer County believes that the State Planning Commission must address the viability of agriculture as an industry in New Jersey and in specific regions in the State. Support industries and infrastructure that can accommodate farm machinery must be provided in these regions.

BBSOCFF: The PDC and UC agree to defer this issue until the PDC can consult with the other counties. The parties also agree that agriculture could be a viable industry in Mercer County, providing that adequate tools and resources for farmland preservation and profitability are available. Additionally, policies in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan that may distinguish between "long-term agriculture core areas" and "short-term agriculture areas" may offer solutions to this issue.

a State Plan. Responses

A section of Statewide Policies for Agriculture was developed for the Interim Plan. These policies aim to preserve and promote the agricultural industry. The Statewide

Agricultural Policies will help to retain farmland by coordinating planning to protect agricultural viability while accommodating beneficial development and economic growth necessary to enhance agricultural vitality.

BESDBF; The PDC and IXC agree that the Interim Plan policies that deal with the viability of agriculture as an industry adequately address this issue.

VCUK HI : UUUSQN CUUKLT

1. Negotiable Item #17: Mixed-Use Development

AT ISSE: Established urban neighborhoods could be adversely affected by large-scale mixed-use developments. Not all neighborhoods are suitable for mixed-use developments.

RESOUT: The OSP clarified the policy for the IMC, stating that mixed-use is intended to be used in ways that are commensurate with community scale and market demand, recognizing that this development pattern is not appropriate in every neighborhood. The scale, scope and intensity of local redevelopment projects in urban areas is a municipal prerogative. The PDC and UC agree that mixed-use developments are not appropriate to every neighborhood.

2. Negotiable Item #18: Permit Streamlining

Xf ISSUE: Streamlining is primarily and generally necessary at the State level and for regional agencies/ such as the HMDC, although there may be instances where this is appropriate on the county or municipal levels. "One-stop shopping" for requisite State permits should be provided. Greater Coordination within and between State agencies should be encouraged.

RBSOUF: The PDC and IWC agree that while streamlining is certainly necessary at the State level, the problem is not confined to any one level of government.

3. Negotiable Item #29: Corridor Center vs. Urban Center

AT ISSKK: Urban centers should receive priority for State capital expenditures and facilities over corridor centers.

KESOKFi The PDC and UC agree that urban centers should be given priority over corridor centers.

4. Negotiable Item #23 - Scenic Corridors, Urban Standards

KT ISSCE: The definition and regulation of scenic corridors should be refined to include an urban orientation. The scenic corridor guidelines that presently exist in the State Plan, as they relate to Tier 1 areas, should only be applied where feasible or appropriate. All guidelines should be particularly sensitive to the unique character of scenic corridors in Tier 1 areas.

RESORT: The PDC and INC agree that this issue of an urban orientation for scenic corridor guidelines be deferred pending the PDC's further analysis of the Volume III format. The EDC and IWC further agree that if guidelines are provided with the Interim Plan, environmental and natural resource issues need to be carefully crafted so that they may be reasonably applied to urban areas.

BB stajbe Plan Responses

A Policy Objective for the Metropolitan Planning Area is to mitigate future negative impacts to scenic corridors. This objective serves as a guide in the application of the Statewide Policies with respect to scenic corridors. Specifically, development and redevelopment should be managed to maintain, complement and enhance scenic values within identified and delineated scenic corridors. Scenic corridors should be protected by appropriate means and preserved by using easement purchase, transfer of development rights, fee simple purchase and other innovative and effective

KE9DUF: The FCC and INC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

HCEHE IV: MTJuti'ic (JUJHB

1. Negotiable Item \$9i Bnpact of State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERF) .

KC ISSCE: An impartial economic analysis must be performed analyzing impacts on population, jobs, rates, economic development on a town, county and regional basis.

The PDC and UC agree that an Economic Impact Assessment will be performed on the Interim Plan, as required by State statute.

2. Negotiable Item #11: The effect of SERF on Agricultural land values and borrowing power.

XT ISSGB: HDW will the SDRP impact land values in rural areas, and the farmers' ability to borrow against the value of their land?

KESQUTs The PEC and I29C agree that the impact of the SERF would be evaluated in the required impact assessment that will accompany the Interim State Plan. The parties also agree to drop the reference to the Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns.

3. Negotiable Item #4 – Implementation of Agricultural Policies and Equity Programs

KC ISSQB: Atlantic County's municipalities rejected Tier 6 designations on the grounds that equity will disappear; agricultural plots are small compared to other areas statewide; portions of municipalities are designated Pinelands Agricultural areas; farms are already being converted; and, Buena may want to expand infrastructure into agricultural areas.

Funding and programs for maintaining agricultural equity must be in place before implementation of SERF. Atlantic County would like to see the State farm preservation program linked to Tier 6 designation. Tier 6 and agricultural policies are acceptable, but need funding to implement. The County feels that growth management practices which adversely affect land values should be minimized. More comprehensive solutions should be provided to prevent disproportionate windfalls and wipeouts in the value of undeveloped land.

RESCEffs The PDC and IMC agree to defer discussion on this issue since the Plan Development Committee is currently in the process of formulating an approach to address a range of agricultural issues.

The New Jersey Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Policy Statement expressed concern over this issue and offered recommendations for equity protection. These equity protection options included the following: continuation and expansion of the Farmland Preservation Program; creative funding options; and creative land use options. The State Planning Commission incorporated these suggestions in the Interim State Plan and the Implementation Report.

The Implementation Report recommends enacting legislation to provide for a stable source of funding for the continued purchase of development rights. The Implementation Report also incorporated the Agricultural Policy Statement's recommendation that legislation enabling counties and municipalities to undertake tax-exempt installment purchases

of farmland be enacted. The Implementation Report also recommends the enactment of a statewide Transfer of Development Rights program.

The Interim State Plan incorporated the creative land planning recommendations proposed by the Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Policy 7 recommends creative land use tools, such as clustering, as a means of maintaining the viability of agriculture and protecting equity.

BBSOE2F: The PDC and IMC agree that the interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

4. Negotiable Item #8 - Tier 7 Policies, Coastal Wetlands

AT ISSTC: Atlantic County has substantial land areas of coastal wetlands that they have designated as Tier 7. Tier 7 policies do not consider coastal wetlands, and do not consider that wetlands often abut highly developed areas. This issue is linked to Tier 1 delineation criteria. The County has two Tier 1 municipalities, both with substantial coastal wetlands. Designation as all Tier 1 does not make sense. The County recommends that the Tier delineation criteria be revised to allow the designation of Tier 7 within Tier 1, so that a municipality could either be all Tier 1, or both 1 and 7.

KESOJC: The PDC and INC agree to defer this issue until the roc decides to either ftit-gr- tlgr delineation criteria or add policy provisions to accommodate anomalies that may result from the application of those criteria. (See SFC Resolution No. 90-006, May 25, 1990.)

Ji Stabs Plan

In addition to revamping the land classification system (tiers to Planning Areas), the Interim Plan recommends the nomination of Critical Environmental Sites to map environmentally sensitive areas of less than 1 square mile. These areas should be managed in accordance with applicable statewide strategies. The combination of these two revisions should adequately address the County's concerns.

BBSOCV: The PEC and IWC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

1. Negotiable Item #2: Funding for the Implementation of Adaptive Raise/Conversion Policy

AT ISSUf: Parts of the County are currently in an adaptive reuse/conversion stage. large houses are capable of conversion to apartments and many of the commercial structures are being converted to multi-uses including residential and commercial.

Funding to support this policy, both for the technical work and for bachng reconstruction through various programs, should be provided.

RESOft 03*3 PDC and UC agree that adaptive reuse/conversion is appropriate in parts of Caroden County. There are existing Federal and State programs that support this policy. Ackitionally, the inclusion of this policy in the Plan will help agencies focus on enhancing implementation of this policy.

2. Negotiable Item #4; Enhancing Transportation Planning and System Management

A3? ISSUE: Transportation planning with the emphasis on traffic capacity management and flexible rapid transit, para-transit systems, rail corridors and pedestrian/bicycle ways is needed in Camden County. Bus transit has also been identified as a very important (tut lacking) element in Camden County.

BESOT: The PDC and ISC agree enhanced transportation planning, system management and transit service are necessary to maintain and improve circulation in Camden County. Inclusion of this series of transportation policies in the Plan should result in improved mobility in the County. The OSP will monitor this issue, following the Final Plan adoption, as part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Process.

3. Negotiable Item #5: Disagreement with the Office of Management & Budget (CKB) Municipal Distress Index Criteria

AT ISSIEs The MiTiv^lp^ Distress Index criteria (including per capita income, ratio of older housing [pre-1940] and equalization valuation per capita) , exhibits discrepancies between economic forces in the NYC-Northern New Jersey Metropolitan area and the Phila-Southern New Jersey Metropolitan area.

RESORT: Ine PDC and INC agree that CMB's Municipal Distress listing is inappropriate as a Tier 1 del ipfiat.ion criteria. Tier 1 should focus on form and areas exhibiting distress should be addressed, regardless of the tier designation, where it is prevalent, as a Statewide Strategy.

4. Negotiable Item #7: State Certification of Economic Development programs.

KF ISSStEs The County would encourage the development of local economic programs and plans. Although the State may wish to provide assistance, guidelines and make recommendations for improvements, these plans should not need to "conform" to State certification requirements.

REStCF: The PDC and UC agree that the interest of both parties is served by the establishment of local Economic Development Offices and the language of the Plan should reflect certification only in the event that a community seeks priority consideration.

5. Negotiable Item #8: The Protection of Undeveloped Stream Corridors

XX ZSSIE: A very important aspect of stream corridor protection is ensuring that adjacent 'municipalities with contiguous stream corridors cooperate to protect the corridor. This will be facilitated through the County's District meetings.

KBSOUP: The PDC and UC agree that the protection of contiguous stream corridors are of statewide importance and are presented and discussed in the Statewide Strategies chapters of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSCR) . Stream corridors often continue beyond a municipality ' s boundaries , therefore , it is appropriate for the County to coordinate planning for protection of the corridors through processes such as Camden County's District Planning Process.

6. Negotiable Item #9: A Final State Plan Should Not be Adopted Until an Impact Assessment is Completed

KF ISSDB: The County supports legislation that recommended an impartial economic, fiscal, social, and environmental impact assessment of the Plan's impacts before a Final Plan is adopted.

The PDC and UC agree that the impact assessment will be completed on the Interim State Plan, as required by State statute.

7. Negotiable Item #10: The Need for Reasonably Priced Housing is Very Apparent Throughout Camden County.

ISSOB: Reasonably-priced housing must be supported by all levels of Government, not just through Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) requirements, but through additional action programs. The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission has created the Regional Affordable Housing Committee to further research this problematic policy area.

HKSOGP: The PDC and LNC agree that the Plan language will be revised to provide policy direction for a range of reasonably priced housing beyond low and moderate income housing currently addressed by the COAH.

8. Negotiable Item #12: The Plan Should Not be Implemented Without Proper Review

JET ISSGE: The County Is concerned that mandated regulations will be adopted and enforced by the State based upon the current general State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP), and its strategies, policies and guidelines. These should be further defined and appropriate standards should be proposed to clarify their intent. Work sessions with the public should be held by appropriate State agencies prior to the enactment of these regulations.

RESffiF: The PDC and I2C agree that the Plan will be implemented by many parties and implementation of Plan policies can only occur through existing or Executive authority, after proper rulemaking procedures have been executed or through legislative action.

9. Negotiable Item #13: Recognition of Historic Preservation Districts

Jff ISSUE: Many of the County's "older" municipal ities have active historic preservation societies and/or districts. Even, municipalities that do not have active programs support the Ictea of rehabilitation of historic structures and preservation districts.

BESHff: The PDC and IMC agree that historic structures and districts are important elements for a community and they should be identified, evaluated and protected, where warranted. The parties also agree to consider any additional language offered by the County regarding this policy.

10. Negotiable Item #19: Policy 1.6 Tier 3: Land Planning and Development – Urban Boundaries

AT ISSQE: Gibbsboro's municipal boundaries are coexistent with the Tier 3 boundary. The opportunity to establish an

"irrtym boundary," which appears to be an effort to create "greenbelts" around Tier 3 areas, is suitable only for certain types of municipalities (i.e., the rural towns). It is less likely that suburban towns, such as Gibbsboro, would be able to establish such boundaries.

It is suggested that the County has suggested that the State Plan should be modified to clarify its intent and to establish criteria for drawing urban boundaries. The clarification should focus on municipalities similar to Gibbsboro that are surrounded by growth or developing

RESUff: The FDC and IMC agree that Tier 3 towns surrounded by developed or developing areas (Tiers 2 & 4) should not establish urban boundaries, as the surrounding area is already urban or urbanizing.

11. Negotiable Item #21: Relevance of Policy language to Developed Communities. (Tier 1, Policy 3.7 - Mixed Use Development and Policy 1.8 - Recommending the Formulation of a Community Design Plan).

AT ISSUE: Brooklawn believes that mixed use development and a design plan would be superfluous, since major design elements are in place and wholesale demolition and rebuilding in this community is unlikely.

The County believes that even though Brooklawn is fully developed, community design plans could be incorporated into sustained renewal (conversion/reuse) plans. The formulation of a well considered community design plan will help Brooklawn slow down the disinvestment process that is occurring in many older communities.

KESCX2F: Die FDC and UC agree that redevelopment is an ongoing process and in order to accomplish the objective of these policies, communities that are "fully developed" should continue to plan and establish guidelines for redevelopment.

12. Negotiable Item #24: Historic Areas, Policy 1.2 - Registration

KS ISSUE: Camden City recommended a modifying the Plan to list all significant sites and structures in a Municipal Register, in addition to those included in the National and State Registers, as is suggested in the Plan.

The County agrees with Camden City that this policy should be expanded to include municipal registers in addition to the National and State Registers.

Camden City pointed out that while introductory paragraphs in the Historic Area chapter of the Plan discussed municipal efforts in historic preservation, improvements are not mentioned in Policy 1.2. This policy should be expanded to include municipal registers.

RESQEF: The PDC and IWC agree that the language in Policy 1.2 should be expanded to include recognition of the Municipal Register of historic structures, districts and areas. This will bring the policy language into conformance with the "intent" section.

13. Negotiable Item #25: land Planning and Redevelopment – Policy 1.4, Funding Urban Recreation

AT ISSTC: Camden City has noted, and Camden County agrees, that funding from appropriate State departments and other sources is critical for the successful implementation of this policy. The development and maintenance of open space, parks, and recreation facilities require additional and permanent funding sources and the creation of a structure to administer them.

BESOUF: The FDC and IDC agree that the policy calls for the funding of urban recreation and it should result in improved urban recreation opportunities. The Office of State Planning will monitor this issue, following Final Plan adoption, as part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Process.

14. Negotiable Item #26s Housing Development – Policy 4.8, Housing Enterprise Zones

Jffi ISSQE: Camden City has noted, and the County agrees, that incentives and controls should be established for users and residents as they are for developers, the City and County believe that the Housing Enterprise Zones Policy should be expanded to include the establishment of incentives and controls for users and residents as they are currently for developers.

RESOtSs The FDC and INC agree that housing incentives and subsidies need to be applied to both developers and residents in Housing Enterprise Zones. The Plan language in Policy 4.8 will be revised to incorporate the necessary language.

vi: mm GULJKH

1. Negotiable Item #2: Permit Streamlining

JKP ISSOB: Regulatory delays should be minimized at the State level. The municipal permitting process should be left alone since the problem does not lie at the municipal level. Consolidating regulations into a unified statewide development regulation, as has been suggested, is inappropriate*

KESOUF: The PDC and INC agree that permit streamlining is necessary at the State level. The parties further agree that it may also be necessary, based upon local review, at the County and municipal levels of government.

2. Negotiable Item #6: The Final State Plan Should be Reviewed Prior to Adoption

JKT ISSDE: The County and municipalities want the opportunity to evaluate and comment upon the State Plan's impact and to suggest alternatives prior to its adoption.

: The PDC and U£ agree that all parties concerned will be afforded an opportunity to evaluate and comment on the Interim Plan. They also agree that copies of the Interim Plan, Impact Assessments and Implementation Report will be supplied to counties and municipalities prior to the public hearings required by statute.

3. Negotiable Item t10A: Comprehensive Planning – Project Reviews*

US ISSUKs The review process for projects of significant regional impacts should include the municipalities.

The PDC and IMC agree that the Plan should be clarified to ensure that the nrffvjn-ipfli role in project reviews will not be pre-empted.

*Please Note: Negotiable Item fl0 was treated as a two-part issue. Please see page 7 for the resolution of issue 10B.

4. Negotiable Item #15: Stream Corridor Buffers in Developed Areas

JHP ISSKEs The State Plan does not adequately address areas in Tier 2 municipalities that are already developed up to the banks of stream corridors. Some communities cannot meet the State Plan's stream corridor buffer guidelines because of existing development. The Office of State Planning explained, however, that the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment plan (PSDRP) does not require specific setbacks from all streams in urban areas. While traditional

flood control measures may be infeasible, innovative watershed and stormwater management techniques, coupled with facilities improvements, should be considered in urban areas.

KTOEJFs Ine PEC and LNC agree that based upon further discussion, clarifying the PSDRF, the existing PSDRP policies and guidelines adequately address ,this issue.

5. Negotiable Item #16: Solid Waste Disposal - Planning and Facilities

ISSOE: The State Plan should be modified to place greater emphasis on recycling, out-of -state disposal, regional solid waste management solutions and strict limitations on the siting of solid and hazardous waste facilities in Tier 1 municipalities. More emphasis should be placed on source reduction rather than waste disposal.

The OSP explained that effective waste management involves source reduction, recycling, resource recovery and disposal. The State Plan acknowledges and supports the existing regulatory and infrastructure investment mechanisms with respect to solid and hazardous waste management.

KBSEff: The FDC and I2C agree with this recommendation, policy clar.1ficat.inn, and also agree that the County's view is not inconsistent with that of the PSDRP.

6. Negotiable Item #20: New Tier Designation – Change portion of Tier 1 to "Tier 8 Historic District"

AT ISS(E: To preserve the integrity of the prevailing architecture in historic districts, the County has recommended creating a "Tier 8 wist-m-iV District" for portions of Tier 1.

HGSKEff: 3he PDC and LNC agree that historic districts need to be recognized. However, rather than creating a new tier, the parties agree that the Statewide Strategies, which could possibly be coupled with an ESS designation, adequately address the needs of historic districts.

7. Negotiable Item #12 – State Funding and Programs, Priority to Tier 1 for State Expenditures and Programs

Kf ISSUE: The County believes that Tier 1 municipalities should not be prioritized over other areas of the State for State funding or programs.

KBS03: The FCC and IMC agreed to defer this Issue pending the proposed restructuring of Tier 1 and any redefinition of priorities resulting from those changes.

m state Plan. Response

Public investment priorities are no longer tied to any one "tier," or what are now known as "Planning Areas." Generally, the Plan's public investment policies give priority for projects and programs in distressed urban communities while providing opportunities for non-distressed communities to meet their needs as well. State agencies are encouraged to consider many different factors when determining the allocation of discretionary funds, so that those communities actively working to implement the State Plan can be given appropriate assistance toward achieving those goals. Highest priority will continue for public health and safety, and for infrastructure maintenance and repair, regardless of location.

The PDC and INC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

8. Negotiable Item #13 - Capital Facilities, Public Expenditures
for On-Tract and Off-Tract Facilities

AT ZSSOB: State expenditures for on-tract and off-tract capital facilities should not be prioritized to Tier 1.

BESDUF: The PDC and IXC agree to defer this issue pending the proposed restructuring of Tier 1 and any redefinition of priorities resulting from those changes.

t State

The Interim Plan does not specifically prioritize expenditures for on-tract or off-tract capital facilities. Public investment priorities are no longer tied to any one "tier," or what are now known as "Planning Areas." Generally, the Plan's public investment policies give priority for projects and programs in distressed urban communities while providing opportunities for non-distressed communities to meet their needs as well. State agencies are encouraged to consider many different factors when determining the allocation of discretionary funds, so that those communities actively working to implement the State Plan can be given appropriate assistance toward achieving those goals. Highest priority will continue for public health and safety, and for infrastructure maintenance and repair, regardless of location.

KESQZF: The PDC and U3C agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

VEE: OCXfiH CUuffif

1. Negotiable Item #9: Infrastructure Funding Priorities

AT ISSQB: The State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) must ensure that funds will be available to meet municipal needs statewide, not just to direct funds to urban areas. All tiers need funds to maintain and upgrade existing services and facilities. The Plan must allow infrastructure funding in tiers 5, 6, and 7 if a public need has been established.

KESCBZFs The PDC and IWC agree that funding for the maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure should be available to meet municipal needs statewide in all tier designations if a public health or safety need has been established.

2. Negotiable Item #10: State Planning Commission (SPG) Treatment of Comments Contained in the County and Municipal Reports

XT XSSK: There is a fear that changes recommended in the County Cross-Acceptance Report will be ignored by the Commission.

EEBSOUFs The PDC and IMC agree that the cross-acceptance process is a cooperative effort intended to give counties and municipalities an active role in shaping the SDRP.

3. Negotiable Item #14: Municipal Participation in State Planning Process

Kf ISSQEs Municipal officials want to be reassured that the SPC will allow them to comment on the State Plan throughout cross-acceptance.

8ESOUF: The PDC and UC agree that the cross-acceptance process is a cooperative effort intended to give counties and municipalities an active role in shaping the SEKP.

4. Negotiable Item #16: Tier Housing Policies – Housing Design Standards

SS ISSIEs Tier policies that call for improved housing standards need clarification to indicate that the standards

apply only to basic protection of public health and safety. Otherwise, if mandated, they could lead to increased housing costs.

KESDUT: The PDC and INC. agree that improved housing design standards are encouraged by the Plan, but not mandated.

5 . Negotiable Item #17 : Statewide Site Plan/Subdivision Standards

KP ISSUE: A standard site plan/subdivision manual should not be mandated for statewide use, but offered as a guide book. The County is opposed to proposed legislation that mandates its use.

The PDC and IHC agree that design or performance guidelines offered in the Plan are recommendations for the purpose of technical assistance.

6. Negotiable Item #18: Tier 3 Policies – Application of Miraflores Use Policies

KF ISSUE: Not all Tier 3 municipalities have developed in a pattern as assumed in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSERP). therefore, strategies that call for mixed-use zoning would not work well.

BESQUT: The FDC and INC agree that the SERF encourages compact growth where appropriate, and included policies concerning mixed-use as one set of tools to accomplish this goal. Mixed-use is intended to be used in ways that are compatible with community scale, recognizing that this development pattern may not be appropriate in every area.

7. Negotiable Item #21: Basing Infrastructure Priorities on Tier Tel i

KT TSBRR; The County explained that one of its municipalities believes that State funding priorities should be based on need, not tier designation. Moreover, the municipality feels the tier system should not be used as a basis for funding and permitting decisions. The tier system should not be implemented.

KESDUT: The FDC and I2C sustained the earlier agreement reached with the OSP, through which both parties disagreed with a municipal recommendation that funding priorities should not be based on the tier system and that the tier system not be implemented. The parties (PDC and UC) noted that promoting growth in certain areas and managing how and

where growth should occur within these areas responds to a legislative mandate to provide a plan "...which shall identify areas for growth, agriculture, open space conservation and other appropriate designation."

8. Negotiable Item #22: Snail towns and Funding for Housing Rehabilitation

AT ISSCE: Small towns are often ignored in receiving funding for housing rehabilitation. If these towns are to provide for affordable housing, they need to be provided with funds.

RESOHT: The PDC and UC agree that small towns need funding for housing rehabilitation if they are to provide affordable housing.

9. Negotiable Item #23: Funding for Economic Development

ISSCB: Tier 3, Policy 3.1 recommends that the State fund regional or county-level economic development offices to coordinate economic development functions. A municipality was concerned that these offices would create another level of bureaucracy. The money is needed more at the county level.

RB9K2F: The PDC and Ut agree that regional or county-level economic development offices should be established to provide a coordinated and comprehensive approach to economic development. The PDC and LNC also agree, as recommended in the Policy, that these offices be funded by the State.

10. Negotiable Item #24: Regionalization of Affordable Housing

Xf ISSUE: There is a need to regionalize affordable housing, but it should be at the County level, not at the State level (Tier 3, Policy 4.1),

RESKEff: The PDC and IMC agree that counties and municipalities should plan a comprehensive housing program which will encourage a wide range of housing choices at reasonable cost.

11. Negotiable Item #11 - Tier Applicability in Coastal Area

AT EBSBBE: Tier 3 policies will allow compact and concentrated development (which Surf City opposes). A tier 4 designation would better preserve the environmental sensitivity and community character.

HUSUUF: The PDC and IMC agree to defer the discussion until Surf City, which raised this concern, has reviewed the resolution to Issue #7.

Til IMF* !• Stflts P13H

Interim Plan recommends a land classification system of Planning Areas and the designation of Centers, called the Resource Planning and Management System. This revised system should be more compatible with the unique nature of the New Jersey Coast. Designation of the coastal area will be done in consultation with the county, municipalities and the Division of Coastal Resources.

RES02F: The PDC and UC agree that the Interim State Plan adequately addresses this issue.

TOUHE V111s HHB90XH UUUFEX

1. Negotiable Item #P2: Park Land in Tier System

AT XSSDE: Should the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERP) classify all lands into tiers, regardless of ownership status, zoning, categories and land use activities.

JflfiWFs The PDC and UC agree that the SCRIP will recommend that park land of less than one square mile in contiguous area be classified into an appropriate adjacent -tier based on the application of tier criteria. Larger park lands will be delineated as parks. Small, park lands should be shown on maps maintained by counties and municipalities.

2. Negotiable Item #P7B: Rural Development Gni tell res*

XT TSKKHRT The County believes that carrying capacity measures should be well understood and not based on a single tool, such as the nitrate dilution model.

The PDC and UC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. The parties also agree that the nitrate dilution model will be renewed from the SERP.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 4 under the "Agreements In Principle" section for the resolution of P7A.

3. Negotiable Item #P8: Character of Small Communities of Place

Kf ISSKEs Hhe County believes that infill and rehabilitation should be sensitive to architecture heritage; fringe development should be compatible with existing community character.

KESQUF: The PDC and I2C agree that the SERF will encourage development within or adjacent to existing Communities of Place that is compatible with the desired community character by emphasizing cmmunity design.

4. Negotiable Item #A16: Statewide Transportation Policy 1.1

KC ISSCE: Guideline a. of this policy states: "The NJDOT, counties and municipalities should be proactive in the development of transportation -F«rni'-Hpfl which promote the objectives of the SDRP. " Hunterdon County approaches transportation planning from a different perspective.

KESkKPs The PDC and INC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. Alternate mechanisms, such as siting large traffic Generators in proximity to existing infrastructure with available capacity; separating local and through traffic along major transportation corridors; and, developing street standards which are more cost effective and sensitive to the rural environment will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

5. Negotiable Item #P4 - Rural Tiers

HS8BS: The County is concerned that agricultural viability and environmental sensitivity have not been understood in the growth management context of the tier system, and would be more effective in the Statewide Strategies and Policies or as a single tier.

BESO2F: The PDC and UC agree to defer this issue as per the SPC Resolution 90-006 (May 25, 1990), which authorizes the PDC to consider changes in the nature of the tier system and statewide policies, the parties also agree that the SERF will define appropriate roles and relationships among statewide and tier policies; and the SDRP will emphasize differences in the design of, and objectives for, rural development and associated public facilities and services among exurban, agricultural, and environmentally sensitive tiers.

6. Negotiable Item #P9 - Other Communities of Place

AT ISSEE: The County is concerned that the integrity and special character of existing villages and hamlets would be threatened if the majority of new growth in the County were focused in or around existing settlements. The County has suggested that the SERF provide for new villages and hamlets in Tier 6 or 7 where a carrying capacity analysis demonstrates that the site is suitable and infrastructure can be provided efficiently.

KESQUF: The PDC and IWC agree to defer this issue pursuant to SPC Resolution 90-006, May 25, 1990. The PDC is reconsidering the definition of appropriate opportunities for new development in appropriate forms in Tiers 5, 6 and 7. As part of this reconsideration, development of new villages and hamlets in Tiers 6 and 7, where development capacity is documented and design is compatible with tier intent/ will be considered for inclusion in the Interim SERF.

KESKE2F: The Hunterdon County Planning Director notified the Office of State Planning by letter dated February 3, 1992, that a meeting between the Hunterdon County IHC and the PDC would not be necessary for the purpose of discussing deferred negotiation items. The Hunterdon County Planning Board is satisfied with the Commission's resolution of these issues in the Interim Plan.

VQCDK IXs CTiHiTgfuat uuufn

1. Negotiable Item t1: Tier 7 Delineation

Kf ISS3E: lack of uniform support for a Statewide Plan. The value of an environmentally sensitive area should not depend on municipal nomination or delineation. There should be uniform statewide policy standards for the protection of environmentally sensitive lands. The County believes it should not be a municipal option to designate anything not fulfilling statewide standards.

BESOHF: The PDC and IMC agree that the protection of environmental features is achieved under the Statewide Strategies in the Plan and should not depend on local nomination or

2. Negotiable Item #8: Economic Impact Analysis

AT TtaMHtFR: An Economic Assessment is vital to the implementation of the Plan. A Final Plan should not be adopted without an assessment of its potential impact of infrastructure costs, land equity, housing costs, etc.

BESOH: -The PDC and IZJC agree that the Impact Assessment will be completed on the Interim Plan. An Impact Assessment will be conducted on the Interim Plan as required by law. The Final Plan will only be adopted after the assessment has been performed. The assessment will address the impact of the Plan on the economy, the environment, community life, fiscal capacity and intergovernmental relations.

3. Negotiable Item #9: Infrastructure Needs Assessment

Kf ISSOB: The requirement to conduct an Infrastructure needs assessment was burdensome for many municipalities. The State Planning Commission (SPC) should take the lead in preparing a comprehensive assessment of infrastructure needs. The Division of Local Government Services in the Department of Community Affairs (DC&) and SPC could provide a tremendous amount of guidance and technical assistance.

KESQCP: The PDC and IZJC agree that the State Planning Act requires the Commission to prepare an infrastructure needs assessment. The parties also agree that the OSP will continue to provide technical support throughout the State planning process to assist counties and municipalities in linking infrastructure and local planning.

4. Negotiable Item #12: Plan Impacts on Growth Municipalities

AT ISSffi: Many rapidly growing municipalities are looking to limit growth, but the State Plan's growth designations will promote yet higher densities, overtaxing existing infrastructure and school facilities. State agencies should assist growing municipalities in the costs of accommodating growth.

RESORT: The PDC and UC. agree that the Plan calls for this commitment. According to the Plan, the State as well as local government has the responsibility to consider the anticipated development of an area and to proactively plan for facilities to accommodate growth.

X: SKUI GDOEQY

1. Negotiable Item #8: Classification of F.I mm- as a Village Rather Than Tier 6B

KF ISS8BB: As a fully developed community, Elmer fulfills most of the requirements of a village (except sewers), the area meets the description of an existing village and should be designated as such, within an agricultural area.

KES02P: The PDC and IHC agree with this village designation.

2. Negotiable Item #11: Perms Grove is Seeking a Change From the Tier 3 Designation

Jff ISSOE: Perms Grove meets all the criteria for a Tier 1 community and would like to receive possible benefits associated with this t.ier designation.

KBXE2F: The PDC and UC agree that Perms Grove meets Tier 1 criteria, therefore, the tier designation should be modified to reflect this request.

3. Negotiable Item #12: Designation of Salem City

AT ISSffi: The City recommends delineating the entire City as Tier 3 (no Tier 6 or 4) . Tier 3 reflects current infrastructure location and allows the City to better accommodate rural growth.

BES0tfe The PDC and IUC agree that this change may be appropriate. Salem City may be defined as a Urban Center Policy Area in the Interim Plan,

TOOK XI: iraharm ULUECEX

No issues were resolved as agreements with Monmouth County during the preliminary negotiation phase.

1. Negotiable Item #G-1B — Inclusion of Volume III as part of the SCKP

AT ISSDB: Many of the strategies and policies were not clearly written and not consistent with each other, and were therefore difficult to interpret. Monmouth County would like their proposed new wording for the strategies and policies to be used in the Final Plan. The County would like Volume III to be eliminated from the Plan.

RES02F: The PDC and Ut agree to defer the issue of the role of Volume III as it is being reconsidered by the PDC, pursuant to the SPC Resolution of JSeY 25, 1990.

M State r1^P1

The format of the Interim Plan is different in an attempt to be clearer and easier to interpret. There is one General Strategy. Policies apply to Statewide Issues only. Volume III has been eliminated from the Plan.

KESoff: She FDC and INC agree that the Interim Plan responds to the County's concerns regarding rigor and inconsistency of the Volume III guidelines as well as its inclusion as part of the SDRP.

2. IfegotiahLe Item 3G-5B – Equity

KE 3S5QB: 3fte County is concerned that development densities recommendad in the PSERP for Tiers 5, 6, and 7 are not realistic without a means to compensate landowners. Legislation to permit transfer of development rights and other mechanisms should be in place.

REjDUF: Tte FDC and IWC agree to defer this issue because of role of Volume III is being , reconsidered/ pursuant to Resolution Ifo. 90-006, passed by the SPC on May 25, 1990.

Tni-CT-i» state Plan Response:

Specific development densities are not included in the Interim plan. The Implementation Report contains recommendations that rail for legislation to enable transfer of development rights , impact/linkage fees , timing and sequencing, equitable taxing of publicly owned watershed lands, counties and municipalities to undertake tax-exempt installment purchases of farmland, as well as other tools that would address the equity issue.

Die HE and INC agree that the removal of development densities, the new agricultural policies and the legislative reconmendations contained in the SPC's Interim Report on Implementation Issues address the viability of agriculture and landowner equity.

3. Negotiable Item #H-1 – Bayshore Tier Designation

JET 3SSDB: An example where more flexible Tier 1 criteria is needed is for the Bayshore Communities. Die coranunities in the Bayshore, north of Routes 35 and 36, share a number of common characteristics. The median income levels are lower than those of the County as a whole, and some of the existing housing stock, much of which was originally built for seasonal use when the Bayshore was a popular simmer resort, is in need of rehabilitation. These areas are part of larger municipalities. This entire area should be targeted for increased State funding.

KESQUT: Ohe PDC and IMC agree to defer this discussion due to the fact that the PDC is currently reconsidering the statewide revitalization strategies and policies for Tier 1

communities, pursuant to Resolution #90-006 passed by the SPG on May 25, 1990.

yi State Flso.

The Interim Plan has combined former Tiers 1 & 2 into Planning Area 1. Municipal boundaries are not a delineation criteria for the Planning Area. Public investment priorities are no longer tied to any one Tier, or what are now known as Planning Areas. Urban Revitalization is a new Statewide Policy section that addresses distressed communities. Priority for projects and programs is still given to distressed urban communities.

The FDC and I2C agree that the Interim Plan addresses the Bayshore concern for State assistance to distressed communities in the Statewide section on urban revitalization .

4. Negotiable Item #M-4/T-2 – Tier SB Folded Into Tier 5

AT ISSUE: The County proposed a new Tier designation, defined as Tier 5B – Environmentally-Sensitive Exurban Reserve. Tier 5B would be a tier in which natural resources are protected by encouraging relatively low-density residential uses and low-intensity, limited-capacity, on-site "package plants." Tier SB areas contain important natural resources, but are more appropriate for a special Tier 5 designation than a Tier 6B or 7 designation because they contain or are surrounded by lands that have undergone significant suburbanization.

Agriculture, public open space and recreation, and conservation should be permitted as co-uses in Tier SB areas, and the land development ordinances for these areas should require or provide incentives for deed-restricting land for these purposes. These ordinances would permit the use of such "flexible design" techniques as clustering, the transferring of development density among multiple properties, and averaging lot sizes.

Municipalities should make use of the substantial tract areas that will remain undeveloped in the Tier SB areas to increase the amount of stormwater infiltration and the quality of the runoff that eventually reaches the surface waters of the watershed.

In addition, traffic reduction ordinances should be encouraged to aid in the reduction of paved parking areas.

BESIDE: The PDC and UC agree that the issue of the definition of Tier 5 will be deferred while the FDC continues

to explore a classification of the meaning of the tier, pursuant to Resolution #90-006 passed by the SFC on May 25, 1990.

Tnl **r **

The Fringe Planning Area is primarily served by a rural, two-lane road network and on-site well water and wastewater systems. This planning area is a predominately rural landscape with scattered small Centers and free-standing residential and commercial development. Agricultural operations may still be active on a fairly large scale. More compact deliberately designed community patterns can reduce land conflicts and encourage the preservation of rural character. Areas over one square mile that meet the criteria for Planning Area 5 should be delineated Planning Area 5. Areas over one square mile that meet the criteria for Planning Area 3 should be delineated Planning Area 3. Municipalities that have environmentally sensitive aspects may nominate sites under one square mile as Critical Environmental Sites for local planning purposes. These sites should be locally identified and mapped to ensure a level of protection, equivalent to that which would be afforded by inclusion in the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area.

KESdff: The PDC and IMC agree that the policies, intent and criteria for Planning Area 5, and the Critical Environmental Sites will address these environmentally sensitive areas.

5. Negotiable Item #S-4 - Mixed Use Development

Kf ISSCE: The County considers the PSDKP definition for multi-use development (comprehensively-planned development that contains at least three interdependent uses) too ambitious for Monmouth County. Some towns would consider having mixed-use development on a much smaller scale. No town was interested in mixed-use development as defined in the Preliminary Plan. The definition of mixed-use development should be expanded to include smaller-scale, mixed-use development alternatives.

RBSOUF: The PDC and UC agree to defer this issue because the county concern revolves around not only the concept of mixed use, but also the role of Volume III, which is being reconsidered by the PDC pursuant to the SFC Resolution of May 25, 1990.

m State

The Interim Plan defines Mixed Use Development as "The development of a tract of land or structure with three or

more different uses such as, but not limited to, residential, office, manufacturing, retail, public, or entertainment in a compact form. Mixed use development is often found in very small forms.

KBSQCP: The PDC and LNC agree that the Interim Plan's definition of mixed use development is appropriate.

6. Negotiable Item #T-2 – Tier 5

AT ISSTE: As currently defined. Tier 5 is not realistic. The County recommends a new definition for Tier 5, which preserves natural resources by encouraging relatively, low-density residential development or low-coverage, non residential development with self-contained wastewater treatment plants.

RESEE2F: The PDC and UC agree that the issue of the definition of Tier 5 will be deferred while the PDC continues to explore a clarification of the meaning of the tier, pursuant to Resolution #90-006 passed by the New Jersey SPC on Kay 25,

ii State Plan Response

The general intent of the Fringe Planning Area is to encourage development in or at the edges of existing communities, or in well-planned, self-sufficient new communities. The character, location and magnitude of new development should be based on the capacities of the natural and built environment. In the environs of Centers, the landscape should remain relatively open.

RESOUF: The PDC and I2C agree with the definition of the Fringe Planning Area.

TOOK XEE: 1KKUS OXHET

1. Negotiable Item fP5: Rural Development Guidelines

AT ISSIE: The County has noted that carrying capacity measures should be well understood in order to be implemented properly. Should the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERP) define guidelines, procedures, and design standards that determine the capacity of rural land to accommodate development?

RBSffiT: The PDC and INC agree that detailed guidelines and procedures for carrying capacity analyses will be provided through handbooks and other technical assistance.

2. Negotiable Item tP11: Models and Regulations

M? ISSKE: The County believes that SERF provisions should be flexible to accommodate local conditions. Should the SERF recommend implementation of statewide standards?

The PDC and IWC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and will provide technical assistance by interpreting the meaning of a policy.

3. Negotiable Item #Alb: Statewide Comprehensive Planning Policy 1.5 - Upgrading Planning Capability: Planning Education*

AT ISSUE: The County notes that counties should only encourage, and not require, training, as indicated by Guideline b. -Training Citizen Planning Officials and Guideline c. -Training Professional Planning Staff, (Both:) Counties and municipalities should require, and provide adequate funding for training. . .

KESDCFs The FDC and IMC agree that Policy 1.5 states that the State should promote and support planning education. planning guidelines pursuant to this policy are advisory and not regulatory, and provide technical assistance.

4. Negotiable Item #A2b1: Statewide Comprehensive Planning Policy 2.2 - Coordinating Planning: County and Ifcmicipal Plans*

Kf ISSDBs The County believes that Guideline c. - Preparing Ccounty /Municipal Implementation Plans - implies vertical integration (Policy 2.3), and counties and municipalities are concerned that the consequences of inconsistency with the SERF are unclear.

HBSKEff: The PDC and INC agree that Guideline c. will be considered in the context of Policy 2.3.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 20 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution, of A2b2.

5 . Negotiable Item 3A27 (1) : Statewide Biological Diversity Strategy 1 - Ecosystem Management*

Jflt ISSKE: A policy statement that addresses the prospective development rights and opportunities of wetlands areas should be included in the SERF.

RESCEJF: The FDC and IWC agree that development opportunities in wetland areas are defined by existing statutes and regulations administered by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (CEP).

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 23 under the "Implementat5ng" section of this Update for the resolution of A27(2).

VXZK XHI: BDROHEECH (JULW7

1. Negotiable Item #1; Equity Protection/Transfer of Development Rights (TER)

AT ISSDB: Support is needed for legislative action to provide for statewide *TER* as a planning tool to implement the goals of the plan while mitigating the windfall-wipeout syndrome associated with land use actions. Agricultural preservation funding should receive highest priority in Tier 6 areas.

BESQEP: The FDC and IDC agree that TDR is one of the mechanisms that is included in the State Plan to provide equity protection by eliminating the windfall-wipeout syndrome associated with land use actions.

2. Negotiable Item #10: Infrastructure Financing

Kf ISSDB: The County feels that long range infrastructure provisions and maintenance needs should be identified and a priority system established to meet those defined needs. Existing deficient infrastructure should receive priority consideration in the funding system.

Areas in need should be determined and receive priority regardless of tier designation. Agriculture strategies should address infrastructure funding to support agriculture (e.g., roads to get crops to markets), The infrastructure funding section should address needs for infrastructure in rural areas to support agriculture (e.g., road maintenance).

RESORT: The PDC and I2C agree that capital facilities priority systems will be presented more comprehensively in the Interim Plan. Maintenance of existing systems will continue to receive priority over new infrastructure construction.

3. Negotiable Item #13: Regional Planning Coordination

KTXSSOB: The county noted that townships have expressed support for stronger county planning efforts and increased State assistance for local growth management projects. The appropriate level to centralize the planning process and yet account for the vast differences between areas of the State, is the County. They are large enough to encompass numerous municipalities yet small enough to effectively service an area.

KKSUUF: The FDC and IWC agree that regional coordination is being addressed by the increasing role undertaken by the Burlington County Office of Land Use Planning. OMs is evident in both cross-acceptance and by initiating the county-wide consensus planning program.

4. Negotiable Item #14: Economic Analysis of the State Plan

AT ISSffi: An economic analysis of the impact of the State Plan should be conducted prior to any final adoption. Its ramifications should be identified and analyzed. The final Plan should incorporate the study's major findings.

RESORT: The PDC and INC agree that an Impact Assessment will be completed prior to the formulation of the Final State Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #18: land Banking (Statewide Housing Policy 2.3)

KF XSS(E): The County recommends a plan requirement that land banking acquisition be connected to specific objectives that are consistent with municipal master plans to avoid the perception of public sector interference in the marketplace.

KESU/T: The FDC and IOC agree that municipalities and counties should connect land banking acquisitions to specific objectives and sites consistent with municipal or county master plans.

6. Negotiable Item #20\$ Statewide Housing Policy 1.2, Reducing Housing Costs

IS ISSDE: The County has called for intergovernmental coordination in the development of a comprehensive statewide housing plan. Specifically, the development of a comprehensive statewide housing plan should include input by the municipalities and counties.

BB5KE2F: The PDC and IMC agree that the development of a comprehensive statewide housing plan should include input from the counties and municipalities.

7. Negotiable Item #21: Economic Development

XT ISSQB: The State should promote and support economic development through county-based economic development offices, economic development Offices should be included as the County develops its comprehensive planning capacity.

KESWF: The PDC and IMC agree that the appropriate level for economic development planning offices in suburban and rural areas is the county.

8. Negotiable Item #23: Implementation

JKF ISSCE: The County believes the Plan should be used as a guidance and technical assistance program, not as mandated official State policy. The relationship between the State Plan and plans of other State agencies, such as NJ Department of Transportation, NJ Department of Environmental Protection, and NJ Department of Community Affairs should be addressed, the State Plan covers areas such as transportation, housing, environmental protection that are already addressed by the functional agencies.

KESQF: The PDC and IWC agree that one purpose of the State Plan will be to serve as a growth management policy document. Clarifying the Plan's intent is necessary; language stating the same should be included in a preface to the Interim Plan.

9. Negotiable Item #28: Flood Plain Regulations

AT ISSUF: Springfield Township believes that flood plain development regulation and historic preservation inventories and protection should be controlled at the municipal level.

RESCEff: The PDC and UC agree that flood control and historic preservation measures should incorporate municipal input and regulatory efforts, however, the County and State share in the responsibility to protect the public's health/safety, and welfare.

10. Negotiable Item #11 - Agricultural Preservation Financing

JKP ISSGE: Due to the scarcity of funds available for the preservation of agriculture, the acquisition of development

rights and agriculturally-based TER programs should only be applied in Tier 6 areas.

FESQTO¹: The PDC and INC agree to defer this issue pending the development of agricultural policy provisions of the Interim Plan. The County was invited to take an active role in the upcoming policy discussion.

m State Plan. Response:

The Interim Plan includes a new Statewide Policy section that addresses agriculture. The viability of agriculture as an industry and Policies to support it are the focus of the Statewide Agriculture Policy. The Infrastructure Investment Statewide Policy in the Interim Plan includes language that targets agricultural lands in the Rural Planning Area for agricultural preservation programs. The Interim Plan contains policies that address innovative land use tools, timing and sequencing and transfer of development rights to accommodate growth in Centers within the Rural Planning Area.

KESQUT: Ibe PDC and INC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

MCWIWK XIV1

1. Negotiable Item #2B: loss of Potential Tax Eatables*

AT ISSOS: 33ie effects of government actions on property values is a municipal concern in Passaic County. Some municipalities feel that there are proposals in the State Plan which could result in the lowering of the development potential of tracts of land. Municipalities will probably resist attempts to place lands in low-growth tiers if they feel such areas have the potential for producing ratables. The municipal view is that these actions will lead to a loss of potential ratables without compensation. Property tax reform offers a potential solution to their problem.

The PDC. and IWC agree that the full impact of the Interim Plan will be addressed in the Impact Assessments conducted on the Interim Plan, which will consider the Plan's economic, fiscal, environmental, intergovernmental relations, and community life impacts.

*Please Note: Issue #2 was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The resolution of Issue 2A is reported under the "Concern" section on page 12.

2. Negotiable Item #8: Comprehensive Planning

•MP T«IMMR« she County is concerned that requiring compatibility between local plans and the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SCRDP) pre-empts home rule. The OSP to the UC that the State Planning Act (P.L. 1985, c. 398) is not intended* to contradict provisions of the New Jersey State Constitution, the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law or the County Planning Enabling Act. Specifically, the State Planning Act calls for the SPC to "develop and promote procedures to facilitate cooperation and coordination among State agencies and local governments with regard to the development of plans, programs and policies which affect land use, environmental, capital and economic development issues."

The PDC and IFLC agree that Comprehensive Planning Policy 2.3 does not require the vertical integration of plans.

3. Negotiable Item #9: Capital Facilities - County and State Review of Plans

XT ISSQE: The County suggested that the State should define what is meant by "review" in Capital Facilities Policy 1.2. If veto power is suggested, then this is unacceptable. The OSP explained that in order to provide adequate capital facilities and related services at a reasonable cost, the State believes that county and municipal governments should ensure that such facilities are planned in accordance with the growth management goals and objectives of the State Plan. Capital Facilities Policy 1.2 calls only for State review of county or local plans, and is not meant to imply any veto power over such plans by the SPC. This policy helps to ensure the vertical integration of plans, and aids in the preparation of an infrastructure needs assessment required by the State Planning Act.

RESORT: The PDC and IWC agree that this is a policy clarification issue and that this policy is not meant to imply any veto power over county or local plans by the SPC.

4. Negotiable Item #10: Economic Development - Planning Offices

KF ISSHBE: The State should not require local financial support of economic development offices, as implied by Economic Development Policy 1.2.

RESOUT: The PDC and INC agree that Economic Development Policy 1.2 does not call for the mandatory establishment of municipal or county economic development offices. I5iis is

only a recommended mechanism for the coordination of economic development activities at the municipal and county levels of government.

5. Negotiable Item #11: Economic Development - Mixed-Use

AT ISSCE: The County cautioned that the State should recognize that mixed-use development is not appropriate for all communities. The OSP explained that mixed-use is intended to be used in ways that are commensurate with community scale and market demand, recognizing that this development pattern is not appropriate in every neighborhood. The scale, scope and Intensity of local redevelopment projects in urban areas is a municipal prerogative. The PDC has emphasized the need to devise an Urban Design Handbook to address some of the concerns raised by this issue.

RESffif: The PDC and LNC agree that this is a policy clarification issue. The PDC and UC agree that mixed-use developments are not appropriate in every neighborhood.

Negotiable Item #17: Scenic Corridors

KE TSSfkz West Milford Township would like to see the extensive system of marked and unmarked hiking trails which traverse it designated as "scenic corridors" in the State Plan. The County Planning Board is supportive of West Milford's proposal, as they also occur in several Passaic County municipalities. The Board hopes to work with the SPC to determine the best method to achieve this objective.

The PDC and UC agree that, since the County is supportive of the municipal position, the County will designate the appropriate trails as scenic corridors.

7. Negotiable Item #18B - Comprehensive Planning, Horizontal Integration of County and Municipal Plans

KS XSSCE: Guideline "c" for Comprehensive Planning Policy 2.2 does not implement the policy. This is vertical, not horizontal integration.

RE5OUT: The PDC and UC agree that the issue concerning guidelines for the horizontal and vertical integration of plans be deferred pending the PDC's further analysis of the Volume III format.

issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the FSCR. This guideline calls for county and municipal master plan compatibility with the State Plan. This is vertical, not horizontal/ integration. This guideline was misplaced in the PSERP.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. The Interim Plan has one general policy in the Comprehensive Planning section which calls for the development of plans that are integrated and coordinated with plans at all levels of government.

Often FDC and LNC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

8. Negotiable Item # 19B - Economic Development, Review and Evaluation of State Performance

ISSUE: The Guidelines in Volume III for Economic Development Policy 1.1 outline tasks that should be performed by municipal governments. Local actions are not mentioned in the policy statement. The policy statement should reflect this, or guideline "a" should be changed by removing any references to local tasks.

UPDATE: The PDC and UC agree that the issue concerning guidelines be deferred pending the PDC's further analysis of the Volume III format.

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP, these guidelines called for State, county and evaluation of economic development trends as well as the analysis of national and regional economic performance. The County is correct in pointing out that the policy statement does not refer to any local actions.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. To address this data evaluation issue, the Interim Plan has a general policy in the Economic; Development section which calls for the development of an integrated and coordinated economic development data base that is to be shared by the State, counties and municipalities.

UPDATE: The PDC and XIC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

9 . Negotiable Item #20 - Air Quality, Guidelines in Volume III

ISSCE: Air Quality Policies 1.1 and 1.2 should be restated to reflect that the guidelines in Volume III outline tasks for municipalities to perform. The policy statements do not indicate municipal tasks. As an alternative, the guidelines should be revised to better reflect what is stated in the policy statement. In addition, the guidelines seem to indicate that standards have already been developed.

BESOff: -.The FDC and INC agree to defer this issue pending the future role of Volume III guidelines in the State Plan.

M State Plan. Response

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP. The guidelines for these policies refer to the municipal preparation of air quality assessments as well as municipal plans, programs and regulations dealing with emissions resulting from new development and redevelopment. The County is correct in stating that the policy statements do not refer to municipal tasks, unlike the guidelines which do.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. The Interim Plan calls for a coordination of planning at all levels of government to ensure that both land and capital facility development and redevelopment will lead to attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

The PDC and INC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

10. Negotiable Item #21 - Air Quality Assessments

Kf ISSDEs Preparing air quality assessments is too expensive for municipalities and may be counter to the policy to reduce regulatory costs and delays. The Air Quality Policy 1.2 guidelines, if carried out to their extreme (e.g. all capital facilities improvements) , would be too broad in their application, resulting in additional costs and delays far even the most inconsequential improvements (e.g. street paving or bridge repairs).

KESQUT: The FDC and INC agree to defer this issue pending the PDC's analysis of the future role of the State Plan's Volume III guidelines. If the guidelines are to remain a part of the Plan, the issue of possible added costs and delays will be addressed.

jpi State

The Interim Plan does not require air quality assessments for development projects. The Interim Plan calls for a coordination of planning at all levels of government to ensure that both land and capital facility development and redevelopment will lead to attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

RESORT: The PDC and U4C agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

11. Negotiable Item #22 - Air Quality, Transportation Management Agencies

JKT ISSW: Guideline "a" for Air Quality Policy 1.4, which calls for the municipal encouragement of contributions to a transportation management agency, is an unnecessary cost-inducing requirement. It is not realistic to expect small to accomplish the tasks in the guidelines.

KBSO2F: The PDC and INC agree to defer this issue pending the PDC's analysis of the future role of Volume III guidelines in the State Plan.

M Stcibe Plso.

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP. The guidelines for this policy called for the encouragement and formation of transportation management agencies by the State, counties and municipalities.

Specific policy guidelines are not included in the Interim Plan. The concept of transportation management agencies is included in the Transportation Section under Policy 11, "Personal Mobility." The policy calls for the movement of more people, rather than more vehicles, when making transportation investment decisions. Transportation management agencies are seen as innovative organizational arrangements to be used to achieve this end.

KUUff: The FCC and IHZ agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

12. Negotiable Item #23 - Water Supply

AT ISSDB: In reference to Water Supply Policy 1.4, guideline b, it is financially impracticable or too late to require sewers for most seasonal dwelling conversions in Passaic County. The policy should consider this.

BESffif: Xbe PDC and UC agree to defer this Issue pending the PDC's analysis of the future role of the Volume III guidelines in the State Plan. If the guidelines are to remain a part of the Plan, the issue of "retrofitting" existing communities that were subject to seasonal conversions years ago will be addressed.

M State Finn

This issue is in reference to the Guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP. The guidelines for this policy rail for the use of cctnmanity sewage systems in residential developments of 25 or more dwelling units along with associated, non-residential development. The conversion of seasonal dwellings to year-round use would be included.

While these and other policy guidelines are not included in the Interim Plan, Policy 21 of the Infrastructure Investments section cal Is for the necessary infrastructure investments in seasonal communities that are undergoing transition to year-round ccmunities in order to remedy threats to the public ' s health and safety, and to ptevtail environmental degradation.

HtiSUUF: The PDC and IljC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

13. Negotiable Item #24 – Rural Development Area Character

KF ISSDB: The Rural Development Area guideline, to preserve at least 95% of the gross area of a development parcel in agricultural use and/or open space, is too stringent.

FESCEV: The PDC and IMC agree that the issue concerning the suggested open space ratio for the rural development area be deferred pending the EEC's further analysis of the Volume III format.

fj state Plan.

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP. This guideline, for the maintenance of rural character in a Rural Development Area, <^11« for the requirement of development to preserve at least 95 percent of the gross area of the development parcel in agricultural use or open space.

Specific guidelines are not included in the Interim Plan and there is no reciprocal policy.

KESUff: The PDC and IWC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

TOOK XV: OUEE Ififf GOOHET

1. Negotiable Item #1: Economic Impact Assessment

JEF ISSOB: An economic impact assessment must be provided that includes the cost of infrastructure, urban revitalization and the value of equity losses due to growth curtailment, should this become a reality.

BESOUR: The PDC and LNC agree that an economic impact assessment will be performed on the Interim Plan, as required by State Statute.

2. Negotiable Item #2: Delineation of Proposed Cape Hay National Wildlife Refuge

3SSQE: The County has included the proposed refuge on the Cape May tier maps. It should be incorporated into the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERP) as an open space project.

BBSCEffs The PDC and IMC agree that the proposed Cape Hay National Wildlife Refuge should be delineated on SDRP tier maps.

3. Negotiable Item #4: Accommodation of Coastal Area in Tier System

AT TaWHR; The Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSDRP) tier system does not currently consider the coastal area. Existing criteria, strategies and policies do not adequately reflect the concerns of the coastal communities. The SDRP must recognize the needs of the County's coastal communities.

BKSUff: The PDC and UC agree that the tier system and the statewide strategies should be strengthened in terms of their relevance to the coastal region, in order to adequately address the diversity and needs of the coast. Such language, when drafted, will be referred to the Division, of Coastal Resources, coastal counties and the PDC for review.

4. Negotiable Item #7 - Agricultural Uses

ISSBBS: Agricultural uses should be expanded to allow aquaculture, salt hay farming and the smaller high-value truck and roadside farm stands that serve the large seasonal tourist population.

KB5KE2T: The PDC and LNC agree that aquaculture, salt hay farming, and small truck and roadside farms are important

agricultural uses in Cape May County and should be managed consistent with statewide strategies and policies on agriculture. The SPC, however, is considering changes to agricultural policies in the Plan, pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006.

M Stste PJuU

The Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan is a public policy document, and as such, does not affect specific activities. However, the definition of agriculture in the Interim Plan has been exrvmdpd. Additionally, the Interim Plan has included a new statewide policy that addresses agriculture as an industry in the State. < The viability of agriculture as an industry and policies to support it are the focus of the new section. *&e infrastructure Investment Statewide Policy includes language that targets agricultural lands in the Rural Planning Area (PA 4) for agricultural preservation programs.

RBSCEXs The PDC and IMC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

5. Negotiable Item #8 – Agricultural Practices

AT XSSTC: The County believes that the Plan should provide a better definition of toxics, and reasonable provisions for their use should be allowed regarding farm practices such as fertilizers and pesticide use, conditioned upon best management practice as recommended by County Agricultural Extension Services.

RESU2F: The PDC and IMC agree that the SPC is considering changes to agricultural policies in the Plan, pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006.

The Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan is a public policy document, and as such, does not affect specific activities . However, in the Statewide Agricultural Policy section, Policy 14 encourages the use of acceptable management practices.

BBSKEff: The PDC and IWC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

6. Negotiable Item #9 – Water Supply

AT ISSOS: The agricultural tiers should be accorded the highest priority for water supply, especially in drought periods.

KESCU: The PDC and IWC agree that in order for agriculture to continue, adequate and reliable water supplies are necessary, however, the SPC is considering changes to agricultural policies in the Plan, pursuant to SPC Resolution 190-006.

Tnf*»i-i« State Plan. Response:

The Interim Plan includes a policy on agricultural water use in the Statewide Water Resources Policies section, Policy 23.

KESQK: The PDC and UC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

7. Negotiable Item #19 – Garments and Reconinendations on Volume III

AT XSSDE: Many standards contained in Volume III are unrealistic. Cape May County idpntififfd several examples in Volume III, including the nitrate dilution model, agricultural area sizes, and tnyjr naterial storage. Kiey have been grouped into one issue.

UtfiWP: She PDC and UC agree that discussion on the role and content of Volume III of PSDRP should be deferred as the PDC currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume HI in the Interim Plan.

M state Plan. Response:

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan.

KSKEff: The PDC and INC agree that the Interim State Plan adequately addresses this issue.

8. Negotiable Item #22B – Conditions for Reinstating Tier 6 in County Haps for the SERF

AT ISSQB: In order for the County to delineate current agricultural areas, certain conditions must be met. Such conditions would provide a basis for Cape Kay County to provide for Tier 6 in the mapping system.

The County believes that the current mitigation policy of the Division of Coastal Resources should be changed to satisfy objection of all parties. The current OCR policy is

inconsistent with the current agriculture preservation.
~~program~~ of the State Agricultural Development Program.

BGSOHs The PDC and IWC agree that the SPC is considering changes to agricultural policies in the Plan, pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006.

The State Planning Act requires the State Planning Commission to rely on the adopted plans of the Division of Coastal Resources (now Office of Regulatory Policy) in the coastal area. As such, the current regulations are beyond the scope of the Commission. Although there were numerous discussions during the cross-acceptance process between the Division and the County, to date the current agricultural mitigation policy has not been altered. This will require meetings with Cape May and DCR.

The PDC and **INC** agree that this issue has been adequately addressed.

TOOK XVI:

1. Negotiable Item #PS-3: Planning Goal

KC ISSDE: The State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERF) should include a goal calling for the establishment of a continuing planning process that TMimigies public and other interest-group involvement and as well as maximum coordination between all levels of government. Policies should promote coordinated regional planning at the county level, including roles for advisory committees, public outreach, and provisions for continuing funding mechanisms to support planning.

The PDC and IMC agree that the cross-acceptance process is a cooperative effort intended to give counties, Ities, the pibl In and other interest groups an active role in shaping the Plan. The PDC and IWC further agree that the last goal in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSCR) , "Ensure sound and integrated planning statewide," responds to the County's concern.

2. Negotiable Item #PS-4: Plan Review Process

AT JSSOE: The SCR should call for and describe procedures for coordination of State, county and municipal plans through the cross-acceptance process on a periodic basis. The State should not have review power over municipal and county plans.

JOfiWPs The PDC and lit agree that some municipalities may have misinterpreted the intent of the cross-acceptance process. The Interim Plan may include language that clarifies the review and revision process.

3. Negotiable Item #PS-6: Economic Development — Balance

XS ISSQB: The SDRP should specify a strategy for economic growth that balances resource protection with the needs of the agricultural, housing, industrial, retail, service and resort components of New Jersey's present and future economy.

RESORT: The PDC and IWC agree that the impact assessment will address this issue. Appropriate changes will, be included in the Final SDRP.

4. Negotiable Item #PS-9: Regional Design System (RDS)

AT ISSTe: The SDRP should expand the elements of the RDS to include: "Town Centers" (mixed-use development concentrated at lower densities than "Corridor Centers"); "Waterfront Redevelopment Areas" (water-oriented mixed-use development with a provision for public waterfront access); and, "Downtown Preservation Areas" (providing mixed-use development with marketing and promotion emphasis to preserve and enhance existing commercial activity). The County proposes locations for all of these elements, which are recommended on Figure 2 in the Middlesex County Cross-Acceptance Report (page 9).

RESffiF: The FCC and I/C agree that "town centers," "waterfront redevelopment areas," "downtown preservation areas," and other designations may be in the RDS in the Interim Plan. Those elements will be integrated into the RDS as community design technique guidelines in an RDS or urban design handbook or manual that will be prepared by the OSP.

5. Negotiable Item tPS-10A: RDS - Planning*

KP JSSfK: The SERF should recommend the preparation of detailed design plans for each dpi Iwntpri area element of the RDS. These plans should include: provision of alternatives to the automobile, traffic reduction methods, parking and vehicular movement, safe pedestrian movement, design standards, balanced mix of land uses, and protection of the natural environment.

KESCKT: The PDC and lit agree that an RDS or urban design manual, to be prepared after the release of the Plan, will include design guidelines.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 9 under the "Implementation" section for the resolution of PS-10B.

Negotiable Item #PS-14: Tier 7

KF ISS (E): The SERP should recommend that all Tier 7 areas be subject to rigorous review for environmental protection standards and requirements of State and local governments. The Tier 7 assignation does not, however, represent an environmental zoning

Ps The PDC and IHC agree that a Tier 7 designation does not constitute a recommendation for an environmental zoning classification.

7. Negotiable Item #PS13 - Agricultural Preservation

AT ISSKE: The PSDRP should require long-term agriculture economic development and marketing studies and plans for «n Tier 6 areas in order to support agricultural viability, address land value (equity) concerns and insure the avail ability of support services to the agriculture industry in those areas.

KESOBF: The PDC and INC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently in the process of formulating an approach to address a range of agricultural issues. In the May 25, 1990 Resolution, the PDC was authorized to consider the development of a set of statewide strategies and policies for agricultural development.

m State Plan

The long-term viability of agriculture is currently addressed in the Interim Plan in the Statewide Agriculture section. In addition, the State Planning Cmmission's Interim Report on Implementation Issues suggests that the Department of Agriculture carry out such development and marketing studies and plans.

KESORS The PDC and INC agree that the Interim Plan has redefined Tier 6 as Planning Area 4, Rural Planning Area, and now does not restrict land use activities to only agriculture. Tte Interim State plan permits development of Centers (Cmmunities of Place) in Rural Planning Areas. The SPC's Interim Report on Implementation Issues suggests that agriculture economic development and marketing studies and plans be prepared by the State Agriculture Department. The SPC's Interim Report on Implementation Issues should also encourage the use of transfer of development rights and/or credits and the continued State and local planning and

funding support for agriculture development easement purchase under the State farmland Preservation Program to address land equity concern. A permanent funding mechanism should be found to support this.

8. Negotiable Item #SG-1 – Specificity of Volume in

AT 3SSQE: Specific standards or guidelines governing land development should be separated from the SDRP and presented as separate implementation manuals or guidance documents .

KBSOHf: The PDC and IWC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan, as per the May 25, 1990 SPC Resolution.

State Plan Response:

Volume III guidelines have been eliminated in the Interim Plan. These guidelines may be incorporated into future manuals.

KESCE2P: The PCX: and UC agree that specific standards or guidelines governing land development are not included in the Interim Plan.

9. Negotiable Item #SG-2 – Policy 1.2a Nitrogen Standard, Use of the Nitrate Dilution Model

XC ISSffi: The nitrogen standard to be used in the nitrate dilution modeling to determine density provisions for land development should be addressed in the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection standards for water quality and should be referenced as such by the PSCRP.

BESOEC: The PDC and I2C agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

« State Plan

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the SERP. This guideline is for managing the intensity and use of development and non-point source pollution control measures in the rural development areas to protect surface and ground water from pollution.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. Instead the Interim Plan includes several general

policies in the Water Resources section which calls for the protection and control of ground and surface water resources.

KESOUF: The PDC and INC agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan, and the County's concern has been satisfied.

10. Negotiable Item # SG-3 – Policy 1.3a Water Supply in Rural Areas

IT ISSIE: The SERP should make provision for a density of land development that can support the cost of extension of public water supply systems to rural areas where contamination has resulted in loss of private well supplies.

KESOUT: The PDC and INC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

Bi StlfcB PX3D.

This issue refers to the guidelines in volume III of the PSCR. This guideline called for municipalities to ensure that development in rural areas have safe and adequate on-site potable water sources.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. Instead, the Interim Plan has several general policies under Water Supply Management in the Water Resources section which address the issue of development and water resources in the State.

KESQJF: The PDC and INC agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan/ and the County's concern has been satisfied.

11. Negotiable Item #SG-4 – Policy 1.4.d (page 3-196) – Establishing Performance levels for Rural Road Networks

AT ISSStEs The State Development and Redevelopment Plan should recommend provisions for movement of slow-moving farm vehicles and equipment in transportation planning for agricultural areas.

HBSDCfF: The PDC and UC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

* StsdbQ Plan.

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the SERF. This guideline called for irMnl^ppi it-jog, counties and the Department of Transportation to nonage the level of development in the rural development area so that it does not create traffic rigmarvte which exceed the capacity of the rural roads.

KESQUEs The PDC and LNC agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan, and the County's concern has been satisfied.

12. Negotiable Item #SG-5 – Policy 1.S.c Size of Agricultural Land Units

AT ISSCE: The SDRP should not designate a minimum size for agricultural land units. Viable fanning areas should reflect market considerations and should be of whatever size is appropriate to local conditions, including zoning, soil/ and crop types.

WSXSEz ttie PDC and UC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

» **State Plan BoBpcnse:**

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSERP. This guideline called for TfflffTif?-jpai-j-H&p to maintain minimum agricultural sites of not less than 40 acres.

Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan. Instead, the Interim Plan deals with the viability of agriculture in a new section in the Statewide Policy Structure called Agriculture. In addition, there is no longer reference to any size for agricultural land units.

B&3E2P: The PDC and IMC agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan, and the County's concern has been satisfied.

13. Negotiable Item #SG-6 – Policy 1.lc(3) Clearing of

IS ZSStE: The SERF guidelines for land clearing should be revised to permit land clearing necessary for pedestrian movement and out door activity areas appropriate to the development type.

HESKEZFs Tte PDC and INC. agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

a State Plan Response:

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSERP. This guideline called for all new development be located so as to preserve the maximum amount of vegetation on a site. Specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan.

KESQUFs The PDC and UJC agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan/ and the County's concern has been satisfied.

14. Negotiable Item #SG-8 – Corridor Center Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

KF ISSUE: The PSCRCP called for a FAR of up to 4.0 for Corridor Centers. Edison Itwnship noted that this FAR exceeds the character of existing suburban office developments in Edison Township. The Township allows a maximum .75 FAR. Consideration should be given to lowering the Corridor Center FAR. Ohe County supports Edison's interest.

KtSUUT: The PDC and UC agree to defer discussion on this issue as the PDC is currently formulating an approach to address the role of Volume III of the Preliminary Plan in the Interim Plan.

M St&tEi

This issue refers to the guidelines in Volume III of the PSDRP. The guideline suggested that Corridor Center density should range between 1 and 4. However, specific policy guidelines are no longer part of the State Plan,

BESOJT: The IWC and OSP Staff agree that this guideline is not contained in the Interim Plan, and the municipality's and County's concerns have been satisfied.

xvm atHHCTr oanro

1. Negotiable Item #4: Economic Impact Assessment

AT XSSDE: An assessment of the economic impact of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) must be completed

and discussed publicly before adoption of the final SERF. The impact of the SERF on labor supply/ the high cost of housing, the availability of adequate land for future development, and the local tax base has to be included in any economic impact study.

RESOUF: The PDC and IMC agree that the Impact Assessment will address these issues. Appropriate changes will be included in the Final Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #6: Housing Cost

AT JESUE: SERF policies, if implemented, should not increase the cost of housing. An analysis of land available for new housing at reasonable prices should be performed.

KESOFF: The PDC and IXC agree that it is not the intention of the SERF Raising Policies to increase the cost of housing. However, the Impact Assessment of the Plan will evaluate its impacts on housing cost.

3. Negotiable Item #7: Housing for Specialized Populations

KF ISSDE: The State Plan should address the full spectrum of housing needs within the State. An analysis of the State's housing needs should be included in the Plan. Policies addressing the various segments of the housing market must be included. For example: one area of concern is the effect of the rising cost of maintaining housing for senior citizens; another is the narrowness of the Council on Affordable Housing (COFH) income guidelines—many households in need of affordable housing fall outside of the guidelines; a third area are the housing needs of specialized populations and policies regarding group homes, homeless shelters and transitional housing, these should all be included in the Plan.

The PDC and INC agree that the issue of Housing policies for specialized populations need to be addressed. Specific concerns for the Preliminary Plan raised by Somerset County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion in the Interim SERF.

4. Negotiable Item #9: Aviation Facilities

JET ISSCE: Bedminster notes that any changes in the classification of private airports should recognize local zoning and land use and should be consistent with the intent of the State Plan. There should be a difference between

changing the operations of smaller recreation airports and larger public aviation facilities with the burden of proof moving in favor of municipalities for local airports.

Montgomery states that a balance must be achieved between the capacity and demands of an aviation system, and the existing and planned land uses surrounding the system, which are often in conflict. This must be analyzed at the local level as every system and zone plan is unique.

KESOUF: The FDC and IIC agree that the New Jersey Department of Transportation (DOT) may revisit air travel policies and develop policies that are sensitive to local land use conflicts. Specific language changes to the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSCR) recommended by Somerset County and Municipalities will be reviewed by the OSP staff and recommendations will be made to the FDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SDRP.

Negotiable Item #15: Community Character

IT ZSSTE: Far Hills and the County suggested adding language to indicate that economic development activities should be of an appropriate scale and consistent with the community's identity and character.

RESFFIR The FDC and INC agree that policy language will be clarified to address the fact that economic activities should be appropriate to the scale of and consistent with the community's character and its surrounding areas.

6. Negotiable Item #16: Village Character

JKP ISSUE: The County explained that some villages and hamlets may want to maintain a residential character (South Branch) and not encourage interrelated mixed uses as stated in Bpginnal Design System (RDS) Policy 3.1. Villages and hamlets may or may not evolve into higher forms of central places.

RESORT: The FDC and INC agree that Policy 3.1 encourages "i"t"iQg to plan for their communities in a manner which is commensurate with its scale and character.

7. Negotiable Item #27: Capital Facilities Financing and Development Policy 2.3 - a) Off-Tract Improvements in Tiers 5, 6 and 7/Public Funding; b) Off-Tract ImpEDvements in Tiers 2, 3, and 4, and Communities of Central Places/Partnership

JKP ISSOB: The County and Montgomery Township suggest this policy be modified to permit off-tract improvements in Tiers 5, 6 and 7 where deemed desirable by the municipality.

- a. In Tiers 5, 6 and 1, off-tract improvement should be supported by the public if they are not contrary to tier intent.
- b. Private contribution towards off-tract improvement should be flexible and negotiable rather than a regulatory process. The PSDKP makes this seem non-negotiable.

RESOLD: a) The PDC and LNC agree that Capital Facilities Financing and Development, Policy 2.3, Funding Priorities recommends that State, county and municipal governments may support off-tract improvements in Tiers 5, 6 and 7 if they are not contrary to tier intent and when necessary to protect the public health and safety; and

b) the PDC and IMC agree that Capital Facilities Financing and Development Policy 2.3 recommends that private contributions toward off-tract improvements be part of a negotiated partnership between a ill levels of government and the private sector.

8. Negotiable Item #30: Scenic Areas

XT ISSTC: The County has expressed the need to establish a process for the nomination of scenic areas, issues must be considered. Subject to the development of an acceptable nominating process (similar to the National Historic Register nomination process) , the County would recommend that scenic areas be made part of the Plan by reference.

HESCEft The PDC and **UC** agree that although existing PSDRP policies and guidelines adequately address this issue, alternative policies or guidslines submitted by the County- should be discussed and recommendations will be made to the PDC for consideration.

Negotiable Item #31: Housing and Community Development

KC ISSUE: Bernards Township felt that land banking for affordable housing is acceptable, but raised the question of its purpose.

The PDC and IMC agree that land banking for affordable housing is meant to stabilize land values for the orderly development and redevelopment of affordable housing in

10. Negotiable Item #32: Tier 6

XS ISSffi: Montgomery Township believes that Tier 6 should also include other open spaces, not just "productive agricultural lands." Bedminster Township has agreed that agriculture should not be confused with agribusiness.

The PDC and UC agree that open space as well as other land uses exist and are supported by the Plan in Tier 6 areas. It is further agreed that the Plan does not confuse agriculture with agribusiness.

11. Negotiable Item #14: Tier 1

KK ISSDE: The County noted North Plainfield's objection to a Tier 1 designation. Tier 1 criteria are not acceptable to some of Somerset's Tier 1 towns. The designation carries an unwanted and unnecessary stigma.

RESOZFs The PDC and IHC agree to defer the issue of Tier 1 Designation Criteria as per the SPC Resolution of May 25, 1990, which authorizes the PDC to consider the changes to the original criteria. The parties also agree that the Municipal Distress Index is not adequate as a criterion for designation of Tier 1. Municipal distress may be addressed under the statewide strategies if an adequate tier format can be maintained.

pn State

The Interim Plan has combined old Tiers 1 and 2 into the Metropolitan Planning Area. The issue of distress has been removed from both the description of the area and the criteria for mapping. "Revitalization" has been addressed in the Interim Plan in a Statewide policy section, and in sections on "Public Investment Priorities" and "Infrastructure Investments".

KBSffiF: The UC and OSP staff agree that the treatment, of urban revitalization in the Interim Plan adequately addresses North Plainfield's concern.

The PDC/UC agree with OSP and IHC result.

12. Negotiable Item #23: Community of Central Place Designations

XT ISSDE: Somerset County municipalities agree that the County will work with municipalities to identify central place designations based on the designation criteria and input.

BESKKiF: The PDC and IMC agree to defer these community of central place designation issues until factual data provided

by the IMC, in a tntflr staff -to-staff meeting, is examiner) and the resolution of the other RES issue are clarified.

1*1 JET

Somerset County and the municipalities will identify centers during the last phase of negotiations using the centers criteria of the resource planning and management structure in the Interim Plan.

HBSOR: r&ie IMC and OSP staff agree with the municipal recormmendations for Communities of Place (centers) .

13. Negotiable Item #24: Tier Delineation

Kf ISSDB: All municipalities agree that the County should raise a number of policy issues affecting tier 1) the definition of "planned sewer"; 2) clarification of "limited sewer capacity"; 3) the "1 sq. mi" mapping convention for delineation; 4) will OSP and DEP verify the environmental resource data substantiating Tier 7, 6B and ESS designations prior to adoption of the Interim Plan; and, 5) "pipeline project."

HESEUTs Ohe PDC and HJC agree to defer these mapping issues until the resolution of the other tier delineation issues are clarified by the State and rurther data provided by the IMC is reviewed in a later staff -to-staff meeting.

M Statbe **Plan**

Planned Sewer Service Area means an area served by sanitary sewer service sufficient to serve anticipated development within the area. These areas include;

1) Sewer Service Areas delineated in Areawide Water Quality Management Plans or Wastewater Management Plans that have already been approved by DEP with the exception of sewer service areas that are recommended ry a county or municipality through the Cross-Acceptance process fox dfil Inflation from a currently approved Areawide Water Quality Management Plan or Wastewater Management plan; and

2) Service areas for Regional or Ccnnunity infrastructure systems that are recommended by a county or municipality through the Cross-Acceptance process for inclusion in a future Wastewater Management Plan.

Limited Sewer Capacity. This issue is in reference to one of the Delineation rvjtg>i*ia for Tier 5 in the FSDRP. This criteria 'is not included in the Interim Plan.

1 sq. mile mapping convention. This is a general mapping criteria used to identify areas large enough for State Plan use.

PA 5, PA 4B and CES designation. OSP will review data provided by the County prior to the adoption of the Amended Interim Plan.

Pipeline Project. This issue refers to when a county or municipality should assume that a proposed development project is certain and not just a proposal. This concern arose most often in the PSEKP mapping between Tiers 4 and 5. It was also a concern in the delineation of Tier 6.

RESORT: The IXC and OSP staff agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses these policy issues.

The PDC/IWC agree with OSP and UC result. 14.

Negotiable issue #33B: &HHii-ional Municipal Comments

AT ISSTC: The complexity, clarity, and consistency of strategies, policies and guidelines in Volume II and Volume III.

KESGE2T: The PDC and I2C agree to defer the issue of the role of Volume III as it is being reconsidered by the PDC, pursuant to the SPC Resolution of May 25, 1990.

ip Starts Plan.

format of the Interim Plan is different in an attempt to be clearer and easier to interpret. There is one General Strategy. Policies apply to Statewide Issues. Volume III has been eliminated from the Plan.

RESULT: The UC and OSP staff agree that the Interim Plan is clearer and easier to interpret.

The PDC/INC agree with OSP and IWC result.

TOOK XVIII: SUUSUC. UUUV

1. Negotiable Item #P-6B: Rural Development Guidelines*

KC JStUC: The County feels that the presence or absence of sewers is not sufficient to determine whether development is appropriate. The Plan should consider the carrying capacity of lands. A variable density environmental constraints ordinance based on carrying capacity may be preferable. Sussex County has carrying capacity guidelines in place. Should the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SERF)

utilize sewer service as a -tier delineation criteria, or should the SERF define guidelines, procedures and design standards to determine the ability of land to accommodate development and redevelopment?

RESffiFr The PDC and INC agree that guidelines and procedures for carrying capacity analyses, which recognize and evaluate existing municipal and county efforts, will be provided through handbooks and other technical assistance.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 5 under the "Agreements In Principle" sect-Inn, of this Update for the resolution of P-6A.

2. Negotiable Item #P-10B: State Funding*

AT ISSDK: The County notes that county and local governments are already fiscally overburdened and believes that State-mandated programs should be funded by the State. The possible fjgfyQ rami ~Picgltlons of the Plan should be addressed.

RESOUT: The PDC and IMC agree that the economic ramifications of the Plan will be addressed in the impact assessment of the Interim Plan. Both documents will be subject to public scrutiny during the issue resolution phase of cross-acceptance.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 10 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of P-1QA.

3. Negotiable Item #A-4: Rural Land Planning and Development

MS ISSOB: Sussex County notes that its existing development already exceeds the population densities proposed in the SERF guidelines and recommends a carrying capacity approach.

BBSQUT: Tte PDC and IMC agree that the issue is associated with item P-6 - Rural Development Guidelines. The parties also agree that planning guidelines are advisory and that detailed guidelines and procedures for carrying capacity analyses, which recognize and evaluate existing municipal and county efforts, will be provided through handbooks and other technical assistance. Ohe parties further agree to exclude the nitrate dilution model from the Interim Plan.

1. Negotiable Item #7: Natural Resource Policies

AT iSUUKs The County believes the Plan should assist counties and mi'nTfoiprO n~-i*»s in protecting critical habitats, environmentally sensitive'areas, river and stream corridors, and other areas of unique or outstanding natural resources. Bie Plan should particularly provide tools for balancing development and conservation, such as model ordinances, ctesign alternatives and the like. Innovative techniques for promoting environmental protection and development patterns, sensitive to environmental needs, are needed.

HESH3¹: Hie PDC and INC agree that the State, counties and municipalities should work together to protect the State's natural resources. Statewide Strategies and Policies in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSEKP) address air quality, biological diversity, critical slopes, historic areas, recreational areas and public open space, scenic corridors, stream corridors and water supply sources located in all seven tiers.

In addition, counties and municipalities are encouraged to Identify environmentally-sensitive sites (ESS) in their local master plans to ensure protection of these areas in accordance with appropriate Statewide Strategies and Policies, regardless of tier designation. This information may be submitted to the OSP for data-base sharing purposes. One OSP will recommend to the PDC that the Statewide Environmental Strategies and Policies should be reviewed, and If new ones are needed for the protection of ESS, they should be added. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and reccranendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP). Te recommended language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SDRP.

2. Negotiable Item #13: Economic Impact Analysis

AT XSSQB: The County supports an economic impact study of the draft Interim Plan as well as the appropriate Plan modifications prior to the adoption of a final document. As has been mentioned in other parts of the County's report, the Plan should not add another layer of regulation or bureaucracy to an already burdensome review process. Financial and positive ~~program~~ incentives should be encouraged wherever possible in place of regulation to achieve a pa-rEif^piay land use or planning objective.

The PDC and I1C agree that an Impact Assessment, focusing on economic, fiscal, social and environmental factors, will be conducted by an impartial party upon completion of the Interim Plan as required by State statute N.J.S.A. The final Plan will be produced after completion of the third phase of cross-acceptance. Issue Resolution, which will include discussion on both the results of the Negotiation Phase and the Impact Analysis of the Interim Plan.

XXs WRRHR IDUUIS

1. Negotiable Item #4A: Adequate Funding Resources for the local Planning Process*

AT Tfaaara* Die County notes that the Plan cannot be implemented without a clear understanding as to where the financial and technical resources will come from to support it and its programs. Due to a lack of funds and an eroding tax base, many municipalities do not have the staff or the funds to conduct local planning at the level recommended in the Plan. tfrvnifrpai j-Hoa require assistance in the ra*pi*v*T budgeting aspects of land use planning.

RESORT: The PDC and IMC agree that OSP will continue to provide technical support throughout the State planning process to assist counties and municipalities in improved capital budgeting and planning at local levels.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 11 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of 4B.

2. Negotiable Item #14A: Rural land Planning and Development*

Kf i&fflus: The proposed density of 100 persons per square mile is inconsistent with existing patterns of development in Warren County; a carrying capacity approach is recommended. The nitrate dilution model is not well understood. Technical assistance is needed to enable municipal Ities to determine the level of existing resources, such as groundwater.

HESCEff: The PDC and I2C agree that guidelines presented in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment (PSDRP) are advisory and not regulatory. The nitrate dilution model will not be included in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SHIP) .

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in three parts. Please refer to page 8 under the "Agreements in Principle" section of this Update for the resolution of 14B

and page 14 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of 14C.

Negotiable Item #15A: Tier 5 Open Space Requirements*

AT ISSOB: the County reports that limiting development to 5 percent of a parcel is disturbing to municipalities for two reasons: First, the County infers a taking of personal property rights without compensation; and Second, it is an erosion of home rule.

KESO2F: The PDC and IWC agree that guidelines presented in the SERP are advisory, not regulatory. Adoption of these guidelines is at the discretion of the municipality.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 14 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of 15B.

4. negotiable Item #16A: Critical Slopes and Stream Corridors*

JKT ZSSDB: The County believes that the control of development in steep slope areas is the responsibility and prerogative of municipal government, the New Jersey Wetlands law provides sufficient protection to stream corridors and the SERP should not create additional regulations.

RESDUF: The FDC and INC agree that guidelines presented in the PSDRP are advisory and not regulatory.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 8 under the "Agreements in Principle" section of this Update for the resolution of 16B.

5. Negotiable Item #22B: Reexamination of the State Plan*

KF ISSDB: The County suggests that in order to be consistent with the Municipal Land Use law, the SCRIP should be re-examined every 6 years. The 3-year review and revision cycle creates cumbersome and unnecessary paperwork for smaller municipalities. The County would like specific information about the process for revision of the Plan map between the 3-year amendment cycle.

HESUff: The PTC and INC agree that OSP should establish a process for State Plan amendments, within the statutory 3-year cycle, to reflect certain changes in existing conditions.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 17 under the "Concerns" section of this Update for the resolution of 22A.

6. Negotiable Item #23A: Phillipsburg's Urban Level

KK ISSCE: The County reports that Phillipsburg is really a freestanding/core center city, totally within northwestern New Jersey and should be listed as an "Urban Center" municipality, such as places like Long Branch and Asbury Park, which are similar in size.

HSTCT: The PDC and LNC agree that criteria for the designation of centers will be revised. The designation of Phillipsburg as a center will be considered in the context of revised criteria.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 17 under the "Concerns" section of this Update for the resolution of 23B.

TOOK XXI: ESSEX GULKH

1. Negotiable Item #12: Economic Development — Neighborhood Targeting

ISSCE: Belleville believes that municipalities should take the lead in designating neighborhood strategy areas rather than giving State departments and counties the major responsibility. The County agrees that designating neighborhood target areas should be the responsibility of the municipalities.

RESOUPs The FDC and UC agree that this is a policy **ration issue. Municipalities should take the lead in designating neighborhood strategy areas.**

2. Negotiable Item #16: Tier 2 — Community Character

KE ISSCE: Essex Fells, North Caldwell and Nutley stated that mixed-use patterns of development are not appropriate in many municipalities. Community character is well-established in these areas and mixed-use patterns of development would conflict with the existing character of many communities. The County reports that the concept of mixed-use developments does not sit well with some stable, fully-developed municipalities in Essex County. Mixed-use developments should only be implemented where appropriate.

RESDTT: The PDC and IXC agree that this is a policy clarification issue. The OSP and liC further agree that mixed-use developments are not appropriate in every neighborhood.

3. Negotiable Item #18: OrMfi'fifl Economic Development Programs

AT ISSCE: Natley is not in favor of the concept of certification recommended in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSDRP) . As written, the policy statement implies that a municipality has to prepare an economic development program and receive "certification" from the State.

KESO2F: The PDC and the Natley Negotiating Committee agree that every municipality is not required to develop an economic development program. The OSP and IMC further agree that this only applies to those municipalities seeking priority consideration for economic development programs.

*Please Note: In accordance with the State Planning Rules, the PDC and Municipal Negotiating Committee for Nutley discussed this issue in the presence of the I*JC. The resulting agreement was made between the Municipal Negotiation Committee and the PDC.

4. Negotiable Item #19: Housing Redevelopment – Neighborhood Targeting of Programs

AT ISSUE: Nutley recommends deleting this policy, The State should not be involved in the targeting of neighborhoods for its programs. This responsibility should be left to the municipalities.

KESQCT: The OSP and the Nutley Negotiating Committee agree that this is a policy clarification issue. should take the lead in designating neighborhood strategy areas.

*Please Note: In accordance with the State Planning Rules, the PDC and Municipal Negotiating Committee for Nutley discussed this issue in the presence of the INC. The resulting agreement was , made between the Municipal Negotiating Committee and the PDC.

Negotiable Item #21: Human Development and Public Safety

Kf ISSOE: Essex Fells' citizens are concerned with the four most important characteristics New Jerseyans use to evaluate their community quality of life (i.e., the crime rate, the

environment, quality of education, and community appearance) cited in the PSERP. Since Essex Fells reflects the needs and desires of most New Jerseyans, the problems of crime and should be listed on the Essex County Negotiating Agenda and the interim Plan should describe in detail goals, strategies and policies directed toward crime and education.

The County supports this statement, noting that since the goals of the State Development and Redevelopment plan (SERF) are to develop a better quality of living and sound planning in New Jersey, it is appropriate for the Plan to recognize the issues of crime and education. The Plan, however, should address these issues in more detail.

BESOUF: The PDC, INC and the Essex Fells Negotiating Committee agree that additional Human Development and Public Safety policies need to be incorporated into the Interim Plan.

*Please Note: In accordance with the State Planning Rules, the PDC and Municipal Negotiating Committee for Nutley discussed this issue in the presence of the IMC. The resulting agreement was made between the Municipal Negotiating Committee and the PDC.

6. Negotiable Item #9 - Tier 1 Priority for State Expenditures and Programs

Kf ISSDB: Many municipalities stated that State funding should not be limited to Tier 1 municipalities. Many suburban towns, especially older neighborhoods in Tier 2 have pressing needs and social issues similar to those in Tier 1 municipalities.

The County concurs with the State's intent to revitalize Tier 2 however there are portions of Tier 2 that are deserving of Tier 1 benefits. County suggests that the Tier 1 criteria be modified to account for distressed subareas within a municipality.

RESH2P: The PDC and I&C agree to defer this issue pending the proposed restructuring of Tier 1 and any redefinition of priorities resulting from those changes.

^ State ~~PX~~an Beeponse:

Public investment priorities are no longer tied to any one "tier," or what are now known as "Planning Areas." Generally, the Plan's public investment policies give priority for projects and ~~programs~~ in distressed urban communities while providing opportunities for non-distressed communities to meet their needs as well. State agencies are

encouraged to consider many different factors when determining the allocation of discretionary funds, so that those municipalities actively working to implement the State Plan can be given appropriate assistance toward achieving those goals. Highest priority will continue for public health and safety, and for infrastructure maintenance and repair, regardless of location.

RESOLUTION: The FDC and IMC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

7. Negotiable Item #15 – Air Quality Assessments for Small Development Projects

AT ISSUE: Montclair noted that air quality regulations should exempt smaller projects, such as the redevelopment of existing buildings, from the requirement of preparing air quality assessments. The County agrees with the municipality's concern.

RESOLUTION: Pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006, the FDC and the Montclair negotiating Committee agree to defer this issue pending the FDC's analysis of the future role of the State Plan's Volume III guidelines.

*Please Note: In accordance with the State planning Rules, the FDC and Municipal Negotiating Committee for Montclair discussed this issue in the presence of the HC. The resulting agreement to defer this issue was made between the FDC and the Municipal Negotiating Committee.

The Interim Plan does not require air quality assessments for development projects. The Plan calls for a coordination of planning at all levels of government to ensure that both land and capital facility development and redevelopment will lead to attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

RESOLUTION: The FDC, IMC and the Township of Montclair agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

8. Negotiable Item #17 – Capital Facilities Financing and Development, Off-Tract and On-Tract Facilities Funding Priorities

AT ISSUE: Essex County municipalities disagree with the priority system proposed by the State regarding the financing and development of on- and off-tract capital facilities. The proposed priority system should be modified, especially in

the area of Tiers 1 and 2. Also, on- and off -tract should not be mandated.

Specifically, municipal officials felt that:

1. The State should modify the priority system to utilize a system based upon both need and future impact, instead of the tier system alone. Possibly some type of incentive system can be initiated;
2. The State Plan should not obligate a Tier 1 municipality to pay more than its fair share for off -tract facilities;
3. State funding for off -tract facilities should not be to Tier 1 municipalities; and
4. The State Plan should not require or obligate local government to provide on-tract facilities anywhere.

KBSCKff: Pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006, the PDC and UC agree to defer this issue pending the proposed restructuring of Tier ' 1 and any redefinition of priorities resulting from those changes.

M State Plan Response:

The Interim Plan does not specifically prioritize expenditures for on-tract or off- tract capital. Generally, the Plan's public investment policies give priority for projects and programs in distressed urban communities while providing opportunities for non-distressed communities to meet their needs as well. State agencies are encouraged to consider many different factors when determining the allocation of discretionary funds, so that those communities actively working to implement the State Plan can be given appropriate assistance toward achieving those goals. Highest priority will continue for public health and safety, and for infrastructure maintenance and repair, regardless of location.

HESHff: The PDC and IMC agree that the Interim Plan adequately addresses this issue.

TOOK I: *aa&xt* UUU3

1. Negotiable Item #1 - Tier 1

AT 25SK: The Tier 1 designation is not acceptable to sane of Bergen ' s municipalities . The designation carries an unwanted and unnecessary stigma. These cmmunities do not "fit" the Critical Issues and Tier Intent outlined in the PSERP. These are not distressed communities. They fear disinvestment resulting from a Tier 1 designation.

KBSDUfc The FDC and LEC agree that it would be desirable to remove the Municipal Distress Index as a criterion for Tier 1 (designations and to address distress under the Statewide Strategies if an acceptable tier format can be maintained.

2. Negotiable Item #2 - Sewer Criterion for Tiers

AT 3SSE: The County believes that the presence or absence of sewers should not be a criterion for delineating tiers (e.g. Tier 5) . This results in the improper categorization of fully/almost fully-developed municipalities as "rural". It is hard to categorize any Bergen County municipality as being beyond the metropolitan periphery.

HESOUF: Ohe FDC and IK? agree that it would be desirable to have additional factors as delineation criteria for Tier 4 if that Information or fjat^ are reasonably available, and if such factors do not conflict with one another.

The PDC and INC further agree in principle that developed communities that are not sewerred, and are surrounded by other developed/ sewerred communities, assy be considered to be the same tier as the surrounding communities if the overall integrity of the tier system is not compromised.

Negotiable Item f3 - Tier 2 vs. Tier 4

AT ISSUE: There are several Bergen County communities designated as both Tier 2 and Tier 4. According to the County, the Tier 4 sections more closely resemble "stable suburbs" due to the lack of vacant land and the already in-place infrastructure systems. Present tier criteria artificially differentiate between new and old neighborhoods.

BESO2F: The PDC and IXC agree that where a tier distinction within a municipality appears to be artificial and has no substantive policy ramifications, the tier split will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to remove the distinction as long as the integrity of the tier system is reasonably maintained. Where the distinction has substantive value, the distinction will remain.

4. Negotiable Item #4 - Tier 7

ISSDB: According to the County, present Tier 7 guidelines are not applicable in suburban areas. Certain Tier 7 guidelines, written for larger expanses of land, are not workable in developed areas. This makes the recognition and preservation of natural resources and environmentally significant features, through the nomination of small Tier 7 areas, less effective.

HESDET: The PDC and LNC agree that the County should review its Tier 7 nominations and resubmit them as ESS nominations which would be managed under proposed Statewide Strategies.

5. Negotiable Item #6 - Capital Facilities - State Funding
Priorities

AT ISSDB: The County believes Tier 2 should be prioritized over Tiers 3 and 4 for State capital facilities funding. It is the County's content-inn that the older suburbs (Tier 2) need help in maintaining necessary services. Additionally, the County has ~~not decided~~ that the State Plan prioritize Tiers 5, 6 and 7 for funding.

RESDHT: The PDC and INC agree that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied and that there are forms and types of development within the existing Tier 2 that should receive priority funding.

6. Negotiable Item #9 - Land Use-Tier 2

XC ISSDB: The County would like to see Tier 2 communities included in the Regional Design System. This would recognize and help preserve existing centers in the older suburbs. Design tools are necessary to support and protect community character in the midst of strong redevelopment pressures.

The PDC and IMC agree that urban and suburban areas need to be better integrated into the Regional Design System.

An Urban Design Manual, to be prepared after the release of the Plan/ will include provisions to accomplish that integration*

Negotiable Item #11 - Human Development

AT ISSCE: According to the County, serious social issues exist in the suburbs as well as the cities. As such, the State Plan's human development policies should not be limited to Tier 1

KESOUF: The PDC and LNC agree that the absence of human development policies in other tiers does not necessarily preclude their use and that Human Development Statewide Strategies and Policies applicable to all tiers will be added.

8. Negotiable Item #13 - Economic Development - Permit Streamlining

AT ISSffi: This is a two-part issue. First, the County and its mnn-impai i-Hag see permit streamlining as more of a State problem than a municipal problem. They see the project review and permitting delays taking place at the State level and not at the local development review level. Secondly, Bergen's municipalities often lack the strong local planning tools envisioned in the PSERP. As such, they are reluctant to give up some of the few development controls they feel they possess now, until such other tools are made available to them.

BBSOUT: Agreement, in Principle - The PDC and INC agree in principle that permit streamlining should occur. Furthermore, in the policies throughout the plan that deal with permit streamlining, a clause ought to be artlpld to indicate that permit streamlining should be accomplished "in ways consistent with good planning practice."

TOOK Us

1. Negotiable Item #4 - Tier 3 Intent

Kf ISSDB: Some Mercer municipalities suggested sub-tiers for Tier 3 towns (i.e., 3A and 3B) to distinguish between places that have the land to support peripheral growth from those towns where growth opportunities are limited to redevelopment and infill.

Mercer County does not necessarily agree with this approach. The County asserts that rural growth and growth inducement are not necessarily appropriate for some Tier 3 towns.

HESOHs The PDC and I2C agree that desirable community character that currently exists should be enhanced. Policies that emphasize the preservation of the character of existing towns of differing scales could be clarified.

2. Negotiable Item #6 - Mapping Detail in Tiers 6B and 7

AT IS9E: The County believes that a State Plan map should be a general guide, and county and municipal maps be used to provide more detail. Since zoning is a municipal function, very detailed mapping of environmental constraints is best left to the municipality.

BBSOhs The PDC and LWC agree that the Plan Map is intended to be a general growth management guide and not intended to be a zoning map. Small, environmentally-sensitive sites should be mapped locally on master plan maps. These may be filed with the Commission as part of a statewide data base.

3. Negotiable Item #7 - 208/W3M Amendments

Kf ISSUE: The County raised several questions regarding the of Tiers 4 and 5. Specifically, the county questions whether planned sewer service should be the sole criteria for distinguishing between Tiers 4 and 5, noting that other infrastructure is important. Further, using planned sewer service does not, by itself, carry out the Tier intent. Also, development located in Tier 4 should not imply that sewer service will be supplied immediately.

BESOUF: The PDC and I2C agree on the following points:

- o Sole use of sewer service to distinguish between Tiers 4 and 5 is inadequate;
- o The Interim Plan should address sophisticated application of the Regional Design System, particularly in regard to utilizing decentralized wastewater facilities with centralized management;
- o The final Plan must be sufficiently flexible in order to allow for technical amendments; and,

- o The PDC needs to discuss how the boundary between Tiers 4 and 5 will affect growth management.
- o Further discussion on the AyFiTn-Hr*p of "planned sewer service;" "Mm**"^ sewer service;" and dealing with "amendments in process" is required.

ZEE

1. Negotiable Item #2: Designating Counties as "Urban Centers"

JO? ISSCE: Counties in which a majority of its municipalities are designated as Tier 1 municipalities should be designated "urban centers" for the purpose of priority treatment with respect to urban policy programming. This definition should be included in the urban center designation in the hierarchy of central places. This would acknowledge the special needs of these counties and the unique characteristics and j nt^T^Blat ionships of such a county's mani cjp al 1 tieq in terms of their infrastructure, transportation, planning, capital faqil"-tif*s and economic development needs* Existing urban center municipalities within the county's borders would remain separately on the urban center list and would not be counted toward the majority total of Tier 1 municipalities needed for the county's urban center designation, nor the county's priority treatment with respect to urban policy programming*

RESDFH: The PDC and lit agree that the concept of an urban county/center should be considered, as stated and defined ry the County in the statement above.

2. Negotiable Item #4: Disagreement with DCL Population and Employment Projections

JET 1KSLK: The State Planning Commission asked each county to comment on whether or not the DCL's population and employment projections were reasonable. The State Planning Commission also asked each county to identify their "preferred" growth levels. The County disagrees with the DOL population and employment projections presented in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The County's population and employment projections should be incorporated into the Interim Plan and should be used in any State analysis of the Plan.

EESO2P: The FDC and UC agree that the County's population and employment projections, as reported in the County's cross-acceptance report, represent a reasonable and acceptable range of growth. The FDC and IWC further agree that as those projections are, for the most part, based on 1980 data; they are subject to change as final 1990 census population data and more current employment data becomes available.

3. Negotiable Item #6: Planning Guidelines and Urban Design Standards

AT ISSKK: Planning guidelines and urban design standards, including "urban neighborhoods of place," need to be formulated for Tier 1 municipalities. "Urban neighborhoods of place" are defined as those areas within Tier 1 municipalities which contain a primarily residential or commercial communal identity and cohesiveness.

KESTCT; The PDC and IMC agree that urban design is an integral part of urban revitalization and that an Urban Design Manual will be prepared by the OSP to address such concepts as "urban neighborhoods of place." The PDC and UC further agree that the Regional Design System will be reviewed to better integrate urban areas into the system.

4. Negotiable Item #8: Repair and Maintenance vs. Replacement

AT ISSCE: Repair and maintenance is not necessarily the most cost-effective strategy in urban areas. Tier 1 infrastructure replacement should be included as a high priority issue.

KBSOJF: The PDC and XJC agree that, in some instances, and particularly in urban areas, full scale replacement of an infrastructure system may be required to adequately support existing and future development. The parties also agree that, in those instances, the Plan should acknowledge that replacement is a necessary component of the repair and maintenance priority.

5. Negotiable Item #10: Transportation - Recognition of Regional Function

AT ISSUE: The Plan should give consideration to the unique traffic issues that affect Hudson County, e.g., use of local

streets as part of the regional road system, Trans-Hudson traffic, waterfront development, insufficient parking and Meadowlands development. Statewide transportation strategies should place more emphasis on addressing areas that serve as regional transportation centers.

RESOff: The PDC and INC agree that strategies and policies should be devised to separate regional mobility demands from local mobility demands in order to better address the unique regional (i.e., Trans-Hudson) role Hudson County plays.

6. Negotiable Item #13: Economic Development - Job Training

AT ISSCB: The State Plan should include policies that promote public/private job training and retraining programs.

KK3UF: The PDC and IHC agree that additional human services policies need to be incorporated into the Interim Plan. The OSP will rely on input from Hudson and other counties on this issue.

7. Negotiable Item #15 s Capital Facilities Financing & Development

AT ISSQE: The County believes that a 15-year capital improvement program is unrealistic on a municipal level.

The Office of State Planning clarified the Plan's intent with regard to the CIP policies. The intention is to have **mmrHpal i-hiQg prepares**

1) a Nflsfpr Plan with 15-20-year horizon; 2) an assessment of the infrastructure needed to support the Plan; and 3) a 6-year dP which will reflect an incremental fulfillment of those needs.

BE5DCF: The CSP's explanation of the Plan's intent regarding this issue is acceptable to the IMC. The PDC concurred that the applicable policies will be rewritten to reflect this

8. Negotiable Item #19: CQftH Regulations Have a Suburban Orientation

AT ISSffi: Emphasis should be placed on providing adequate housing for low and moderate income households in Tier 1 areas. A new policy (Policy 3.4) under Housing, entitled

"Coordination with the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH): Implementation," should be added to the Plan. The IWC recommended a new policy that should state:

"Coordination with COAH requires special consideration of creative implementation mechanisms. These implementation methods should be particularly sensitive to the unique housing needs of Tier 1 areas."

BK5KS: The FDC and UC agree that language such as that provided by the County will be considered in order to craft policies that will better define how CCAH might relate to urban tiers.

9. Negotiable Item #20: Air Quality - Regionally-Generated Air Pollution

AT ISBBEHE: local entities should not be penalized by regulatory agencies for regionally-generated air quality problems that are beyond their control (e.g. , Trans-Hudson crossings).

The I2C recommended adding the following language to Policy 1.6: "Attainment of national ambient air quality standards should focus first upon regionally generated emission, including those produced by the interstate road network. Air quality should be viewed in the context of the State Plan goal of urban revitalization. "

The EEC and UC agree in principle that air quality issues must be addressed at the regional level and that language to highlight the regional nature of the problem/ such as that proposed by the County will be considered for inclusion in the Interim Plan. The FDC and I1C further agree, however, that National Ambient Air Quality Standards are set at the Federal level and, therefore, are beyond the scope of the State Planning Commission to affect directly.

10. Negotiable Item #21: Open Space - Urban Policies and Standards

Kf ISSBES: The State Plan should address the unique open space needs of cities. The Plan's emphasis seems to be on preserving large tracts of contiguous property. Park rehabilitation should have equal priority with park purchase. Tier 1 communities should receive priority funding.

Moreover, the open space possibilities in Hudson County are located largely in the area under the jurisdiction of HMDC. The agency's cooperation is critical if comprehensive open space and recreation planning is to be achieved.

RESORT: The PDC and UE agree that recreation and open space priorities are unclear in the PSDRP and that the overall criteria for funding and program prioritization needs to be restudied by the PDC. The EDC and IMC further agree that, in most cases, park rehabilitation in Tier 1 carries a higher priority than acquisition and should be noted as such in any overall prioritization structure (See Issue #7, page 12, with regard to issues involving HMDC) .

11. Negotiable Item #22: Sewers - Funding Priorities & Regulatory Standards

KF ISSUE: The County recommends adding the following policy language to the Plan:

DEP should be sensitive to the sewer needs of Tier 1 communities, in particular with regard to the existence of combined wastewater and storm systems. Although the replacement of combined systems is feasible, it is prohibitively expensive. The DEP should provide regulatory standards for combined systems that are sensitive to both the environmental needs and financial ability of affected

The PDC and I2C agree in principle that the State should be sensitive to both the environmental needs and financial abilities of a municipality when dealing with combined sewer systems, to the extent that the State has such discretion under the Federal Clean Water Act. Language such as that proposed by the County will be considered for inclusion in the Interim Plan to highlight this concern. Additionally, these proposals will be forwarded to DEP for their consideration*

12. Negotiable Item #24: Water Supply

KE ISSOB: The reliance of communities on water sources outside their municipal boundaries requires strong protective measures to insure the quality and quantity of their water supplies. Development standards in affected tiers should be sensitive to these communities' water needs.

HES02F: The PDC and I2C agree that these water supply sources need to be protected. The FDC and I/C further agree that it is not the Plan's intent to differentiate the relative importance of a given water supply source based on the geographic location of the eventual consumer. It is the Plan's intent to promote effective management of all potable water supplies.

13. Negotiable Item #25: Flood Control - Urban Regulations

XSSDE: Due to the unique characteristics of urban areas, traditional flood control techniques are infeasible. Developed urban areas located within flood plains should be subject to alternative regulatory controls that are sensitive to the development characteristics of those urban areas.

KES02P: The PDC and UIC agree that flood control policies need to be more explicit regarding the utilization of alternative approaches for flood control in urban areas.

14. Negotiable Item #26: Human Development

Kf ISSUE: Representatives from human development agencies, such as the Departments of Education, Law & Public Safety, Corrections, Higher Education, Health, and Human Services should provide input into the cross-acceptance process in order to address the social consequences of the Plan's policies. Among the issues included should be job training, day care, education, health, welfare and criminal justice. The social consequences of Plan's policies must be included in any analysis of the State Plan. "Hie County recommends that the following language should be added to the Plan: "It is recognized that human services are critical to the revitalization of Tier 1 areas. Due to the disproportionate share of social service needs which Tier 1 areas encounter, additional resources, including funding, must be available to these areas. In addition, the use of public-private partnerships and nonprofit organizations should be encouraged to develop and implement social service programs.

KtftWft The PDC and IMC agree that additional "Human Development" policies need to be incorporated into the Interim Plan and that language such as that proposed by the County will be considered for inclusion in the Interim Plan.

PDC and INC further agree that the social consequences of the Plan need to be considered and should in turn be considered for inclusion in the Plan assessments to be released with the Interim Plan.

15. Negotiable Item #28: Map Change - "Palisades Open Space Overlay"

AT ISSTC: The goal of the "Palisades Open Space Overlay" is to recognize the natural character of the Palisades while acknowledging appropriate development that complements the unique qualities of the Palisades. Muryigipai i-Eieg, that have not already, should supplement their municipal land use regulations to address this goal.

Special management overlays in Tier 1 areas should be included within the State Plan. A special management overlay is defined as a geographic area within Tier 1 that combines environmentally sensitive features with a variety of developed and/or developable areas. Ofte following language should be added to the Plan:

"Special management overlays should encourage a reasonable balance of appropriate development that complements the unique qualities of the special management overlay. Miiirvinipnl ities, that have not already, are encouraged to supplement their municipal land use regulations to address this goal."

RESULT: The PDC and IMC agree that areas of unique character and location such as the Palisades need to be addressed in the Plan and that language such as that proposed by the County will be considered for inclusion in the Interim Plan.

16. Negotiable Item §30: Required Planning Programs

JET I.SRI K; Ofte PSERP requires a number of plans be prepared to address functional areas such as housing and economic development. Several of these plans appear to be duplicative efforts, thereby potentially placing an unnecessary drain on local resources (e.g., the "certification" concept appears to be limited to only one area, i.e., economic development. This presents an inconsistency).

: The PDC and UC agree that the Plan will be reviewed to ensure that planning policies are more explicit and that there are no redundancies in planning programs.

17. Negotiable Item #31: Tier Designation

JCT ISSDB: The town of Guttenberg has requested that it be moved from Tier 2 to Tier 1. Given that Guttenberg is surrounded by Tier 1 municipalities, its physical character, **and its Urban** character, the County wholeheartedly supports Guttenberg being redesignated as Tier 1.

BB50UT: The PDC and UC agree that Tier 2 communities with an existing urban character, that are surrounded by Tier 1 communities, and exhibit physical (i.e., infrastructure) and social interrelationships with those Tier 1 communities may be considered to be the same "tier - as the surrounding communities, if the overall integrity of the tier system is not compromised.

MTJUK XV- MTJUJPI

1. Negotiable Item #2: Seasonal Stress on Coastal Infrastructure

AT ISSDE: The State Plan does not recognize the seasonal burdens faced by coastal counties and municipalities.

RBSGKT: The FCC and INC agree to drop the "deferred" category of the above stated agreement, in principle. The Committees also agreed to add the "Division of Coastal Resources, and the County" to the statement indicating that review of the policy language will also be necessary.

2. Negotiable Item #3: Sub-Tiers or additional categories to reflect the diversity of conditions within the seven tiers.

AT XSSQB: The current tier system did not consider the coastal area when it was developed. Tier strategies, policies and criteria do not adequately reflect the unique qualities of the coast, The current statewide strategies are not comprehensive in regard to the coast.

BESCEff: The PDC and JJC agree to drop the "deferred" category of the above stated agreement in principle. The Committees also agreed to add the "Division of Coastal Resources, and the County" to the statement indicating that review of the policy language will also be necessary.

Negotiable Item #5: Funding and priorities for infrastructure maintenance in tiers. County and itii«ag expressed concern that Ibseliminary State Development and Redevelopment Flan (PSEHP) funding priorities are focussed on urban areas and growth tiers.

ISSDKs Die County recommends top funding priority for maintenance of health and safety in all tiers, then next priority should be T*gr 1. Hie SERF must ensure that funding will be available to address municipal needs in all and tiers / particularly rural areas . County feels it is proper to target Tier 1, but if the SERF is encouraging compact growth, infill development ani Cannunities of Flace, then it must also support, it with funding priority. As written, priorities do not support regional solutions.

RESQUF: The PDC will study criteria for funding prioritization and provide greater specificity about public health and safety funding priorities for infrastructure needs, particularly with respect to Tiers 5, 6 & 7. The parties also agree that the t.lf=»r system proposes to guide the programmatic priorities of State agencies; it does rot prohibit appropriate State assistance for emergent needs to protect the public health and safety in any tier.

4. Negotiable Item #10A: Urban Development Issues

XE XSSOB: T5ie SERF must identify urban development issues, including the cost of demolition/ land acquisition, environmental approvals, and public/private partnership incentives.

KESTCT: The OSP and UC agreed that urban revitalization issues should be made explicit, now and had agreed to defer resolution of this issue until the PDC had developed these strategies more completely. After further discussion among the PDC and IMC, the parties agree to drop the "deferred" categorization of this agreement in principle.

TOZK Vs aiEES CUUK13

1. Negotiable Item #11: The Regional Design System is Unclear and Does Not Contain Provisions for Highly Developed Counties Such as Cfflirlpn.

Kf IS5DB: Corridor Centers do not appear feasible in developed counties such as Camden. However, the County is

interested in the development of an expanded Regional Design System. There is a need to address, "Downtown and Preservation," as well as to clarify the provisions of the system oriented toward developed regions

KES0Zft The PDC and IMC -agree that urban and suburban areas need to be better integrated into the Regional Design System. An Urban Design Manual, to be prepared after the release of the Interim Plan, will include provisions to accomplish that integration.

Negotiable Item #22: Tiftr Change

AT TS50E: 3te Borough Ccnmissionrs unanimously agree that the tier designation for the Borough of Pine Valley, should be changed from Tier 4, Suburbanizing Area, to Tier 5, Exurban Reserve. The Borough has no intent inn of encouraging significant development.

Camden County agrees that Pine Valley should be listed uncter Tier 5, Exurban Reserve, instead of its current listing as Tier 4, Suburbanizing Area. As stated in the 201 Facilities Plan for Wastewater Treatment for the Delaware River Drainage Basin of Camden County, approved by the EPA in 1981, Pine Valley will remain on septic tanks for at least the next 20 years and will not be sewered.

RESKUT: The PDC and UC agree that pine Valley does not have the capacity to accept significant new development and the area will be designated Tier 5 when the Borough documents its development capacity.

3. Negotiable Item #23: Housing Policy 2.6, Revitalization Without Displacement, and Housing Redevelopment Policy 4.11, Redevelopment Without Displacement

Kf ISSKE: Camden City pointed out that, as currently drafted, this policy addresses ijnmediate and short-term displacement effects. low income residents or residents on fixed income might be displaced as tax assessments and rental values rise.

The County agrees with Camden City and would like further r?i ar if -j rat-,1 op of this issue ty the State Planning Commission.

She PDC and UC agree that the Plan contains language that encourages redevelopment without displacement. The City should offer specific recommendations for improvements to these Plan policies.

4. Negotiable Item #27: Tier 1 Should Not Receive Funding Priority

AT ISSTC: Haddonfield does not agree with the proposed funding prioritization that could result in funding for necessary infrastructure replacements being channeled away from Haddonfield and into surrounding Tier 1 communities.

Some of these sub-regional systems will have to be funded for extension into adjoining non-tier 1 communities or urban policy areas. OSie County agrees with Haddonfield and would like the State Planning Commission to clarify this issue.

HESUF: The PDC and IMC agree that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied and that there are forms and types of development within existing Tier 2 that should receive priority funding.

IV: HQ3CH

1. Negotiable Item #5: Tier 1 Inscription

AT ISSCE: Tier 1 communities are concerned the designation may project a negative image. "Distressed Communities" are not places where people want to live. Calling Tier 1 municipalities "Redeveloping Communities" would be a more positive description. The State Plan should recognize the need for a Tier 1 subtitle to account for differences between those presently identified as Tier 1 municipalities.

KESOCff: The PDC and I2C agree that it would be desirable to remove the municipal distress index as a criterion for Tier 1 and to address distress under Statewide Strategies if an acceptable tier format can be maintained.

2. Negotiable Item #7: The Final Plan Should Not be Prepared Prior to the Availability of the 1990 Census Data

AT ISSCE: By waiting for the 1990 Census results, the State would have a more accurate view of where its current population is within its various regions. It is not

appropriate to proceed without such information. This would replace speculative conclusions as to population and densities.

JAKUJte Agreement in Principle - One PDC and lit recognize the significance of current census and other population data in the development and implementation of the State Plan. One agrees in principle that the latest available population data, including census results, will be considered in formulating and implementing the State Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #11: Capital Facilities - Improvement Plans (CIP)

Xf ISSEE: The County expressed concern regarding the 15-year cycle recommended for localities to project and prioritize capital expenses. One OSP explained, however, that the Plan's intention is to have municipalities prepare: 1) a Master Plan with a 15-20-year horizon; 2) an assessment of the infrastructure needed to support that plan; and, 3) a 6-year CIP which will reflect an incremental fulfillment of those needs.

RBSOUT: The PDC and I2C agree that the explanation clarified the Plan's intent. The applicable policies will be rewritten to reflect this clarification.

4 . negotiable Item #18 : Capital Facilities - Public Sector Tract Facilities in Tier 2

ISSK: This policy may be too absolute. In certain instances, public sector involvement is needed for the provision of on-tract capital facilities.

BESOUTs One PDC and IMC agree in principle that there may be some instances where county and municipal expenditures for on-tract capital facilities would be necessary in Tier 2 areas. The PSERP should be reviewed to ensure that are not precluded from utilizing mechanisms that may help attain compatibility with the goals of the State Plan.

Negotiable Item #19: Housing - Displacement

JET ISSE: The County believes that the State Plan should be modified to reflect the need for adequate relocation planning prior* to any displacement activities.

BESOUF's The PDC and IXC agree that policies reflecting the need for relocation planning are de^jrafole and that the Plan will be reviewed and revised accordingly to incorporate relocation planning.

6. Negotiable Item #21: Tier 7 Nominations

AT JSSLK; The County has nominated several snail Tier 7 areas to preserve locally recognized environmentally sensitive features. However, the OSP explained that the PDC is considering including a series of policies by which "Environmentally Sensitive Sites" (ESS) may be identified, mapped and managed in accordance with appropriate Statewide Strategies and Policies, independent of tier or Regional Design System designations. These would be included in the Statewide Strategies for Natural and Cultural Resources. Such provisions will give counties and municipalities the opportunity to nominate areas to be recognized by the State Plan for protection without a Tier 7 designation.

HESCT: The PDC and INC agree that the County should resubmit its Tier 7 nominations as ESS nominations.

VQUK VH: GOBBHOXHR

1. Negotiable Item #5: Seasonal Population Fluctuation and Stress on Infrastructure

Jffl ISSUE: The SERF needs to make special recognition of the of municipalities and counties impacted by seasonal population fluctuations.

The PDC and IMC agree to drop the "deferred" category of this agreement in principle and confirmed that the Division of Coastal Resources and the County will review proposed Interim Plan language to address this issue.

2. Negotiable Item #6: Assumptions on the *rmiii:inn* and Capacity of Urban Infrastructure – Infrastructure Funding Priorities

AT ISSUE: Urban infrastructure that is obsolete or poorly maintained is not capable of accommodating the new levels of service envisioned in the PSCR. It is often more cost efficient to provide new infrastructure in towns and suburbs (Tiers 3 and 4) than to expand and improve urban infrastructure.

BESQF: The PDC and lit agree that the Plan language should be clarified to specify that public health and safety is the priority for infrastructure priorities statewide. Urban centers will receive priority treatment after public health and safety needs have been addressed.

3. Negotiable Item #7: Accommodation of Coastal Area in Tier System

AT ISSQB: SERF must recognize the needs of developed and undeveloped coastal communities. The majority of island municipalities had requested a new tier designation to address their unique qualities and needs: The County report recommends that the SPC adopt a separate tier designation for coastal municipalities. This position is advocated by the municipalities of: Ship Bottom, Mantoloking, Lavallette, Harvey Cedars/ Barnegat Light, Beach Haven, Long Beach.

RESCUF: The PDC and LNC agree that statewide strategies and policies will be prepared to address the concerns of coastal areas and their unique attributes. Such language, when drafted, will be forwarded to the PDC, the Division of Coastal Resources and the County for their review.

4. Negotiable Item #15: Capital Facilities – Support for On-Facilities

AT XS9E: Tier 3, Policy 2.4 should read: The State, counties and municipalities should not provide support for on-tract capital facilities [These facilities should be provided by the private sector], which do not support municipal and State goals beyond tract boundaries. The county recommendations for deletions are [bracketed], and additions are

BESQF: The PDC and HC agree that increments of on-tract public facilities can be provided by the public sector if it serves a public goal, purpose, or interest, beyond the private development.

5. Negotiable Item #19: Capital Facilities – Provision of Infrastructure to Link Growth Tiers

XX ISSQB: Certain policies need to be clarified to ensure that infrastructure links between growth tiers are permissible (meaning infrastructure that passes through Tiers 5, 6 or 7 to connect Tiers 1, 2, 3 or 4).

RESORT: The PDC and IMC agree that the Plan language should be clarified regarding infrastructure links between tiers and their secondary impacts. The parties also agree that the issue should be referred to the Implementation Committee to consider new policies for the Implementation Report.

TOOK VIU: HHIWUji uuucnt

1. Negotiable Item #P1: Limestone Areas

KS ISSUE: The County has noted that subsurface limestone needs to be carefully considered in siting development, as it is prone to sinkholes and is sensitive to ground water contamination..

HESQHF: The FDC and LNC agree that the SERF will include policies for the management of development in areas of subsurface limestone deposits among the Statewide Strategies for Natural and Cultural Resources.

2. Negotiable Item #P3: Sewer Criterion for Tiers

AT ISSUE: The County stated that the presence or absence of sewers is not in itself sufficient to determine whether development is appropriate given considerations of public health, community character/design.

RESQHCs The PDC and INC agree that the SERF will incorporate additional factors as delineation criteria for Tier 4, provided that these factors are presented in the context of a comprehensive, capacity-based planning approach and that supporting data are available. The parties also agree that the SERF will support the provision of appropriate infrastructure supporting Communities of Place within Tiers 5, 6 and 7.

3. Negotiable Item #P7A: Rural Development Guidelines

Kf ISSUE: The County believes that carrying capacity measures should be well understood and not based on a single tool, such as the nitrate dilution model. Opportunities for alternative infrastructure must be satisfactorily addressed when the capacity for development is limited.

HESCBF: The FDC and **INC** agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its

attainment. The parties also agree that policies -in the SERF will emphasize the use of alternative or community wastewater treatment systems as an alternative to large-lot zoning where water quality is a 1 Smiting factor.

4. Negotiable Item #A12: Statewide Economic Development Strategy 7.0 — Rural Areas

AT XSSKs file appropriate State departments, counties and municipalities should establish a coordinated and comprehensive approach to economic development at all government levels.

The PDC and *IXC* agree that policies in the SERF will address types of economic development that are consistent with rural character and that do not create undue development pressure in such areas.

5. Negotiable Item #A15: Statewide Housing Policy 2.8 — Housing and Community Development: Development Standards

ACT ISSGE: file County believes that design standards should be applied to high density developments on a permissive, not mandatory basis, in order to be aesthetically pleasing and compatible with existing historic structures.

CEP/ISC RESOJTs file OSP and UC agreed to defer this issue, so that it could be discussed in further detail by the PDC and UC.

HC/CfIC HWfl-MltfT: file PDC and IMC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. Design guidelines will be developed through technical assistance to rnvmlrlpalltlfts and in handbooks.

6. Negotiable Item #A17a: Statewide Biological Diversity Policy 1.1 — Ecosystem Identification & Management*

AT ISSBES: Because of the confidential and general nature of mapping endangered species, there is skepticism about the practicality of protecting endangered species.

KESTCT: de PDC and UC agree that policies in the SERF will encourage the identification and mapping of critical habitats by local governments for inclusion in local master plan conservation elements.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 10 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A17a2.

7. Negotiable Item #A18: Statewide Critical Slope Areas Policy 1.2 - (yi -MI-MI Slope Areas: Design

AT XSSDE: The County believes that performance-oriented design standards are preferable to outright restriction of development; architectural review of hicfclly visible structures is desired.

The PDC and HC agree that mechanisms to manage development in critical slope areas will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

8. Negotiable Item fA19: Statewide Flood Control Policy 2.2 - Flood Control: Storm Water Management

AT ISSQS: She policy states: "Municipalities, in cooperation with counties, and the flEEP should prepare and implement watershed based storm water management plans for each flood control priority area..."

The County has suggested that a proactive, regional approach to storm water management should be pursued on the County level. The issues of maintenance, safety, as well as engineering should be addressed.

RESO2T: She PDC and UC agree that mechanisms to promote storm water management in flood control priority areas will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

9. Negotiable Item #A20: Statewide Historic Areas Policy 1.4 - Historic Areas: Construction Codes and Development Regulations

AT ISSffi: The County has suggested that there is a need to relax the Building Officials and Code Administrators (BOCA) codes when the rehabilitation of historic structures is involved.

BESQUFs The PDC and Ut agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. Mechanisms to promote flexibility in rehabilitation of hlRtnn'n structures will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

10. Negotiable Item #A21: Statewide Recreation and Public Open Space Policy 1.1 - Recreation and Public Open Space: Planning and Design

AT ISSKE: The County has recommended that the open space needs of an expanding population be considered as part of an infrastructure needs analysis, beyond those irfp<ni-.ifigH in the guidelines of Volume III of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSCKP).

KESU/T: The PDC and INC agree that planning guidelines are advisory. and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. Mechanisms to assist in planning for recreation and open space will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

11. Negotiable Item #A22a: Statewide Recreation and Public Open Space Policy 1.7 - Recreation and Public Open Space: Stable Funding Sources*

Kf ISSUE: The PSERP policy states: "Hhe State, counties and should devise a system of stable funding sources for the acquisition, development and maintenance necessary to implement a recreation and public open space program, making use of funds from both public and private sources."

The County believes that it is unrealistic to rely on public funding to meet the future open space needs of an expanding population..

RESORT: Ohe PDC and INC agree the SERF will include a policy that fiscal impact on the municipal tax base should be considered and addressed as part of public land acquisition.

*Please Note: Inis issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 10 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A22b.

12. Negotiable Item #A24; Statewide Recreation and Public Open Space Policy 1.10 – An Affirmative.. .Approach: Adequate Facilities Requirements

Kf ISSCB: The County has noted the need for sane entity to accept responsibility for deed restricted open space (e.g., as with open space set asides in cluster development) to ensure that the terms of the deed restriction are enforced and that the land is managed and maintained in a manner consistent with the inrprvted use.

HESU/T: The PDC and IMC agree that mechanisms to ensure that deed-restricted open space is protected from development (such as regional open space agencies, or not-for-profit organizations) will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

13. Negotiable Item #A25: Statewide- Stream Corridors Policy 1.1 – Protection: Buffer Areas

Kf ISSCE: The County has noted that setbacks from streams are desirable provided that this buffer area can be used to calculate site density.

She PDC and INC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy by providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. The application of guidelines will be addressed in handbooks and through technical- assistance.

14. Negotiable Item #A26: Statewide Stream Corridars Policy 1.2 – Protection: Storm Water Management Facilities

XI ISSEBs Bie County has recommended a regional ~~approach~~ to storm water management to reduce the amount of sedimentation that occurs in streams.

HESCUF: The PDC and INC agree that planning guidelines are advisory and not regulatory, and define the meaning of a policy be providing a way to measure a minimum level of its attainment. Mechanisms to control storm water runoff will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

TOOK IX: CTiMMJHM

1. Negotiable Item #4: Bie Tier 4 Delineation Criteria is Unrealistic and Confusing

AT ISSUE: Tte Gloucester County Utility Authority is under contractual obligation to each municipality to serve all areas within the consolidated sewer service region, which is inconsistent with the Tri-County 208 plan. In addition, many Tier 5 & 6 areas, already committed to development through subdivision approvals were overlooked.

The PDC and IMC agree that Tier 4 criteria, based solely on. waste water planning is unsatisfactory in defining future suburbanizing regions. Tier changes, however/ must be supported with documentation. The County should indicate which alternative the State Planning Commission Resolution of May 25, 1990, the capacity based planning approach, or the designation of central places supports the -tier modification. All modifications should be compatible with and respect the goals of the Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #7: Density standards for Rural Tiers

AT ISSQB: The 100-persons-per-so^are-mile density standard in rural tiers is unrealistically low. Densities in all municipalities (except one) are already above this standard.

SESDBE: Ohe FCC and IXC agree that development of an area should be balanced with the area's natural and built capacity to support that development. Capacity based planning should be the basis to determine density in rural areas. should undertake studies to determine a reasonable density given the available infrastructure or natural carrying capacity in order to be considered consistent with the Plan. In the absence of such an analysis, 100 persons per square mile is the recommended base for new development outside of corridor centers, towns, villages and hamlets.

3. Negotiable Item #11: Implementation of the Regional Design System

AT JSSUC: 2he Plan must offer a clear means of implementing the Regional Design System if villages and hamlets are to become more than a concept. Ohere are concerns over higher densities, the need for sewers and cost liabilities, and

market demand. Who will perform the detailed planning needed for development? What would be the institutional arrangements among three levels of government? How much infrastructure would be supported? How much flexibility would municipalities have in controlling density?

RKSffiR The PDC and I2C agree that clarification and implementation of the Regional Design System will be addressed in the Interim Plan. In addition, two Technical Reference Documents are currently under development to further clarify the Regional Design System. They will be released following the Interim Plan.

X: SizEM UUUU3

1. Negotiable Item #6: Expansion of Tier 3, Carneys Point and Pennsville

JET XSSKE: Carneys Point and Pennsville have identified an area that reflects the long-term expansion of the towns' sewer service area. The County agrees with the recommendation.

RESORT: The PDC and IWC agree that the area in question, which falls between the New Jersey Turnpike and Route 295, is a logical extension of development and Tier 5. The area identified as Tier 3 by the County will be considered the long-term urban services boundary. The parties also agree that updated sewer service information will be forwarded to the State Planning Commission.

2. Negotiable Item #9: Rejection of "Communities of Place" Concept

AT XSSStE: Mannington does not believe that the village concept reflects the Township's future. A Tier 4 designation expresses the Township's desire to attract industry. The Office of State Planning pointed out that the village concept, applied in Mannington, would allow the Township to attract the industry it desires and at the same time establish an efficient pattern for future development.

RESOZF: Agreement in Principle - After hearing more about the mixed-use concept from the PDC, the pftrt.ififi agree to consider delineation of an area in the Township as a village. The OSP will assist Mannington in trying to plan for the accommodation non-residential uses in Communities of Place.

3. Negotiable Item #10: Corridor Center Designation for Oldmans Township

ISSIE: The Township hopes this designation will help to establish a commercial base within the 295 corridor. However, the Office of State Planning pointed out that the Township does not meet the necessary criteria. There are four general criteria for the nomination of the corridor centers: a Unaar transportation corridor, a strong existing and projected market demand for development; a sufficient supply of developable land, and, a primary route which crosses municipal boundaries. The area designated in Oldmans Utewnsip satisfies three of the four criteria, the one that is tar?Vi'Tig is the projected demand.

: Agreement in Principle – The PDC and IMC agree that the Office of State Planning should meet with local officials to explore appropriate growth patterns, such as a village designation.

\OC2ME XI: wi^Mrm uucrt

1. Negotiable Item #G-1A: Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSEKP) Overall Content

AT XSSCE: The County considered that many of the strategies and policies were not clearly written and not consistent with one another, and were therefore difficult to interpret.. The strategies and policies should be rewritten in a clear and concise manner. Monmouth County would like their proposed new wording for the strategies and policies to be used in the Final Plan.

RE5DKF: Ofe PEC and IflC agree that specific language changes referring to Volume II of the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed by the OSP and recxxnnendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim Plan. Consistency among all strategies and policies and any of the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #G-5A: Equity

AT ISSEE; The County considered that development densities recommended in the PSERP for Tiers 5, 6, and 7 are not realistic without a means to compensate the landowners.

Legislation to permit transfer of development rights and other mechanisms need to be in place before any tiers with severe density restrictions, recommended in Volume III of the Preliminary Plan, are officially designated.

HESO2P: The PDC and UJC agree that the recommended densities for Tiers 5, 6, and 7 currently in Volume III of the Preliminary Plan are guidelines and are not mandatory requirements. The OSP staff will forward Jfanmouth County's proposed new language for strategies and policies regarding this issue to the PDC.

3. Negotiable Item IG-6: Role (Authority) of the State Planning Commission (SFC)

ISSCE: The County is concerned that the SPC will become another level of bureaucracy. Care should be taken so this does not occur. Any aHrfi-HrmAi reviews that are suggested in the PSDRP should be done according to a strict time schedule (14 days).

RESOUT: Ohe PDC and UC agree that the Commission, under the State Planning -Act, is not intended to be another level of bureaucracy and has no independent review powers. If any advisory contents from the staff are requested by other State agencies , counties , or municipalities , they should be addressed and submitted in an expeditious manner so as not to cause any costly delays. Specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed ty the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion Into the Interim SERF. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the SERF.

4. Negotiable Item #G-8: Applicability of Statewide Strategies and Policies

XT 2S9K: She County noted that the Statewide Strategies and Policies are not applicable to every municipality, especially to those that are completely developed. These municipalities should only have to do those studies and activities that make sense for their towns.

RBSCCF: Ohe PDC and IXC agree that not every Statewide Strategy and Policy is applicable to each municipality. Obe OSP staff will recommend to the PDC language that clarifies

where and when strategies are appropriate, by including explanatory introductory paragraphs in the Statewide Strategies section of the Interim Plan, with descriptions of existing conditions in categories of communities, the strategy intent/ and the desired visionary aspects of the intent. Furthermore, the language in existing (and any new) strategies and policies will be reviewed to clarify where and when they may be applicable. Specific language changes to the PSDRP recommended by Monmouth County regarding this issue will be reviewed by the OSP, and recommendations will be made to the PDC. The proposed language changes will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SDRP. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the Plan.

Negotiable Item #G-9: Community Character

ISSCE: The County is concerned that the PSCR encourages a variety of land uses and housing types for each community. This mix may not be appropriate for each town. In addition, the plan includes other strategies and policies such as establishing uniform design standards and performance standards, prescribing economic growth and transportation programs and certain Regional Design System components that also affect community character.

KESDETI The PDC and IMC agree that specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the SERF. The OSP staff will recommend to the PDC language which clarifies that strategies and policies that affect community character will only apply in appropriate localities. Any specific language changes regarding mixed-use will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim Plan.

6. Negotiable Item #S-1A: Funding Priorities – The Basis for state Funding for Capital Facilities

AT ISSCE: The County disagrees with the FSEKP's funding priorities. Maintaining existing and related services that protect public health and safety should be the first State funding priority for all tiers, not just for Tier 1. Any

funds for capital facilities should be allocated on the basis of a needs assessment as well as planning criteria/ rather than tier designation.

KESDUF: The FDC and INC agree that maintaining existing related services that protect public health and safety throughout the State is the first funding priority. The PDC and IWC further agree that any additional funds for capital facilities should be allocated on the basis of a needs assessment and planning criteria in addition to the tier system.

7. Negotiable Item #S-2: On-Tract/Off-Tract Financing

KF ISSUE: The County believes that municipalities, including those designated as Tier 1, should not be forced to contribute to developer improvements, on-tract and off-tract. Developers should pay for these improvements whenever possible and municipalities should contribute only when the municipality determines that it is necessary.

BESDUT: .The FDC and IKC agree that OSP staff will recommend language to the FDC that ensures consistency between Statewide Capital Facilities and Service Strategies and Policies and Tier 1 Capital Facilities and Service Strategies and Policies. The specific wording recommendation made by Mormouth County to use "may" instead of "should" in Statewide and Tier 1 Strategies and Policies referring to this issue will also be made to the FDC for consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the SERF. Any specific language changes regarding on-tract/off-tract financing will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim Plan.

8. Negotiable Item #S-3: Capital Facilities in Tiers 5, 6, and 7

AT 3SSQB: State funding for roads and bridges should be granted in Tiers 5, 6, and 7 when a road linking other tiers passes through these limited-growth tiers or when public safety and health is involved.

RBSOGT: The FDC and LNC agree that the intent of the Eceliminary Plan, is for roads in all tiers to be maintained. OSP staff has recommended to the FDC that new transportation policies are needed in Tiers 5, 6, and 7, that address

highway linkage. Wording such as "highway access will be carefully managed so as not to induce additional growth" will also be recommended. The PDC and UC also agree that specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed by the OSP, and recommendations will be made to the PDC for consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the SERF.

9. Negotiable Item #8-5: Flood Control Stormwater Management Policies

AT 1SSCE: de County has recommended including the following in the revision of the PSCRP: (1) stormwater management and flood control should be addressed in separate, but adjacent sections of the SCKP; (2) there is a need for separate strategies and policies for non-tidal and tidal areas; (3) in addition/- **Hai areas which are developed should have different strategies and policies than those that are undeveloped, and for each of these two categories there should be separate policies for coastal and mainland areas; and, (4) for both tidal and non-tidal areas, there should be different policies for the replacement of existing structures and the building of new structures.

: Ofte PDC and INC agree that stormwater management and flood control should be addressed in separate but adjacent strategies and policies, and that Moranouth County's recommendations regarding this matter will be reviewed by the PDC. de PDC and IXC further agree that separate, relevant Statewide Strategies and Policies should be developed for tviffai and non-tidal areas and for other Issues raised by Monmouth County. Such language, when drafted, will be referred to the PDC, the Division of Coastal Resources, and the County for review and ~~eeiiien~~ before inclusion in the Interim SERP.

10. Negotiable Item #3-6: Regional Design System Concept

Jff XSSDB: The County concern is that the concept of central places as described in the PSCRP was not acceptable to almost all Tnnnlqjpf0 l"tj^8 in the County. Most monijCipalltTies that had Tiers 5, 6, and 7 designations also contained growth tiers, dey want new development to be.concentrated in the

growth tiers and not to create new growth areas in Communities of Place. In addition, the designation of the components of the Regional Design System should not be mandatory.

KESCUP: The PDC and LNC agree that Policy 2,4 should be rewritten as follows: The SPC should recognize corridor centers, villages and hamlets nominated by counties and determine their boundaries and delineate their boundaries in the final SEKP. Areas with potential for new villages and/or new hamlets can be designated by municipalities and counties without specifying their precise location.

11. Negotiable Item #S-7: Energy, Noise and Community Design

AT ISSStE: The County recommends the addition of Statewide Strategies and Policies for the following subjects: Energy Conservation; Noise; and Community Design.

BESOtTfe The PDC and IHC agree that mWtinnnl energy, noise, and community design policies will be considered for inclusion into the Interim SERF. Any specific language changes regarding these issues will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim Plan.

12. Negotiable Item #T-1: Tier 1 - The Density, Scale and Character of Tier 1

AT ISSDB: The County noted it is crucial that redevelopment in Tier 1 municipalities be compatible with the density, scale, and character of surrounding areas. Developers should not be allowed to use the Tier 1 designation as a tool to support large-scale redevelopment projects that do not conform to zoning regulations and are not compatible with the character of neighboring sites.

HESOUF: The PDC and UC agree that current desirable community character should be maintained and enhanced. Policies that emphasize redevelopment should be clarified to address the diversity existing in municipalities and their differing needs and scales of redevelopment efforts. The scale, scope, and intensity of local redevelopment projects in urban areas is a municipal prerogative in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law. It is agreed that specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed for consideration for inclusion into the Interim SDRP. Consistency among all

strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the Plan. Any specific language changes regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the interim Plan.

13. Negotiable Item #T-3: Tier 7 - Environmental Protection in Developed Areas

KE XSSOB: The County recommended that there should be special strategies and policies for environmentally-sensitive areas designated within Tiers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Most of the Tier 7 strategies and policies are recommended for rural areas and do not work well for proposed Tier 7 areas surrounded by Tiers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

KESffiT: The PDC and UJC agree that Monmouth County will resubmit to the OSP the smaller (less than one square mile) Tier 7 sites designated ESS. These sites will be filed with the State and serve as a data base, but will not appear on the State tier map. A footnote should appear on the State map indicating that more detailed information is found on the County and municipal maps, and then should be included on the County's map and on municipal maps. Statewide, not Tier 7, Strategies and Policies will apply to ESS. The OSP will recommend to the PDC that the Statewide Environmental Strategies and Policies should be reviewed, and if new ones are needed for the protection of ESS, they should be added. The PDC and I2C also agree that specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed by the OSP and ~~recoanriations~~ will be made to the PDC for consideration or inclusion into the Interim Plan. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted recommendations will be maintained throughout the SDRP. Any specific language changes will be submitted to the County for review and comment.

14. Negotiable Item #M-3A: Historic Town and Sensitivity Buffer*

AT 35SDB: Monmouth County proposes an "Historic Town" designation and "Sensitivity Buffer" delineation, as follows and explained below:

"A town possessing an exceptional number of historic structures and places. In rural settings, these towns frequently exist as traditional centers surrounded by

historic landscapes. The policies for Historic Towns and Sensitivity Buffers would emphasize the preservation of these historic resources."

The Borough of Allentown, for which the Historic Town category was created, does not want the wholesale redevelopment of its historic district that might be suggested by the existing Tier 3 policies and it is fearful that it would become the nucleus for aHHi-Honai ring development along its border if it were designated as a village. (See Volume III Guidelines for Villages and County of Montnouth checklist comment on Tier 3 Policy 1.6).

RESORT: The PDC and I1C agree that sites that have historic significance can be designated as environmentally-sensitive sites. These sites will be filed with the State arid serviced as a data base, but will not appear on the State t.ier map. They should be included on the County map and on municipal maps. Statewide Natural and Cultural Resources Strategies and Policies will apply to protect the historically-significant site and its surrounding areas. The OSP will recommend to the PDC that Statewide Natural and Cultural Resources Strategies and Policies should be reviewed, and if new ones are needed for the protection of historically-significant sites and sensitivity buffers, they should be added.

*Please Note: This issue was resolved as a 2-part issue. Please refer to Page 13 in the Implementation Section for the resolution of Item #M-3B.

ZEE: XHRIS Ouerr

1. Negotiable Item #P1: Tier 1 Criteria

JET XSSTC: The County believes that Tier 1 criteria should be modified to remove the stigma currently associated with this designation, while still providing for revitalization needs. The County feels that the municipal distress index should not be used in Tier 1 criteria, as it may inaccurately characterize areas.

OSP/Ef1C KttWF: Defer - The OSP and IMC agreed to .defer the resolution of this issue, as the PDC is considering it pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006 dated May 25, 1990.

IDC/UC RESOKTr Agreement in Principle - The PDC and agree that Tier 1 criteria will be revised in the SERP to remove the municipal distress index if an acceptable

alternative is defined. The SCRP will include statewide strategies and policies to promote "community revitalization" regardless of tier designation.

2. Negotiable Item #P2: Environmental Protection in Urban Areas

AT ISSEE: The County has noted that watershed management is needed to protect existing and suspected sources of water supply, but ECRA and other environmental requirements limit opportunities for infill or redevelopment. How should environmental protection be balanced with needs for redevelopment in developed areas?

RR5UP: The PDC and X24C agree that the SCRP will emphasize the complementary relationships between environmental protection, support for the value of, and opportunities for, existing development and/or redevelopment via appropriate policies that provide for intergovernmental coordination.

3. Negotiable Item #P3: Suburban Redevelopment

Kf IS5DB: The County believes that intensification of development in existing developed suburbs should not degrade community character or result in the imposition of fiscal burdens. Does the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSCR) encourage redevelopment in suburbs that may result in negative changes to community character?

KtSULfe The PDC and IMC agree that the tier intent for Tier 2 states that, "Future growth must be absorbed prudently in order to maintain the attractive quality of life that currently characterizes these Tier 2 municipalities." The SERF will include a policy (-ies) to encourage redevelopment in developed suburbs that will be compatible in intensity and design and will make a positive contribution to the character of that community and its region. Design recommendations will be addressed in supplementary handbooks and through technical assistance.

4. Negotiable Item #P4: Suburban Tier Criteria

Kf ISSOB: The County believes that tier criteria should consider differences in community character and the capacity for growth. The SDRP should include [arbitrary] tiers or sub-tiers that reflect the diversity of conditions in the suburbs.

G6P/UC KESTCT: Defer- The OSP and UC agreed that the PDC is considering this issue pursuant to SFC Resolution #90-006 dated May 25, 1990.

HK/UC BESDC2F: Agreement in Principle - The PDC and IMC agree that the SERF will be reasonably flexible in application and interpretation of tier criteria as well as in consideration of *i«»r intent. This flexibility will accommodate the diversity of conditions in suburbs, and in various tier designations.

5. Negotiable Item #P6: Secondary Agricultural Areas

Kf JSSfkz Policies pertaining to agricultural lands outside of Tier 6 should address the eligibility and participation of these lands for farmland preservation and/or opportunities for development. Should the SERF address agriculture outside of designated agricultural areas?

OSP/UC HESOUPs Defer - The OSP and U9C agreed that in response to the SFC Resolution #90-006 of May 25, 1990, the SDRP will include appropriate statewide strategies and policies that encourage Communities of Place, rural development, and farmland preservation.

EDC/UC BESffiFs Agreement in Principle - The PDC and IMC agree to continue the dialogue as statewide strategies for agriculture are developed. The SERF will include appropriate statewide and tier policies that will address agriculture throughout the State.

6. Negotiable Item #P7: Corridor Center Development

Xf XSSEKi The County believes that corridor center densities and building heights should be compatible with community character. Should a wider range of densities for corridor center development be encouraged?

RE&WF: The PDC and UC agree that policies in the SCKP will emphasize comprehensive, intergovernmental corridor region development planning as the context for design to balance community character with regional transportation and development objectives. Guidelines and procedures for corridor center development will be provided in handbooks and through other technical assistance.

7. Negotiable Item fP8: Other Communities of Place

AT ISSK: The County feels that communities of place concepts should be applied to maintaining and enhancing the character of <MHgH™j developed communities. Should the SERF provide for other types and locations for communities of place, particularly in existing developed areas?

KESffift lire PDC and UC agree that policies in the SERF will encourage the application of regional design (including communities of place) concepts in existing developed areas, where appropriate, in order to maintain and enhance community character in accordance with SCKP objectives.

8. Negotiable Item #Pl0a: Permit-Project Streamlining*

AT ISSCE: 03ie County is concerned that permit streamlining might result in local government responsibility for which the State has traditionally been responsible. Should permit and project streamlining be initiated by government as an important ii^entive for continued growth?

BESO2T: The PDC and IMC agree that the delegation of permit authority is defined by the State legislature, and therefore is beyond the scope of the SDRP. Permit streamlining will be advocated in the SCKP as a cooperative effort among State and local government to be achieved in ways consistent with sound planning practices.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 16 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of Pl0b.

9. Negotiable Item #A2a: Statewide Comprehensive Planning Policy 2*2 - Coor*H™'***T*g Planning: County and Tfr*pv^ip? \l Plans

KF ISSUE: The County suggests that planning activities should be coordinated with all "appropriate" agencies within county or municipal government, rather than "all" county and municipal agencies, as suggested in "Guideline a. Ensuring Conformance Among Plans & Regulations" "Guideline b. Coordinating Agency Plans and Actions."

BBSU2F: The PDC and IMC agree that long-range, comprehensive planning has implications for, and should be informed by, agencies not traditionally involved with land use planning activities (such as school boards and health and human

service agencies). The SERF will encourage consultation and coordination that involves the broadest possible range of agencies.

10. Negotiable Item #A5: Statewide Capital Facilities Financing & Development Policy 1.1 – Planning: State Department Plans

*T ISSIE: The County notes that the above policy suggests that State departments should identify and prioritize capital facilities and related services costs over a 15-year period. A 15-year capital financing period may be excessive, especially when compared to other states.

RESTCT: The PDC and UC agree that policies in the SERF will distinguish the long-term objectives of an infrastructure needs assessment from the relatively short-term objectives of capital financing programs. The 15-year period will be reviewed and, if appropriate, modified in the context of the infrastructure needs assessment published with the SERF and in the context of the Implementation Report of the SPC.

11. Negotiable Item #A6a: Statewide Capital Facilities Financing & Development Policy 1.2 – Planning: County and Municipal Plans

Kf ISSQE: The County reports that a 15-year capital financing period may be excessive, which is indicated by the above-referenced policy. It states that counties and municipalities should identify and prioritize capital •Fam'ii-Hcis and related services costs over a 15-year period.

KESOUT: One PDC and UC agree that policies in the SDRP will distinguish the long-term objectives of the infrastructure needs assessment from the relatively short-term objectives of capital financing ~~programs~~. The 15-year period will be reviewed and, if appropriate, modified in the context of the infrastructure needs assessment published with the SERF and in the context of the Implementation Report of the SPC.

12. Negotiable Item #A7: Statewide Capital Facilities Financing & Development Policy 2.4 – Funding Priorities: Extensions

JKC ISSQE: The County believes that "Guideline a. Restricting Expansion of Facilities to Ensure Infill" is inappropriately restrictive.

HESOGF: 3fte PDC and IflC agree that policies in the SERF will support the extension of capital facilities for public health and safety or where otherwise compatible with SDRP objectives.

13. Negotiable Item #A8b: Statewide Economic Development Policy 3.1 - Capital Facilities and Public Services: Adequate Facilities/Services , Guideline a.- Establishing Levels of Service

AT ISSOE: The County feels that all infrastructure cannot be defined in terms of "level of service. " A consensus should be reached on methods of determining "appropriate" levels of service.

.The PDC and I/JC agree that this and associated policies in the SEEP will define "adequate " capital and related services in a measurable context, such as levels of service/ that is sensitive to differences in local circumstances and community character. Guidelines and procedures to establish these levels will be provided through handbooks and technical assistance.

14. Negotiable Item #A9(1): Statewide Economic Development Policy 3.2 Capital Facilities and Public Services: Utility/Energy System*

KF ISSDE: She County reports that some municipalities are troubled by "Guideline a. Coordinating Utilities with Statewide Objectives." Some municipalities are concerned that local participation will be excluded from the decision making process with respect to any prospective location of utility plants.

RESUff: The PDC and INC agree that the SERF will reinforce relationships among policies so that energy facilities are provided in a manner responsive to statewide, regional, and concerns.

*Please Note: ttiis issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 20 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A9(2) .

15. Negotiable Item #A10(1): Statewide Economic Development Policy 5.3 - Revitalizing Redeveloping Cities/Suburbs: Facilities*

AT ISSUE: The County believes that cultural facilities should be promoted and supported in centers of all scales.

KESOGF: The PDC and IJJC agree that the SERP will reinforce policies to provide cultural facilities in a manner responsive to the overall development and redevelopment objectives of Urban Centers, as well as all other centers.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 20 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A10(2) .

16. Negotiable Item #A11(1): Statewide Housing Policy 1.1 - Reducing . Housing Costs: Streamlining the Permitting Process, Guideline d. -Consolidating Regulations*

AT ISSUES The County believes that the State should not institute a single, consolidated development regulation to be applied to all levels of government, as indicated by the above guideline.

KESOUFT The PDC and IMC agree that streamlining policies in the SDRP will promote consolidation of development regulations within each level of government, rather than among levels.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 21 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A11(2) .

17. Negotiable Item #A18: Statewide Housing Strategy 3 - Coordination with the Council on Affordable Housing (CQAH)

Kf ISSUE: The County believes that the solution to providing an adequate supply of affordable low- and moderate-income housing should not be limited to current CQfH guidelines.

RBSKE2F: The PDC and LNC agree that policies in the SERP, and among policies, will emphasize maximizing housing choice in terms of income groups, tenure types, and locations including, but not limited to, low- and moderate-income housing.

18. Negotiable Item #A19: Statewide Housing Policy 3.1 - Coordination with CQAH: CQfH Needs Allocations

AT XSSCE: Bie County believes that this policy is unclear and its implications are uncertain.

UKSUUfc After discussion clarifying the policy, the PDC and LNC agree that policies in the SERF, and relationships among policies, will promote the implementation of municipal master plan housing elements while discouraging development incompatible with other provisions of the SQRP.

19. Negotiable Item #A23(1): Statewide OZransportation Strategy 2
- An Integrated and Efficient Transportation System*

AT XSSTCi County believes that NJ Transit and transportation management associations should be considered important entities and responsible agencies in this strategy.

KESQUT: The PDC and I2C agree that the policies in the SERF, and relationships among policies, will promote the involvement of State and regional transit and transit management agencies in providing an efficient and integrated transportation system.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 21 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A23(2).

20. Negotiable Item #A24(1): Statewide Transportation Policy 2.1
- An Integrated/Efficient Transportation System: Highway Funding

ISSUE: Hie County believes that mechanisms should be identified for relating capital ~~implevemeuL~~ plans and transportation master plans with the SDRP, particularly for recurring and backlog needs.

RESCEff: Ite PDC and IWC agree that policies in the SERF, and relationships among policies, will help to determine priorities among projects.

*Please Note: ttiis issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 21 under the "Implementation" sect inn of this Update for the resolution of A24(2) .

21. Negotiable Item #A24+: Statewide Transportation Policy 2.9 --
An Integrated/Efficiency Transportation System: Air Travel

AT XSSOB: Public Cements included in the County Cross-Acceptance Report note that existing airport facilities and operations need to be maintained.

BESQCffs The PEG and UC agree that the SERF will promote the maintenance of existing airport fan*Titles and the provision of airport safety zones by municipalities.

22. Negotiable Item #A25a(1): Statewide Air Quality Policy 1.1 -
- Coordinating Development Patterns: Land Use Patterns
Guideline b.*

AT ISSDBs. The County objects to this guideline, noting that requiring air quality assessments will further complicate development and contradicts permit streamlining policies in the SERF.

RESO2F: The PDC and UC agree that policies in the SERF, and relationships among policies, will promote air quality provisions in local and county master plans, as well as in specific development projects.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 22 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A25a(2).

23. Negotiable Item #A25b(1): Statewide Air Quality Policy 1.1 -
- Coordination Development Patterns: Land Use Patterns,
Guideline c.-Preventing Increases in Emissions*

AT XSSKs The County is concerned that limiting retail parking spaces, as indicated in the above guideline, may be detrimental to the viability of businesses.

BBSOQF: The PDC and INC agree that the SERF will promote a variety of approaches to modify land use patterns, in order to prevent increases in air pollutant emissions, where appropriate.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 22 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A25(2).

24. Negotiable Item #A26(1): Statewide Air Quality Policy 1.4 -
Coordinating Development Patterns: Alternate Travel Means,
Guideline a.-Encouraging Transportation Management Agencies*

XT ISSUE: The guideline states that private or public contributions to a regional transportation management agency should be encouraged that will result in reduced overall contaminant emissions for new development in Tier 4 and in Rural Development Areas. The County believes that contributions should not only be encouraged in Tier 4 .

BESDC2F: The FDC and IMC agree that the SDRP will promote a variety of alternative travel means relevant to both developed and developing areas/ which could be implemented, as

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 22 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of £26(2) .

- 25 . Negotiable Item #A28 (1) : Statewide Biological Diversity Policy 1.1 – Ecosystem Management: Ecosystem Identification & Management*

AT ISSCE: The County feels that critical habitats should be identified, but not as part of the SDRP cross-acceptance process, as the policy indicates.

BESQHF: The PDC and INC agree that policies in the SDRP will encourage the identification and mapping of critical habitats by local governments for inclusion in local master plans.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 23 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of £28(2) .

26. Negotiable Item #A32(1): Statewide Critical Slope Areas Policy 1.1 – Development and Redevelopment: Identification/ Delineation*

ISSCE: The County believes that individual should determine what constitutes a critical slope.

BESOT: The PDC and **IXC** agree that the policies in the SDRP will encourage the establishment of uniform standards for the and mapping of rrr-it-irigi slope areas by the State and/or local governments for inclusion in local master plans.

*Please Note: 1*1* « issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 23 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A32b.

27. Negotiable Item #A33(1): Statewide Flood Control - General*

JKP ISSCES The County reported that some municipalities consider the general intent and specific proposals of statewide flood control impractical from legal ("taking") and planning practices, as all development "effects" storm water runoff.

BESOUTs The PDC and IMC agree that the STEP will promote a variety of approaches for flood control relevant to both developed and developing areas that could be implemented as appropriate.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 24 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A33(2).

28. Negotiable Item #A37(1): Statewide Flood Control Policy 2.3 - Proactive Flood Hazard Controls: . . .Outside Flood Plains*

XT ISSUE: The County noted that the current enabling legislation does not support the actions recommended by this policy.

KESQ2T: The PDC and IFC agree that policies in the SERF will promote the use of existing storm water management, soil erosion, drainage, and flood control programs in managing development and redevelopment outside of flood plains.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 24 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A37(2) .

29. Negotiable Item #A43(1): Statewide Scenic Corridors Policy 1.1 -

JET ISSUE: The County feels that scenic corridors should be identified, but not as part of the SERF cross-acceptance process.

RESQufe The PDC and LNC agree that policies in the SCKP will encourage identification and mapping of scenic corridors by State and/or local governments for inclusion in local master plans.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 24 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A43(2) .

30. Negotiable Item #A46: Statewide Waste Disposal Strategy 1 - Waste Disposal Planning and Facilities

XT iSSUKs The County does not believe it is necessary to restrict new development and redevelopment activities near waste-to-energy "EfKTLM'ti.QP because certain industrial/commercial development is compatible.

HESOHF: The PDC and I1C agree that the strategy will emphasize the provision of Policy 1.2, "Waste Disposal: Development/Redevelopment." The policy identifies the appropriate areas for these restrictions as, "Where there is sufficient evidence that off-site contamination could affect public health or safety..."

31. Negotiable Item #A49(1): Statewide Water Supply Sources Policy 1.4 - Water Supply: Development Regulations for Wastewater Disposal, Guideline a.-Development Capacity Analysis - Applying the Nitrate Dilution Model*

JT ItiSlK: The County reports that legal and technical assistance is needed to develop alternative approaches and to avoid misapplication of the nitrate model.

KESHSPs Otoe PDC and UC agree that policies in the SEKP will emphasize the use of alternative or community wastewater treatment systems as an alternative to large lot zoning, where water quality is a limiting factor for development.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 25 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A49(2).

32. Negotiable Item #A69: Tier 7 - Criteria

JO? ISSCE: The County believes that criteria should be flexible; not all tier criteria should not have to be satisfied for a specific delineation; not all policies need to be applied, even if they are not relevant.

OSP/UC KEDE/P: Defer - She OSP and I2C agreed that the SPCs PDC is considering this issue pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006 dated May 25, 1990.

HDC/UC KKSUUfe Agreement in Principle - The PDC and UK. agree that criteria for tiers in the SERP will be reasonably flexible in application and interpretation of tier criteria

as well as in consideration of tier intent. This flexibility will accommodate the diversity of conditions in suburbs -in various

XOI: HBUHGKH GUUKLX

1. Negotiable Item #5: The use of the Office of Management & Budget (CUB) Distress List as a Criteria for Designating Tier 1

AT XSSOS: The CMB list should not be considered part of the criteria by which Tier 1 is designated. Tier 1 should be framed with more positive language, in order not to stigmatize areas so designated. Additionally, policies should be crafted to address pockets of distress in otherwise stable communities.

JflfiWR The FDC and INC agree to change the category of this issue. The new criteria is still being developed. The parties also agree that Tier 1 should focus on form and areas exhibiting distress should be addressed, regardless of the tier designation, where it is prevalent, as a Statewide Strategy.

2. Negotiable Item #6: One Council on Affordable Housing (CQAH) and the State Plan

KF ISSUfis The County noted that the Plan's housing policy needs to be clarified concerning CQAH, particularly in Tiers 5, 6 & 7. Burlington County feels that the SFC should work toward clarifying the relationship between the Plan and CQAH to minimize confusion. Florence Township also stated that land use and funding for CQAH housing should be integrated with State Plan strategies and policies.

JRESOUTs The FDC and UC agree that language clarification is necessary in the Interim Plan to explain housing policy intent, particularly in Tiers 5, 6 & 7.

3. Negotiable Item #8: Housing Policy 2.5, Housing and Community Development

AT 3S5K: Burlington County suggested the policy appears to add an additional layer over CQAH as well as requiring specific neighborhoods to be "targeted."

HBSoff: Bie PDC and IWC agree that a comprehensive master plan, including a detailed Housing Element, should be sufficient to identify specific areas for housing and community development, and therefore, no additional layer is created.

4. Negotiable Item #9: Tier 5 - Criteria Should be BpdefInert or Eliminated

KC ISSCE: Burlington County raised the possibility that large lot development will occur in Tier 5 areas, eliminating the possibility for "future growth." She County also believes that State financing of infrastructure to promote clustering associated with agriculture and farmland preservation should receive priority regardless of tier assignment (e.g., TDR receiving zone in Tier 5 should receive priority infrastructure to promote agriculture preservation).

KESDUT: The PDC and INC agree that Tier 5 needs to be more clearly defined. land development patterns, development opportunities along with agricultural and natural resource based land uses for this region will be presented and discussed. 3ER receiving zones which result in Communities of Place as well as easement purchase will be given consideration for priority in Tier 5 areas.

5. Negotiable Item #12: Growth Center Designations

KF XSSCE: The County ccmamicated several concerns on behalf of its nrmim'pai i-hi^sr They are reluctant to designate new growth centers due to a lack of incentives to do so without being able to devise a related preservation benefit elsewhere in the township. The Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan's (PSDRP) growth strategy seems to discourage a variety in densities, and sore of the land use recommendations contained in Volume III for villages are objectionable. Communities in the TCR pilot project have designated villages or growth centers to accommodate growth. Other townships suffering from "overdevelopment" (areas fully developed that feel they can't accommodate additional growth) have rejected the Regional Design System concept as counter productive. Overdevelopment = traffic woes.

Municipalities are reluctant to identify growth corridors; they fear they will lose planning control over corridors

within their community and concrete examples of clearer descriptions of growth incentives and permit expediting are needed.

KESDHF: The FDC and UC agree that urban and suburban areas need to be better integrated into the Regional Design System. An Urban Design Manual, to be prepared after the release of the Plan, will include provisions to accomplish that integration.

6. Negotiable Item #19: Statewide Strategy, Natural Resources

AT ISSCE: The County has recommended that the existing language concerning Statewide Natural Resource policy provisions should be strengthened. language in Strategy 1, Development and Redevelopment should be changed from, "only when the effects on the natural hydrology regime have been minimized..." to, "only when NO SIGNIFICANT SOIL DISTURBANCES OCCUR" on the hydrologic regime will occur."

The language in Policy 1.5, Managing Development should be modified to read as follows: "NO SIGNIFICANT SOIL DISTURBANCES OCCUR" for critical slope areas.

RESOUT: The FDC and IMC agree that development of steep slope areas should not result in erosion, the creation of excess stormwater runoff and flooding downstream.

MTWIUK XIV? P*SS*^TC QOWHF-

1. Negotiable Item #3: Permit Streamlining - ifctne Rule

XT ISEBEHE: The streamlining of the development and redevelopment review process raises concerns with a number of while most j^{ir} i ***** pylons agree with the concept of streamlined regulations, many do not support efforts to adopt new laws that promote nrii farm standards at the expense of local conditions, problems and needs.

KES02F; The FDC and INC agree that it is not the intent of the State Plan to promote uniform standards at the expense of local conditions, problems and needs. The parties further agree that, while permit streamlining is necessary at the State level; it may also be necessary, based upon local review, at the County and municipal levels of government.

2. Negotiable Item #4A: Development Financing of Infrastructure Improvements*

AT E5S99Z: pa-ftlci pat" i on in the cross-acceptance process has not generated a County or municipal understanding of the extent to which new development should pay for public infrastructure, open space and service needs. Municipal negotiations with developers are still somewhat informal. The County is looking for State guidance for determining development financing of infrastructure improvements.

BESOUTs Ohe FDC and UC agree in principle that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied.

*Please Note: Issue #4 was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The resolution of Issue 4B is reported under the "Implementation" page 11-12.

3. Negotiable Item #6: Tier 1 - Negative Image of Tier 1

AT XSSR: The SPC should reconsider the definition of Tier 1. The tier criteria are not adequate when they are applied to all such designated municipalities. In some cases, a Tier 1 designation may place a stigma on the community which is misleading. The problem seems to lie with the use of the Municipal Distress Index as a ^lor <tel inggt; j cm criterion. Some components of the Index, such a pre-1940 housing, do not necessarily reflect distress. The Passaic County Planning Board has recommended that a sub-Tier 1 (e.g.. Tier IB) be devised to include current Tier 1 irmTncHpat-i-Hpg, such as Haledon, which are distinct from the 16 most distressed cities on the list.

BESOR: The PDC and IX agree that it would be desirable to remove the Nunim'pal Distress Index as a criterion and to address distress under the Plan's Statewide Strategies sections if an acceptable tier format can be maintained.

4. Negotiable Item #12: Housing - Inclusionary Zoning

Kf ISSDB: The Borough of Ringwood objects to the State Plan's inclusionary zoning language in Housing Policies 3.2 and 3.3. Citing its environmentally sensitive landscape, its designation as a "conservation community" not subject to a regional COAH obligation, its substantive COSH certification, its satisfaction of its indigenous housing need, and its lack of public sewer facilities, the Borough has requested that

the Passaic County Cross-Acceptance Report be amended to delete any reference to mandated inclusionary zoning for the community*

The County believes that inclusionary zoning should not be required in any tier since this would inhibit the local choice of inclusionary zoning locations. Inclusionary zoning could induce unwanted growth in Tiers 5, 6 and 7, and should be eliminated from these tiers. This policy should be reworded in this respect so that the environment and natural resources will be protected. Hamlets are too small for inclusionary zoning.

RESORT: The PDC and IWC agree that the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSORP) does not require the use of inclusionary zoning by any municipality. Rather, the Plan suggests directing the development of any subsequent housing into Communities of Place. The parties further agree in principle that the intent of both policies should be clarified in the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #13: Housing – Regional Contribution Agreements for Tiers 2 and 3

AT ISSCE: The County stated that regional contribution agreements (RCAs) are not a suitable concept for providing housing in most of Tiers 2 and 3. These municipalities often use RCAs for housing in Tier 1. Additionally, RCAs are not suitable in Tier 3 except for distressed communities.

JTW: The PDC and IWC agree that there may be cases where the use of RCAs is appropriate for Tier 2 and Tier 3 communities.

6. Negotiable Item #14: Regional Design System

AT ISSCE: Development should not be encouraged in Tier 7 in Passaic County. The State should reword Regional Design System Policy 7.1 to discourage unsuitable development in Tier 7. The OSP explained that in rural development areas, the Plan recommends that housing densities should be based upon the carrying capacities of the natural and built environments. Housing development at higher densities should be permitted in corridor centers, villages and hamlets where appropriate and consistent with design criteria and infrastructure provided with respect to those places.

KESU/F: The FDC and IMC agree in principle that the Regional Design System does not encourage growth beyond County and municipal capacities to support that growth, nor beyond what they have identified as their preferred levels of growth. The parties further agree that the policies related to of Place in Tier 7 should be clarified in this regard.

7. Negotiable Item #15: Tier Changes – Tier 7 Nominations

AT 35SK: The County has nominated several small Tier 7 areas to preserve locally recognized environmentally sensitive features. The OSP explained, -however, that the PDC is considering including, among the Statewide Strategies for Natural and Cultural Resources, a series of policies by which "Environmentally Sensitive Sites" (ESS) may be identified, mapped and managed in accordance with appropriate Statewide Policies, independent of tier or Regional Design System designations.

EBSffiF: The PDC and IMC agree in principle that the County should resubmit its Tier 7 nominations as ESS nominations.

8. Negotiable Item #16: Sewer Criteria for Tiers – Tier

JET ISSCE: The presence or absence of sewers should not be a threshold for making tier designations. This results in the improper categorization of fully- and almost fully-developed areas as "rural" (e.g., Tier 5), or conversely, large, undeveloped tracts as ** gnHirhanizing" (e.g., Tigr 4) due to outdated 208 plans.

RESOUFs The PDC and IMC agree that it would be desirable to have pHri-ii-iona] factors as delineation criteria for Tier 4 if that information or data are reasonably available, and if such factors do not conflict one with the other.

The HXZ and IMC further agree that, and when a County and/or municipality can demonstrate to the SPC that it has devised more sophisticated analyses that are consistent with a capacity-based planning approach, and that tier changes are warranted based on those analyses, then the OSP may review and reconsider the current tier delineations that rely on the sewer distinctions.

9. Negotiable Item #1SA: Comprehensive Planning – Horizontal Integrating of County and Municipal Plans*

XSSTC: Guideline "c" for Comprehensive Planning Policy 2.2 does not implement the policy. This is vertical, not horizontal integration. The OSP noted that the County does not disagree with the policy, but with the guideline, which may in fact contradict the policy. This guideline may have been placed under the wrong policy. It should be noted, however, that the guidelines in Volume III are advisory, not regulatory. They provide technical assistance in defining the meaning of a policy through a means by which to measure a level of its attainment.

RBSQUFs The PDC and IWC agree with the policies calling for the horizontal and vertical integration of municipal. County and State plans.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The resolution of issue 18B is reported under the "Defer" section page 8-9.

10. Negotiable Item #19A: Economic Development – Review and Evaluation of State Performance*

M TjaHMR: The Guidelines in Volume III for Economic Development Policy 1.1 outline tasks that should be performed by mnn-impai it-.jes. iky?fli actions are not mentioned in the policy statement. The policy statement should reflect this, or Guideline "a" should be changed by removing any references to local tasks.

The County does not disagree with the policy, but with the guidelines, which, they believe, contradicts the policy. However, further review of the guidelines indicates that they do support the policy, as the municipal and county actions would supply the data necessary for the SPC to evaluate enonmir performance.

KESH/T: The FDC and I2C agree in principle with the policy calling for the State review and evaluation of New Jersey's economic performance. The parties also agree in principle that the municipalities and counties play an important role in the data exchange necessary for the performance of this review.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The resolution of issue 19B is reported under the "Defer" section page 9.

VO1K XV: OK MS? IXUU3

1. Negotiable Item #6: Infrastructure Funding Priorities

JKP ISSQB: As a non-urban area, Cape May County is concerned about the equitable distribution of funds throughout the State. Agricultural, rural, resort and suburban areas have existing and future infrastructure needs should not be ignored for the purpose of urban redevelopment. One Plan has been accused of having urban redevelopment as its primary focus. The Plan must show and state that this is not the case.

KESOUF: The PDC and IXC agree that funding for the maintenance and upgrading of Infrastructure should be available to meet municipal needs statewide in all tier designations if a public health or safety need has been established. The SPC is considering changes to funding priorities in the PSERP to reflect possible modifications in the tlnr system, pursuant to SPC Resolution No. 90-006.

2. Negotiable Item #10: Tier 5 Capital Facilities Financing

ISSQB: Tiers 2 through 4 Capital Facilities Financing policies recommend sharing costs through public/private partnerships. Tier 5, Capital Facilities Financing Policy 2.3 recommends that all facilities be funded by the private sector. In Cape May County, rapidly developing mainland municipalities making use of public/private partnerships are unsewered, thus delineated as Tier 5. Since these municipalities have implemented cost sharing for parks and capital facilities in public/private partnerships should be allowed in Tier 5.

BBSO2F: The PDC and INC agree that prioritization will be examined for capital facilities consistent with tiers, such as transit improvements for all tiers, agriculture funding in Tier 6 and parkland and wildlife preserves in Tier 7. The plan also agrees that life-threatening health or safety situations would receive priority. Discretionary funding for growth inducing projects would use tier delineations for priority.

3. Negotiable Item #15: Coastal Economy

Jffi ISSDE: The County has noted the PSEKP suggests diversification of the economy. This should be re-examined with consideration of a goal to preserve the coast for the natural and recreational asset that it is.

HES02P: 3iie PDC and IMC agree that the SERF statewide strategies and policies concerning the coast should encourage a balance between protecting natural, recreational and aest.hfit.1c features, and maintaining the coastal economy. Such language, when drafted, will be referred to the Division of Coastal Resources, the PDC and coastal counties for review.

4. Negotiable Item #16: Seasonal Stress on Coastal Infrastructure

Kff ISSDE: The County believes the SERF should specifically recognize the capital needs of municipalities and counties impacted by seasonal population fluctuations. rapi-t-ai improvements to highways are a special concern.

KESDEF: The PDC and INC agree that the PSCRIP statewide strategies and policies concerning capital f^nin-Haa should acknowledge seasonal population impacts in the coastal area. Such language, when drafted, will be referred to the Division of Coastal Resources, the PDC and coastal counties for review.

5. Negotiable Item #17: Mainland Economy

Kf I3SBBE: Ohe County pointed out that the situations that face the coastal communities also concern mainland resort towns. Like the coastal area, mainland ccmunities face seasonal stress on infrastructure. The SQRP should recognize this.

KESQUF: The PDC and INC agree that the PSCKP statewide strategies and policies concerning capital facilities should acknowledge seasonal population impacts in the coastal area including the mainland areas. Such language, when drafted, will be referred to the Division of Coastal Resources, the PDC and coastal counties for review.

6. Negotiable Item #18: Economic Development Policy 3.2

AT ISSQB: The County has endorsed the proposed amendments of Atlantic Electric regarding wording of Economic Development Policy 3.2: Capital Facilities and Public Services: Utility Plant/Energy Systems.

The PDC and Ht agree that utility infrastructure is essential to the economic growth of the State, in addition to the vitality and growth of our communities. This may require specific wording changes to the policy which will be submitted to the PDC for their review.

TOOK XVI: miiiJHSIOt.

1. Negotiable Item FPS-7: Planning Goal - Transportation

Kf ISSQB: The SERF should provide a specific transportation planning goal, similar to Middlesex County's master plan, in order to ensure that a safe and efficient transportation network is maintained to meet the needs of residents, visitors, and businesses in the State. It should also ensure the adequate delivery of goods and services to support the economy of the State.

RESOUF: The FCC and UC agree that the statewide goal to, "provide adequate public services at a reasonable cost," is intended to include provision of a safe and efficient transportation network. The description of this goal needs to be expanded to define the public services and to create a public service list that specifically includes transportation.

2. Negotiable Item #FS-8: Infrastructure Funding Priorities

AT XSSOB: Edison, South Plainfield, Woodbridge, Piscataway, Milltown, Metuchen, Spotswood, Helmetta, and Monroe have identified areas where an infrastructure repair/upgrading policy for Tier 2 should be applied without the "distressed community" and redevelopment emphasis -tied to Tier 1 criteria.

The County has expressed its agreement with these desires. There is a need to identify specific areas within Tier 2 that do not have adequate existing infrastructure. These areas should be separately classified as Tier 2A and should be given priority for Federal, State and county funding assistance for infrastructure improvement, repair and

upgrading, this priority should not be lifted to redevelopment or "distressed community" designations as in the Tier 1

BESEUT: • The FDC and INC. agree that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied and that there are forms and types of development within the existing Tier 2 that should receive priority funding.

3. Negotiable Item #T-5A: Woodbridge Township/Tier 2A*

ISSUE: Woodbridge Township has requested designating the majority of the area of Woodbridge as Tier 2A from the PSERP Tier 2 to reflect the major infrastructure investment needed for repair and replacement. The County is in agreement.

RESOLUTION: The PDC and UC agree that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied and that there are forms and types of development within Tier 2 that should receive funding priority.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 14 under II. Mapping Issues in the "Agreements To Change Tier Map" section for the resolution of T5-B.

4. Negotiable Item #T-7C: Old Bridge Township/Tiers 1 and 7*

AT ISSUE: The Lawrence Township has requested several tier changes as follows:

1. Change Tier 5 and Tier 2 areas in the Madison Park section to Tier 4 (to reflect undeveloped lands expected to develop with available sewer service), and to Tier 1 (to reflect possible redevelopment and infrastructure deficiencies).

The County report supports these changes.

RESOLUTION: The PDC and IMC agree that the overall criteria for funding prioritization needs to be restudied and that there are forms and types of development within Tier 2 that should receive funding priority.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in three parts. Please refer to page 11 under the "Agreements In

Principle" section of this Update for the resolution of T7-C, and page 18 under the "Disagreement" section, for the resolution of T7-B.

5. Negotiable Item #T-10B: Cranbury Otamship/Tiers 6A, 6B and
•- . 3*

KC ISSUE: Cranbury Township has requested the following tier changes:

1. Change Tier 4 designation on the west side of Main street south of the Village to Tier 6B.

The County supports the changes; except for the Station Road Tier 5 change due to the expected construction of sewer service to the area.

KESOZT: The PDC and IWC agree that Item #5 be recognized as an environmental ly sensitive site within Tier 6.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in three parts. Please refer to page 9 under the "Agreement" section of +*H« Update for the resolution of T10-C, and page 12 under the "Agreements in Principle" Update for the resolution of T10-B.

TCUBfi XVU: SOHKKC UAKtx

1. Negotiable Item #3: Capital Facilities

Kf XSSOB: This policy should be worded more strongly to ensure that State agencies adhere to local planning requirements in permitting facilities. Conditional approvals, where granted, should have a timetable requirement to meet the capital facmtvi-os planning of the municipality.

JOfiUff: The PDC and UC agree that specific language changes to the Preliminary Plan recommended by Somerset County and its mmlnlpnllt.lflB will be reviewed by OSP staff and recommendations will be made to the PDC for consideration for inclusion into the Interim SDRP.

2. Negotiable Item #8: CQAH in Tiers 5, 6 & 7

AT JSSDE: Bedminster, Bernards, and Montgomery Townships all felt that the housing policy stating that a community

permitting development in Tiers 5, 6 and 7 will have
' CQAH requirements imposed upon it is an
Mnappnrprie penalty. "

The County noted that restrictions on the location of affordable housing by tier or Community of Place could pose hardships and jeopardize attainment of both CQAH and SERP goals.

The OSP acknowledged the need to clarify the language discussing the relationship between the Plan and CQfth, specifically housing policy intent in Tiers 5, 6 and 7. *She SPC mandate is to promote the provision of an adequate supply of affordable housing. Housing concerns, however, should be carefully weighed along with environmental constraints. Although the SPC has accepted CQfth 's housing allocations through 1993, the Plan intent is to encourage development into a compact settlement pattern, taking into consideration the location of existing infrastructure to accommodate that growth.

BESO2F: The PDC and IMC agree that the PSCR Statewide Housing Policy will be reviewed and recommendations to clarify the language discussing the relationship between the Plan and CQAH will be made.

3. Negotiable Item #11: Water Supply Policy 1.4c – Development Capacity Analysis

KF ISSOB: The County believes that this methodology must be further tested to determine if it is truly the better indication of carrying capacity. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (CEP), Chapter 199, revisions for on-site disposal program may be another tool.

RESOCF: The PDC and INC agree that the nitrate dilution model is one of a number of means for establishing acceptable density guidelines for land development. This provision is not mandatory.

Negotiable Item #13: Historic District Haps

AT ISSOB: North Plainfield has suggested that a list of all historic sites and districts on the New Jersey Register should be made an official part of the SERP by reference.

KESffiT: The PDC and IMC agree that sites with historic significance can be designated as "historically significant sites." --These sites will be filed with the State and serve as a data base component, but will not appear on the State t-.jgr map. They should be included on the County map and on mrmifripai maps. Statewide natural and cultural resources strategies and policies will apply to protect these sites and the surrounding areas. If new ones are needed for the protection of these sites, they should be added.

5. Negotiable Item #17: Locating Villages and Hamlets

XT ISSCEs The County has related the concerns of Manville, Montgomery, Bedminster and Bridgewater Townships, which believe that existing and new villages should be permitted within Tier 4, only when consistent with the Municipal WastPr Plan.

KESOUF: The PDC and IMC agree that the criteria for designation of an existing or new village needs to be restudied, and that an existing or new village could be in a Tier 4 area.

Negotiable Item #18: CrirrlfVrr Center Designation

Kf 1SSLK: Bedminster and Montgomery Townships feel that Corridor Center designations should be approved by the County and municipality in addition to the State.

z She PDC and LNC agree that the SPC should recognize ~~can~~ ~~Idnr~~ centers, towns, villages and hamlets nominated by counties and ~~iffinv-!ipaiji---iea-~~ Their boundaries should be in the Final SDRP.

7. Negotiable Item #19: Corridor Center Transportation Routes

JO? TKHHMRt nhe County believes that the primary transportation routes serving corridor centers should include highways and inter-municipal principal arterials of less than four Taring to recognize differences in scale and statewide highway conditions.

Tha PDC and LNC agree that the criteria for designation of a corridor center needs to be restudied. In

addition, the relationships between major transportation routes and corridor center locations needs to be further clarified.

8. Negotiable Item #21: Central Place Boundary Designations

JKP ISSUE: Montgomery recommended that preliminary boundary designations of central places should not be included in the Interim State Plan, but, identified through on-going discussions prior to adoption of the Final Plan.

HESffib The PDC and INC agree that preliminary designations of central places should be included in the State Plan. They further agree that the boundaries could be modified through on-going discussions and dpf-nlled. design plans.

9. Negotiable Item #22: Town Centers & Business Districts

AT ISSBBS: Suburban town centers/ traditional town centers and business districts should be adrted as another element to the RDS. They generally fall between towns and villages in terms of the hierarchy of central places, and are located on secondary travel corridors.

BESOUF: The PDC and I1C agree that existing town centers and business districts need to be recognized. The forms and functions of these centers could be considered for inclusion in the <ymmmi'ti^g of place definition.

10. Negotiable Item #25: Storm Water Management Programs and On-Site Regulations and Standards

ISSK: North Plainfield and Far Hills are concerned about the County strategies and policies related to flood control, specifically: 1) the need for a clarification of the definition of high and medium priority areas; and 2) the need for greater protection of developed areas.

WSOOCz The PDC and IMC agree that the OSP will review the criteria .for high and medium flood control priority areas and the applicability of the existing New Jersey Flood Control Master Plan to current conditions. Furthermore, the OSP and If1C agree that the Interim Plan will balance the needs for conventional methods of flood hazard protection with proactive flood control measures. The proactive flood control policies will address the needs of the existing developed areas as well as the developing areas.

11. Negotiable Item #33A: aririr.lnnnl Municipal Garments*

AT XSSCE: T3ie complexity, clarity, and consistency of strategies, policies and guidelines in Volume II and Volume III.

RESULT: The PDC and LtC agree that specific recommendations referring to Volume II of the Preliminary Plan recommended by Sonerset County and its municipalities will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim Plan.

*please Nate: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to under the "Deferred" section for the resolution of 33B.

XVJJJ.: Nrfe*a UAKLT

1, Negotiable Item #P-1: Seasonal Infrastructure Stress

Kf ISSUE: In Sussex County, many seasonal lake communities have evolved into year-round communities; State funding is needed to mitigate public health and safety pressures on water and waste systems and to rehabilitate substandard housing. Should the SERP provide capital investment and affordable housing policies and strategies for seasonal lake communities in the northwest part of the State?

GBP/EH! RESKEff: Agreement in Principle – The OSP and UC agreed that the SERP will provide policies to support capital investment in infrastructure for existing, as well as new seasonal communities, the conversion of seasonal, communities and the acquisition and maintenance of public open space.

FOC/EJC BESOZfe Agreement in Principle – The PDC and IMC agree that the SERP will provide policies to support capital investment, in infrastructure for former and existing seasonal communities.

2. Negotiable Item fp2-A: Relationship of SERP to Out-of-State Plans*

Iff ISSKEs The Sussex County transportation network is overburdened by ccmmuter traffic and State funding for improvements has not been forthcoming. Should the relationship between the SEEP and out-of-State plans be ctefined?

BESOUF: Agreement in Principle – The PDC and *Utic* agree the SERP will address the relationship of the SDRP to the plans of neighboring states, in consultation with hnrtr counties and municipalities.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 13 under the "Concerns" section of this Update for the resolution of P-2B.

3 . negotiable Item #P-3 : Rural Revitalization and Infrastructure

KF 2SSQB: The County has stated that the massive costs and disruption of daily routine created by the effort to maintain and repair decayed urban infrastructure may not be worthwhile. Some municipalities are concerned that inclusion in Tiers 5, 6 & 7 will preclude State funding for rural revitalization and for infrastructure, even where public health and safety is an issue. Should the SDRP place a priority on urban revitalization and the provision and maintenance of infrastructure in urban areas or should funding for community revitalization and infrastructure be available throughout the State?

KESOUft The PDC and IMC agree that policies in the State Plan will address community revitalization throughout the State. Tte prntl.es also agree that policies in the State Plan will emphasize that funding should be available to promote communities of plane and for public health and safety needs, through the State.

4. Negotiable Item #P-4: Rural Council on Affordable Housing (CQ&H) Allocations

Kf ISSQB: The County believes that affordable housing quotas should not apply in Tiers 5, 6 & 7. The PDC noted/ however, that the State must balance a legislative mandate to manage growth with a constitutional mandate to provide affordable housing. A variety of mechanisms should be available to improve the diversity of housing opportunities, in order to support a work force that will assure the economic growth that is essential to the future of New. Jersey.

The PDC and INC agree that policies in the SERP will emphasize that in rural areas, locations and densities of new development should not exceed those appropriate to rural carrying and development capacities.

5. Negotiable Item #P-5: Rural Economic Development

AT ISSUE: Open space, recreational and agricultural preservation interests must be balanced with the need to provide a stable tax base and reasonable employment opportunities in rural areas. Should the SDRP encourage economic development in rural areas other than that which is agriculturally or recreationally related?

The PDC and UC agree that policies in the SDKP will encourage types of economic development in rural communities of place and other appropriate areas, that will support agricultural needs as well as the economic/ community and service needs of a diverse, non-agricultural population.

6. Negotiable Item #P-6A: Rural Development Guidelines

Jf1P ISSDE: The County feels that the presence or absence of sewer is not sufficient to determine whether development is appropriate. The Plan should consider the carrying capacity of lands. A variable density environmental constraints ordinance based on carrying capacity may be preferable. Sussex County has carrying capacity guidelines in place. Should the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) utilize sewer service as a primary delineation criteria, or should the SDRP define guidelines, procedures and design standards to determine the ability of land to accommodate and redevelopment?

KESH2F: The PDC noted that it is considering carrying capacity approaches for tier criteria. The PDC and IMC agree that the SDRP will incorporate aHRH-Mrmai factors as dpi infiltration criteria provided that these factors are presented in the context of a comprehensive, capacity-based planning approach and that supporting data are available.

Negotiable Item #P-11A: State Agency Coordination*

Kf ISSDB: The County suggests that the compatibility of State agency functional plans with the SDRP may result in all locations' of funds and permits away from rural areas.

JO3WT: Agreement in Principle – The PDC and IMC agree that policies in the SDRP will emphasize that rural areas will be eligible for State funds, and that permits are granted on the basis of carrying capacity analyses and sound planning practice and not solely on the basis of tier or policy area designation.

*Please Note: ifrjg issue was discussed and resolved in three parts. Please refer to page 10 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution, of P-11B and page 14 under the "Disagreements" section of this Update for the resolution of P-11C.

8. Negotiable Item #P-12A: Permit-Project Streamlining*

XS 355CE: The County believes that regionalism is best served by County and municipal cooperation. The County feels that statewide uniform development regulations should not be implemented, and that equal priority should be given rural areas. Should permit and project streamlining be initiated by all levels of government as an important incentive for continued growth?

BESOUfe Agreement in Principle – The FDC and UC agree that permit streamlining policies in the SDRP will specify that approaches be consistent with good planning practice. These approaches can be accomplished by providing more rapid and determinations of where growth is ~~a map~~ or inappropriate based on carrying capacity analyses and in consultation of other SERF policies, and by coordinating with existing State, regional and local administrative and technical responsibilities.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 11 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution, of P-12B.

9. negotiable Item #P-16: Regional Planning

AT ISSUE: Sussex County believes that counties are the appropriate entity to carry out the policies and strategies of the SERF. Should the SCRIP provide a greater role for counties in regional planning and in the implementation of the SDRP?

RESORT: The PDC and INC agree that policies in the SDRP will emphasize that counties are the appropriate entity to carry out regional level policies and strategies of the SERF, in coordination with municipal and State level efforts.

10. Negotiable Item #A-1; Tier 1 Capital Facilities 2.0 – Capital Facilities Financing and Development

XT IS5CE: The County believes that rural areas should not v»a?T- the costs of revitalizing cities; revitalization should not be at the expense of necessary improvements in rural areas. The appropriate State Departments should place the highest priority on statewide capital fnllitlfis and services for Tier 1 municipalities after maintenance and repair responsibilities are met statewide.

HESottfc ' The PDC and IMC agree that this issue is associated with P-3 - Rural Revitalization r and Infrastructure. The parties agree that policies in the State Plan will give priority to public health and safety needs, as well as infrastructure needs generated by development and redevelopment that is consistent with sound planning practice, throughout the State.

11. Negotiable Item #A-2: Statewide Capital Facilities 1.1 - Planning: State Department Plans

KT ISSUE: The County notes that many rural towns and villages have the same problems as Central City Business Districts and should receive similar assistance.

BESGCffs The PDC and LNC agree that the issue is associated with Item #F-3 - Rural 'Revitalization and Infrastructure. The parties agree that policies in the SDRP will give priority to the revitalization of small communities, public health and safety needs, as well as infrastructure needs generated by development and redevelopment that is consistent with sound planning practice, throughout the State.

12. Negotiable Item fA-3: Statewide Recreation and Open Space Policy 1.1 - Planning and Design

XT JSSCE: The SERF should reflect needs of municipalities for transportation, public safety and other improvements created by the existence of public and private recreational such as State and Federal parks, ski resorts and lake communities.

BBSOR: The PDC and IMC agree the issue is associated with Item P-1 - Seasonal Infrastructure Stress. The parties agree that the SDRP will provide policies to support capital investment in infrastructure for existing as well as new seasonal communities, the conversion of. seasonal communities and the acquisition and maintenance of public open space.

13. Negotiable Item #A-6A: Statewide Biological Diversity Policy
1.1 - Ecosystem Managements Ecosystem Identification & Management*

KS ISSEE: The County notes that the identification of large tracts of CMn'gt-ing woodlands of 50 acres or more or other critical habitats is beyond the resources of any local government, except when a development of sufficient size is proposed that can generate that information.

RESOffs Ote PDC and IHC agree that policies in the SERF will emphasize that local governments are the appropriate entities to identify critical habitats.

*Please Note: Ohis issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to pags 13 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of A-6B.

XIXs CDHffIRUH) UUUX

1. Negotiable Item #1: Hans Rule

JKF XSSffi: local and County governments recognize the value in coordinating plans and programs that have inter-County or inter-municipal impact. There is a concern, however, that in promoting a regional planning strategy, local governments will be directed, as a result of the State Plan, to give up their land use authority to the State. Die Flan should promote a balance between good regional coordination and the maintenance of control.

KESffite One PDC and INC agree that Volume I of the Interim Plan will show the relationship of the State Plan to the statutory framework (Municipal Land Use law, etc.) of municipal, county and State government. The Implementation Report will describe how State agencies may implement the Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #4: Coastal Area Facilities Review Act (CAERA) Zone and Regulations

3SSCE: Die County suggests that while the CAERA zone is officially exempt from participation in the State planning process, there should be coordination with CAFRA to promote coastal management that is more in keeping with municipal and

county objectives. This may mean strict enforcement of environmental regulations in some areas, and the relaxation of those regulations in other areas to foster development.

The County identified two municipalities that have villages in the CAFRA region with an industrial and cultural heritage, which are different than other villages. The County would like to see this difference reflected in CAERA maps and the State Plan.

PESOUT: The PDC will investigate "Maritime Villages" and cooperate with CAFRA to refine and promote this concept in keeping with the special statewide Coastal Policies being proposed.

Negotiable Item #5: Protection of Water Supply

AT USSEE: The County believes the State Plan should be used to promote aquifer protection, discourage ground and surface water withdrawal from the region, and protect private and public water supplies from contamination. Population growth rates should reflect the capacity of the water supply to sustain them. Recharge areas should be protected.

BESQHF: The PDC and IWC agree that water supply sources need to be protected. Strategies and policies pertaining to water supply protection will be reviewed to ensure effective management of all potable water supplies. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County regarding private well protection will be reviewed by the OSP. Recommendations will then be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERP. The proposed language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SERP.

4. Negotiable Item #6: Plan Implementation

AT 3S9Ks The County believes there should be considerable implications of the funding priorities, regulatory program development, and State agency associated with the Plan prior to its adoption, since this is a new process with no track record on implementation. There should be linkage between the policies outlined and the manner in which the Plan is actually used. The County also notes that State initiatives have historically placed financial and statutory obligations on local governments which have been very difficult to bear.

This has been particularly true for less affluent counties and municipalities. Cumberland County is looking for assurances written in the Plan that there will be steps taken to provide the programs and funding needed to implement the Plan in a positive and constructive manner.

The OSP explained that there is no central mechanism with regulatory or enforcement powers to directly Implement the SDRP. Instead, the SPC, in performing its coordinating role, will rely heavily on the plans, policies and programs of State departments, counties and municipalities. The OSP also stressed the commitment of these governmental entities to the State planning process is absolutely essential, to its ultimate success.

RESECT: The Interim Plan and Implementation Report will discuss prioritization schedules. The PDC and IMC agree there should be greater State agency involvement in the State planning process and State agency strategies for implementing the Plan should be part of the Implementation Report.

5. Negotiable Item #8: Farmland Equity

XX ISSK: The County believes that the Plan should implement programs and policies that address the concerns of farmland equity. The farming community strongly feels Tier 6 designations will result in a loss of land value, which would decrease the financial assets of the farm operation. It is important that programs and policies recommended by the Cumberland County Agricultural Development Board are linked to the implementation of the Plan. The County also recommended that Tiers 5 and 6 should be consolidated and that a rural development tier be created in conjunction with the Regional Design System (RDS).

BBSDE2F: The PDC agrees to examine the concept of a single Rural Tier in conjunction with the RDS;

2. The PDC and UC agree to foster agriculture as a viable industry and activity;
3. The PDC and IMC agree to incorporate policy suggestions from the Department of Agriculture;
4. The PDC and INC agree that the SPC will work with the Department of Agriculture to develop a series of programs to address the land equity issue, some of which may need to be Implemented concurrently with final Plan adoption;

The Cumberland County Board of Agriculture, Agriculture Development Board, and agricultural community will participate with the Department of Agriculture in developing agricultural strategies and policies for the State Plan.

Negotiable Item #9: Affordable housing

AT XSSDE: The County believes the Plan should provide greater opportunities for affordable housing, but should focus on more innovative, non-regulatory techniques. The County states that current regulatory structures add considerable costs to a home in New Jersey.

The FDC and LNC agree that language clarification is necessary in the Interim Plan to explain housing policy intent, both for reasonably-priced housing beyond the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) definition as well as for affordable housing consistent with COAH allocations. The County believes the State Plan should also address economic incentives in addition to regulations to promote affordable housing.

7. Negotiable Item #10: Clarification, of the PSCR Policies

JET ISSffi: The County states that a number of policies outlined in the PSCR are unclear. Some of these are addressed under other issues. Generally, the problems with clarity have to do with policy intent or the manner in which it will be implemented.

RE502F: The PDC and LNC agree that specific language changes referring to Volume II of the PSCR recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion in the Interim Plan.

8. Negotiable Item #12: Natural Resource Policies: Open space Conservation

Kf ISSCK: The Plan should be used to protect the open spaces of the County. The Plan should distinguish between the open space and recreational demands of local residents and those demands that come from the influx of tourists. Funding priorities should distinguish between these different demands.

HESffir She FDC and INC agree that protecting open space is an important concern. Open space conservation policies should address both the need to provide recreational opportunities for the indigenous population as well as for recreational activities that satisfy a regional or broader need. The County is encouraged to participate in the PDC discussion of the issue. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. The recommended, language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SDRP.

9. Negotiable Item #15: Urban Redevelopment

AT ISSQB: The County feels the Plan should be a vehicle for promoting downtown revitalization and improving the infrastructure and quality of life in urban areas. His goal should be implemented through the continued development of strategies and policies in the Plan that act as catalysts to attract business and redevelopment to urban centers; not through severe regulation, and restrictions of activities beyond urban areas. "Urban Enterprise Zones" are good examples of kinds of positive catalysts that would come from this planning process.

HESDHP: The PDC and IXC agree that the issue of urban redevelopment needs further expansion. The PDC is considering the inclusion of Urban Revitalization Strategies and Policies in the statewide strategies section of the Interim Plan/ which would address the need for revitalization regardless of tier or policy area designation. Cumberland County is encouraged to participate in the PDC discussion of this issue. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the FDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. The recommended language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SERF.

10. Negotiable Item #17: Rural Economic Development

XT ISSCE: The County states that the Plan should find ways to promote economic opportunity in rural areas and to reward that undertake strong conservation efforts. Again/ the objective here is to use the Plan to promote the

protection of rural areas by focusing on development opportunities in certain key communities and activities. These communities and activities should be designated in the Plan.

BESQUF: One PDC and IWC agree that the economic development strategies and policies, as well as the natural and cultural resources protection policies, should be reviewed to address the County's concerns. The PDC agreed to review the PSDRP Statewide Environmental Strategies and Policies, and if new ones are needed for the protection of environmentally-sensitive sites, they will be added. In addition, the Economic Development Strategies and Policies will be reviewed and expanded. If necessary, to address economic development issues of statewide significance, such as mining and tourism. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SERF. The recommended language regarding these issues will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SDRP.

11. Negotiable Item #18: Natural Resource Development

AT ISSOB: The County suggests that a consistent approach to natural resource development, such as sand mining activity, in a manner that promotes a predictable regulatory process, and environmental safeguards should be developed in the Plan. Natural resource management practices for forest land, agricultural land and other natural resources in the County should be in keeping with the objectives of the Plan.

KESoff: One PDC and IMC agree that the economic development strategies and policies, as well as the natural and cultural resources ~~protection~~ policies, should be reviewed to address the County's concerns. Statewide Environmental Strategies and Policies will be reviewed by the PDC, and if new ones are needed for the protection of environmentally-sensitive sites, they will be added. In addition, the Economic Development Strategies and Policies will be reviewed and expanded, if necessary, to address economic development issues of statewide significance, such as mining and tourism. Specific languages recommended by Cumberland County will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim SDRP. The recommended language regarding these issues will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Interim SERF.

VGUK XX: H&RRES COW

1. Negotiable Item #1B: ifame Rule*

AT 3SSCE: Ccompatibility of State agency functional plans may result in allocation of funds and permits away from rural areas. How will the State Plan be utilized by State agencies in decision making?

RESOt/P: The HE and UC agree that policies in the SERF will emphasize that rural areas will be eligible for State funds to meet certain objectives, such as public health and safety needs and the prcraotion of cmmunities of place. The parties also agree that permits should be granted on the basis of carrying capacity analyses and sound planning practice.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 18 under the "Disagreements" section of this Update for the resolution of 1A.

2. Negotiable Item #3A: Agricultural and Environmental Protection*

XT 35SK: The County believes that agricultural viability and environmental sensitivity have not been understood in the growth management context of the tier system and would be more effective as a statewide strategy or policy.

VBSOSfs The PDC and UC agree that the SERF will define the appropriate roles and relationships between the statewide and tier policies; will provide a statewide agriculture policy; and, the SERF will emphasize differences in the design of, and objectives for, rural development (including rural economic development and other forms of development) and associated public facilities and services among exurban, agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in seven parts. Please refer below for the resolution of 3C and 30; refer to page 10 under the "Deferred" section of this Update for the resolution of 3B; pages 10 & 11 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of 3E and 3F; and page 15 under the "Concern" section of this Update for the resolution 3G.

3. Negotiable Item #3C: Agricultural and Environmental Protection

Jfl? ISSQE: The County feels that the State should clarify for County and local governments the benefits of delineating - or sanctions' for failure to delineate - agrj ailtajral and environmentally sensitive areas.

KBSffift The PDC and LNC agree that although the State Planning Act does not require counties and municipalities to bring their master plans into conformance with the SERF, policies in the SERF will emphasize the benefits of delineating agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas.

4. Negotiable Item #3D: Agricultural and Environmental

KK ISSDE: The County believes that scene of the criteria for Tier 7 are too broad and too subjective to have meaning at the State level.

KBSOUFs The PDC and IWC agree that policies in the SERF will encourage the identification and mapping of critical habitats by local governments for inclusion in local master plan conservation elements.

5. Negotiable Item #5B: Intergovernmental Coordination/Regional Planning

AT ISSIE: There is a suspicion that OSP and the SPC will beccme an unmanageable bureaucracy if it assumes a role in the review of those developments that may have a "significant regional impact."

: The PDC and INC agree that policies in the SCRP will emphasize that counties are the appropriate entity to carry out regional level policies and strategies of the SERP, in with wmi^lg0 and State level efforts.

6. Negotiable Item #7: Urban Revitalization

KC ISSDE: The County believes that it will be more costly to adequately rehabilitate and upgrade existing infrastructure in the urban areas to support intensive revitalization than to build new infrastructure elsewhere in the urban and suburban fringe. Should urban areas be rebuilt to densities of the past?

RESEUF: Ote PDC and UC agree that the Flan language should be clarified to specify that public health and safety is the priority for Infrastructure statewide. Urban centers will receive a priority after health and safety needs have been achieved. The partvres also agree that there should be a continuing dialogue among the counties, municipalities and the OSP in developing and refining the infrastructure needs assessment. The assessment also should consider educational

7. Negotiable Item #8: Rural Economic Development

KE ISSQB: The County believes that open space, recreational and agricultural preservation interests must be balanced with the need to provide a stable tax base and reasonable employment cfpportunities in rural areas. Rural municipalities need technical assistance to adequately rehabilitate and upgrade the existing housing stock.

BESOUP: The PDC and IIC agree that policies in the SERF will encourage types of economic development in rural communities of place and other appropriate areas that will support the economic and community service needs of a diverse, non-agricultural rural populating, as well as agricultural needs. 33ie parties also agree that community revitalization win be addressed in the Interim Plan as a statewide strategy.

8. Negotiable Item #1QA: Rpglnnal Design System (RDSJ*

AT ISSUE: The County states that the Regional Design System proposes to induce development in rural communities of place and suggests severe restrictions on development in the surrounding countryside; Biis concept is inconsistent with the life-style and objectives of Warren County residents, many of whom left concentrated urban areas for rural areas. Municipalities (not developers) should control the size of communities of place. Local determinations regarding appropriate growth should be recognized ry State agencies.

HHSWF: The PDC and LNC agree that policies will emphasize that in rural areas, location and densities of new development should be compatible with rural carrying capacity and rural character of the area.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 12-13 under the "Implementation"¹¹ section of this Update for the resolution of 10B.

9. Negotiable Item #12B: Legal Support*

Kf ISSDB: The County feels that: counties, and especially are vulnerable to lawsuits concerning strategies, policies and the State Plan map designations. The SDRP will create another avenue for adversaries to litigate their cases. -.-"-:-

The PDC and I2C agree that if municipalities review and amend their plans and ordinances to be compatible with the SDRP, then technical and legal assistance, including affidavits, briefs and interpretive statements, should be provided, as appropriate, by the OSP. The PIC will consider recommending the creation of an "Office of Municipal Support" in the Attorney General's office, to provide legal support to

*Please Note: *This* issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 13 under the "Implementation"¹¹ section of this Update for the resolution of 12A.

10. Negotiable Item #13A: Rural Council on Affordable Housing (CORE) Allocations*

JB? ISSDB; The County reports that there is a perception that communities that have developed affordable housing plans must be in "growth" tiers, especially where the proposed developments are at densities that require extensions of sewer and water ffmnj-Hea- A supply of affordable housing is essential for economic development in Warren County.

RESuff: The PDC and UC agree that policies in the Interim Plan will clarify the relationship between the mandates of CORK and the State Plan, and will emphasize that in rural areas, locations and densities of new developments should not exceed those appropriate to communities of place and rural carrying capacity.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 15 under the "Concerns"¹¹ section of this Update for the resolution of 13B.

11. Negotiable Item #146: Rural Land Planning and Development

Jff ISSQB: The proposed density of 100 persons per square mile is inconsistent with existing patterns of development in Warren County; a carrying capacity approach is recommended.

The nitrate diluting modal is not well understood. Technical assistance is needed to enable municipalities to determine the level of recharging resources, such as ground-water.

WSSfSSz The PDC and UC agree that policies in the SERF will emphasize that appropriate levels of development should be determined on the basis of carrying capacity and sound planning practice.

12. Negotiable Item #16B: Critical Slopes and Stream Corridors

Jff fgnyHRa Hie County believes that the control of development in steep slope areas is the responsibility and prerogative of municipal government. The New Jersey Wetlands Law provides sufficient protection to stream corridors and the SDRP ghngiri not artrf aHHi^imnAi regulations.

KBSDE2P: The PDC and INC agree that policies in the SERF will emphasize that counties and mm'r'ipai -I-HM are the appropriate entities to manage development, in critical slope and stream corridors.

13. Negotiable Item #17: Tier System - General

US ISSBBB: Qfce County notes that specific lands within a given tier may not meet the criteria used to designate the Innfte in, which the property falls. This results in an injustice to the landowner, whose land is dissimilar to those surrounding lands. The State Plan should rely only on statewide strategies and p*^ ir?i<g to tmplpgnent its growth management objectives.

JOfiWTs The PDC and *IXC* agree that policies in the SDRP will emphasize that the tier system is not a zoning classification to be applied to specific parcels of land, but a classification system meant to generally describe existing conditions. Because of the general nature of the tier system, it is possible that an area that generally meets the criteria for a particular tier may have within it small areas that meet the criteria for another tier.

14. Negotiable Item #18: Miscellaneous Ward Changes

KF ISSCE: Ohe County notes that during the comparison phase many municipalities reconnended word and policy changes in the SDKP. Obere is a concern that these recontnendations will

be ignored. How will specific ward changes, recommendations and Amendments made by municipalities be treated during negotiations and in the Interim Plan?

HESQEFF: OSe PDC and IMC agree that the cross-acceptance reports are being used to review the SERF. The proposed recommendations will be considered in the formulation of the Interim Plan. There will be additional opportunities for public comment before adoption of the final Plan.

15. Negotiable Item #19A: Open Space Preservation*

KF ISSUE: The County reports that communities that actively save open space feel penalized by the smaller tax base that results when property is removed from the tax rolls. There should be a mechanism to compensate municipalities for lost tax revenues.

BESOUF: The PDC and UC agree that policies in the Plan should emphasize the benefits to municipalities of open space preservation, including reduced needs for services, relative to development.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 15-16 in the "Concerns" section of this Update for the resolution of 1SB.

1XXHE XXI_s ESSX OXHTY

1. Negotiable Item #4: Housing Objectives of the PSCR

JET ISSUE: Essex Fells states that any mandated change in density, housing type, or any requirement for a certain zoning incidence or mixed-use development, would detract from local ambiance and would pose economic jeopardy for selected Tier 2 communities. The strength of these communities, the Township notes. Is stability in the face of neighborhood change.

The County is concerned that the PSCR's housing objective, which states "a diversity of adequate housing types. . .with efficient access to shopping and employment, " is too encompassing and imperils local zoning. Many of the older suburban Township in Essex County are fully developed* Requiring this diversity would destroy the unique character of many of these areas and possibly alter historic patterns of growth. The State should only mandate this objective where appropriate.

RESOUPS The FDC and I1C agree that redevelopment in fully-developed municipalities must be sensitive to and enhance the existing community character.

Negotiable Item #5: Tier 7 Designations in Suburban Settings

XSISSK: The County suggests that Tier 7 needs to be reconsidered so that it can be better applied to suburban settings like Essex County. In order to protect snail pockets of environmentally sensitive lands in developing areas, the SPC should reword the tier criteria to allow smaller Tier 7 designations. HPdar Grove Township noted this concern in a letter dated March 4, 1991.

Relevant notes to this issue include:

1. Die Millburn Township Environmental Commission has requested that the Fox Hill Reserve in Millburn Itwnship be designated as Tier 7. This 33-acre tract contains 4.5 acres of wetlands, numerous plant -species and prime habitats for owls, pileated woodpeckers and other aniiral species.
2. 3be Township of Essex Fells has requested that the Trotter Tract be designated as Tier 7. ttiis 99.6-acre tract is a prime recharge area for the Township's wells/ contains a virgin forest, provides a habitat for many upland species of wildlife and is a landscape of exceptional scenic value.

KBSOUF: The FDC and I2C agree that the County should resutrait its Tier 7 nominations (including the Fox Hill Reserve and the Trotter Tract) as Environmentally Sensitive Sites nominations, which would identify small areas for protection without the necessity for a Tier 7 designation.

3. Negotiable Item #6: Tier Structure and Intent

AT ISSKE: Die County is concerned that as written. Tier 1 designations stigmatize Tnm'rHpai i-Moa . West Orange also noted this problem. The promise of unidentified state aid does not compensate for a negative Tier 1 image, ttie intent and criteria for this tier should be reconsidered to mitigate this problem. The County has suggested the following for State

1. Re-examine the cut-off point of the Municipal Distress Index if it is to remain a Tier 1 criterion;

2. Place the "Sweet 16" Urban Centers into a separate category;
3. Give a higher funding priority to Tier 1 municipalities that are not "Sweet 16" Urban Centers;
4. Redefine Tier 1 or change the criteria so that the definition is more representative of the iwm-irnpai i-Hg*e! in this group; and,
5. Modify the Tier 1 criteria to permit a portion of a municipality to receive this designation.

KESTCT: The PDC and **IEC** agree that it would be desirable to remove the Municipal Distress Index as a criterion for Tier 1 and to address distress under statewide strategies if an acceptable tier format can be maintained.

4. Negotiable Item #7: Water Supply Management

Jffi ISSTC: Essex Fells and Nutley Borough reported that water supply issues are not mentioned in Tiers 1-4, even though these areas generate their own potable water supplies. Water supply and quality are very important issues in these areas , and, as such, should not be overlooked in the State Plan.

The County also reported that many municipalities in Essex County feel that the subject of water supply was not addressed adequately in the State Plan. The State should identify, monitor and regulate aquifers and reservoirs.

fft The PDC and **INC** agree that water supply sources need to be protected and that the Plan should promote effective management of all potable water supplies.

5. Negotiable Item #8: The State Plan's Relationship to CQftH

AT ISSUE: Essex Fells believes that the OSP, especially in the short run (to 1993) should not circumvent or supersede CQftH procedures. In the long run (post-1993), procedures must be mutually agreed upon, with CORE prescribing procedures that, while not in conflict with the State Plan, are workable because they have been tested in the courts and successfully survived six years of iinplementation.

County reports that municipalities are uncomfortable with the State Plan's housing goals, strategies and policies and their relationship with CQAH. The State Plan should be more

specific about its role with regard to affordable housing (i.e., Is the State Plan going to supercede OAH's rules and regulations?) .

KESDGP: The PDC and IIC agree that the State Plan's • housing policies, particularly as they relate to CQAH, should be more clearly AyF-irari in the Interim Plan.

6 . Negotiable Item #10 : Economic Development – Mixed-Use Development/Adaptive Reuse

AT ISSffi: Belleville reports that its industrial areas are not suitable for mixed-use development, and the erosion of its industrial base is undesirable. Belleville suggests that measures -should be taken to attract new occupants to vacant industrial complexes.

Essex County notes that the concept of mixed-use developments does not sit comfortably with sane stable, fully-developed in Essex County. Mixed- use developments should only be implemented where appropriate.

RESH2P: The PDC and IIC agree that adaptive reuse is not intended to be a mandatory economic development tool and should only be used where appropriate.

7. Negotiable Item #11: Housing Linkages

Kf ISS(E: Belleville is concerned that requiring commercial developers to incur obligations for portions of the housing needs generated by their projects could discourage redevelopment.

She County reports that recent trends indicate that the majority of Essex County commercial developments are in urbanized areas (e.g., Newark) and areas having vacant land for Industrial purposes (e.g., Fairfield). Taking into consideration the housing situation the former faces, it would be an advantageous method to have commercial developers contribute to the housing needs of the area in relation to their projects. She County, then, can only see housing linkages occurring where housing is significantly needed.

KBSffifc The PDC and IMC agree that housing linkages should be employed only where market comfit Inns make such linkages feasible.

8. Negotiable Item #13: Housing – Design Standards

Kf ISSUE: Housing design standards, which may require technical expertise from multiple levels of government, should clearly reflect local interests and prerogatives. However, the M^r^r*ipai Land Use law does not permit a municipality to amend its land use regulations to include housing design standards beyond basic safety and health requirements.

The County believes that the State should not bear the full responsibility of setting housing design standards. Similarly, not all municipalities possess the technical expertise of setting such standards. A collaborative effort is one solution.

KESGCF: lite PDC and IXC. agree that the development of housing design standards should be a joint effort between municipalities and the Department of Community Affairs. The PDC and IWC further agree that such "standards" are optional.

9. Negotiable Item 114: Housing – Displacement

Kf XSSCE: Montclair believes that the State Plan should encourage legislation that would provide bonus payments, above and beyond fair market value, to relocated businesses and households so that they may remain in their community when displacement from a redevelopment project is unavoidable.

HESHffs The PDC and the Montclair Negotiating Committee agree in principle that policies reflecting the need for relocation planning are desirable and that the Plan will be reviewed and revised accordingly.

*Please Note: In accordance with the State Planning Rules, the PDC and Municipal Negotiating Committee for Montclair discussed this issue in the presence of the IWC. The resulting agreement in principle was made between the Municipal Negotiating Committee and the PDC.

10. Negotiable Item #20: Water Supply as a Growth Management Tool

Kf ISSDBs Essex Fells believes the State Plan should make water supply and protection the primary guideline for controlling, limiting, redirecting and stimulating growth in New Jersey. The State should assess existing and projected

water supplies (including aquifers) ; present and projected water demand; and describe more fully the consequences of development on these water supplies. Until this is done, other proposals for stimulating, limiting or redirecting growth should be cast as recommendations rather than requirements.

The County states that water supply alone, however, is just a single, albeit important, facet in determining proper growth levels. Other factors that share in the character of an area should be considered with equal vigor. The County would be supportive of a growth analysis technique that would utilize water supply as well as other significant variables.

OBP/USC RESOKTs Deferred - The OSP and the Municipal Negotiating Committee agreed to defer this issue until the FDC/ue negotiation session on March 26, 1991.

KESffiF: Agreement In Principle - The PDC, UC and the Essex Fells Negotiating Cmmittee agree that it is essential to have other factors, such as water supply, as delineation cr rfr^ria , provided that these factors are presented in the context of a comprehensive, capacity-based planning approach, if that data are reasonably available.

TOGDHB I: mn-Mi uinrnr

1. Negotiable Item #5 - Ccraptehensive Planning - Funding

Kf 3SSK: It is the County's position that State funding for planning should not be limited to counties and Tier 1 municipalities. In order to promote an enhanced planning capability at all levels of government, State funding should be a matching, annual per capita grant for every county and municipality.

The FCC and INC agree that State funding of planning for municipalities and counties statewide is a critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

VQUW H: 2RKSJ COOBSS

1. Negotiable Item # 1 - Absence of legislation

JKP I5SK: Mercer County and its municipal.ltlns believe that legislative action is absolutely necessary for effective implementation of the State Plan. Some of this legislation has already been enacted and includes: Highway Access Management Act; Transportation Development District Act and tax reform. Others still require passage by the New Jersey Legislature, including: . the County/Municipal Partership Act; and statewide authorization for transfer of development rights. In addition, new legislation should be prepared providing for phasing and concurrency.

SEESOUF: The PDC and INC. agree that appropriate legislation providing for statewide transfer of development rights, the County/Municipal Partnership Act, phasing and concurrency legislation, and tax reform is desirable for effective and equitable implementat.i on of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. If the above-stated items are not law by the time the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan is prepared, they will be supported in the New Jersey State Planning Commission's Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #2 - Mass Transit Threshold

Jff ISSCE: Mercer County recccnsnds including a new policy that addresses the implementation of mass transit in corridor centers. Because the densities in these places may be low in the initial phases of development, partnerships between all levels of government and private developers will be necessary in order to finance the infrastructure.

HESQUT: Ite PDC and LNC agree that the Commission, along with the New Jersey Department of Transportation and New Jersey Itansit, will revisit the policies that address the provision of mass transit in corridor center development. Providing mass transit services for corridor center projects may require additional resources for proactive public infrastructure investment. This is an implementation issue and will be addressed in the Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

3. negotiable Item #8 - Tier 6 Implementation*

AT ISSUE: The lack of a mechanism to address the equity issue makes the implementation of Tier 6 programs difficult. TER is essential.

KESQUT: The PDC and I2C agree that the equity issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report, where specific strategies and recommendations such as fee-simple purchase, purchase of development rights, and TER will be addressed and evaluated.

*Issue #8 was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The second part of the issue is reported under the "Defer" section.

TOOK TTTs Hiwri uutnc

1. Negotiable Item #3: State Funding for Plan Activities

AT ISSDEt The State should provide adequate funding to support any municipal or County activities that are mandated as a result of the State Plan, such as planning activities; neighborhood targeting; non-profit housing; public/private partnerships in transportation; and any policies that state that counties and municipalities should support, ensure or encourage certain activities. The County has requested a statement to that effect be incorporated into the Interim Plan.

KRSffiR The PDC and IWC agree that funding for Plan-related activities is a critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the interim Plan. The Implementation Committee will have to decide whether or not a statement such as that recommended by the County is appropriate for inclusion in the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #5t Identifying Sources and Inter/Intra Agency

AT ZSSDB: The State Plan should indicate specific sources of funding for specific functional categories. Intra and interagency programs should be prioritized (e.g., do mass transit programs have priority over highway projects, or do housing programs have priority over transportation programs?).

KESQBFs The PDC and INC agree that this Issue will be considered by the Plan Implementation Committee for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

3. Negotiable -Item #12: Economic Development - Certified Economic Development Programs

KF XSSQE: The State shall provide the funding necessary to produce an Economic Development Program. The program "model" should not go beyond the capability of the municipality to either prepare or implement.

HBSOZT: The PDC and INC agree that funding for Plan-related activities/ including economic development programs, is a critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #14: Economic Development - Job Access

Kf ISSUE: Stronger transportation linkages are needed between employment opportunities and housing within Tier 1 areas. County residents do not always have access to in-county jobs. The existing public transit system has not kept pace with the shifting employment locations. A policy should be added to the Plan stating that "Priority funding should be made available for intra-county transportation, providing access between the County's residential concentrations and centers of employment. "

HBSliff: The PDC and INC agree that transportation, should be responsive to shifting employment patterns, and that to achieve this objective, including the prioritization of funding, will be addressed in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

Negotiable Item #16: Hazardous Waste - ECRA

ISSCE: ECRA makes redevelopment so costly that, without State funds to subsidize clean-up costs, project delay or abandonment results.

BESOZTs The PDC and INC agree that this issue will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

IV:

1. Negotiable Item #1A: Funding for Implementation of SERF.*

AT XSSEE: Financial incentives and opportunities should play a key role in implementing the SDRP. The State must provide adequate and continuous funding in order to implement SERF growth management strategies. Increased funding must occur with Plan adoption. County wants SDRP to positively both recommend and identify funding sources and programs necessary to implement Plan.

KESffif: The PDC and I2C agree funding for the implementation of the final SDRP is an issue that should be addressed in the State Planning Commission's Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed as a two part issue. Issue IB is discussed under the "Concern" section, page 9 .

2. negotiable Item f1OB: Urban Development Issues

AT ISSUE: Funding for planning and implementation must be addressed.

MfiWP: The PDC and IMC agree that adequate funding is desirable for effective urban revitalization, and this position will be supported in the Implementation Report.

3. Negotiable Item #6: Wastewater Treatment in Designated Communities of Place

XT ISSOB: One County is interested in exploring options for sewer service in rural areas to promote growth under the Communities of Place concept. The County Wastewater Management Plan currently discourages the type of Wastewater treatment options envisioned in the Regional Design System described in the Preliminary Plan. The County would want to tie designation of Communities of Place to the provision of wastewater treatment.

HEH2F: The PDC and ISC agree that wastewater management for Communities of Place is an implementation issue that should be included in the Implementation Report in a section on the Regional Design System. It was also agreed that if this issue were not addressed, the Regional Design System would face serious difficulties in terms of implementation.

1. Negotiable Item #6: Redevelopment of Cities

JEP ISSQs There should be very clear content of urban redevelopment issues like infrastructure costs/ streamlined environmental permitting (ECRA) , more attractive tax structure/ etc. There should be a "plan of attack" to make cities like Camden vibrant again. This should be defined by goals/ objectives/ and dates of these implementation items stressed.

The PDC and LNC agree that infrastructure funding/ permit streamlining and other issues regarding urban revitalization are important to the implementation of the Plan. "They will be included in the redevelopment section of the Implementation Report which will accompany the release of the interim Plan and forwarded to the State Administration Legislature/ counties/ municipalities and the public.

2 . Negotiable Item #16 : Implementation Issues Should be Resolved Prior to Adoption of a Final State Plan.

AT 1StUE: The implementation ~~program~~ should be clarified and expanded. It should respond to the questions regarding plan implementation prior to Final Plan adoption.

RESDCts The PDC and UC agree that a more thorough understanding of implementation devices is necessary to continue the County and local review of the State Plan. Implementation issues will be addressed in the Implementation Report, which will be released with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #18: Policy 1.2, Tier 3, Permit

Jffi 1SSCE: The procedural process for the approval of site plans and subdivisions is set by law through the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL). Changes in procedure should be made through legislative action by the State. Gibbsboro commented that the delay process usually occurs because of the requirements for permits issued at other levels of government and not at the local level.

The County noted that it currently issues preliminary and •final approvals for County land Development Review of county highway access/ right-of-way, reservation/dedication strips/

cartways, and off-site improvements including drainage systems. This is all done in a timely fashion which should help Glbhfihnx) and other Caraden County municipalities avoid delays.

REStUF: Die PDC and I2C agree that permit streamlining should result in a more timely review of d^elppment/redevelopment applications. Gibbsboro' s reconnendation that in order to accomplish permit streamlining other levels of government will have to review their permitting processes will be presented in the Implementation Report that will be published in conjunct.Jon with the Interim Plan.

TOOK VI: TMKH U1K13

1. Negotiable Item #3: State-Mandated Programs - Funding

AT ISSOE: Many Union County municipalities face yearly fiscal pressures with layoffs of professional personnel and larger percentages of their budgets being allocated to the uniformed services. The State Plan does not indicate where are to obtain funds to undertake additional responsibilities.

Kt£WT: OSie PDC and UC agree that State funding of planning for municipal Itififi and counties, statewide/ is a critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report which will initiate or support legislation to fund planning at the municipal and county levels.

2. Negotiable Item #9: Comprehensive Planning - State Funding Pri orit i zation

Kf I5SOB: State planning grants should be made available to all minifripai jfjgg regardless of t-i*** designation. Funding should not be l imitjRd to counties and Tier 1 municipalities as recommended in Volume HI of the PSERP. Many communities face yearly f i seal pressures, with professional personnel being laid off, and larger percentages of their municipal budgets are being devoted to the uniformed services. 3hey do not have the resources, and the State Plan falls to indicate where the T^V!^p^i.Ti.'^i^99 are to obtain the funds to undertake comprehensive planning activities.

BESDHT: Die PDC and IHC agree that State funding of planning for municipalities and counties, statewide, is a

critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #10B: Comprehensive Planning – Project Reviews

AT 1SSQE: The total carrying capacity must be established by a regional entity so that a small project's impact can be assessed.

IffiSCCP: '• The PDC and INC agree that a capacity-based planning approach should be considered by the PDC and Plan Implementation Committee for inclusion in either the Interim Plan or the implementation Report.

4. Negotiable. Item #22: Farmland Equity

AT ISSOB: The State Plan will negatively impact the agricultural economies of many rural communities in the State. The loss of farmland equity will reduce the farmers' ability to borrow the money necessary for them to operate.

RE5EK2T: The PDC and UNC agree that this is an implementation issue and that the Plan's impact on agricultural economies will be addressed in the Implementation Report and the Agricultural Impact Assessment.

TOCHE VHs OQQH CULNH

1. Negotiable Item #1: Coordination of State Agencies

AT ISSSESE: The County and Tffinirjpai j-Hga have been consistently frustrated by conflicting policies and regulations among various State agencies. The State agencies must make a commitment that required permits are issued for projects consistent with the SERF, ' for infrastructure projects.

The PDC and I2C agree that there is a need for greater government coordination and permit streamlining to ensure maximum efficiency in processing permits. This position will be supported in the Implementation Report.

2. Negotiable Item #8: Equity loss in Agricultural Areas

AT ISSUE: The SERF must provide for the maintenance of land values and owner equity in Tier 6 areas. As the main agricultural area in the County, Plumstead Township has demonstrated a commitment to agriculture by adopting a right-to-farm ordinance and through agricultural zoning. The municipality believes Tier 6 "will place a further strain on farmers if there is no provision for equity maintenance. The Township suggests linking Tier 6 designation with enrollment in a farmland preservation program.

RBSOUF: The PDC and IMC agree that equity recommendations provided by the County will be included in the Implementation Report released with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #13: The Need for Additional Legislation to Implement SERF Policies

JT ISSBBB: There is concern that some policies of the SCRP will not be implementable within existing regulations. There appears to be a need for additional legislation.

JUULET: The PDC and UC agree that additional legislation may be desirable for effective and equitable implementation of the SERF. This will be included in the Implementation Report. If the County has specific recommendations, these recommendations should be forwarded to the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

4. Negotiable Item #20: Provision of Hooded Infrastructure to Designated Tier 3 Town

JT X5SEE: A public sewer system is needed in New Egypt, Plumstead Township, in order to accommodate desired growth. The QSP, in its meeting with the IMC, recognized that there is a need to identify and encourage adequate instruments with which to implement the Regional Design concept, including facilitating infrastructure funding mechanisms (e.g., impact fee legislation) and designating Community Service Boundaries to deal with the phasing of infrastructure.

BBSOCffs The PDC and LNC agree that adequate instruments to implement the Regional Design System concept are required.

This position will be supported in the Commission's Implementation Repeal which will accompany release of the Interim -Plan.

TOOK VEH: HJfffiHUfi CUHBE

1. Negotiable Item IP13: Intergovernmental Coordination

KF ISSEE: The County has recommended that regional roles for SERF implementation should be administered by counties, with State funding, in order to be responsive to local concerns and authorities.

RESORT: Ohe FDC and UC agree that appropriate roles and procedures for intergovernmental coordination will be addressed in the SERP and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

2. Negotiable Item #A10: Statewide Capital Facilities Financing and Development Policy 1.2 – Planning: County and Municipal Plans

ISSIE; Some municipalities perceived that long range planning is not feasible at the local level; if feasible it is undesirable as it will promote growth and development.

KESTCT: she PDC and IXC agree that mechanisms to coordinate priorities among State and local agencies for the financing and development of capital facilities and related services, will be recommended in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

3. Negotiable Item #A13: Statewide Housing Policy 1.1 – Reducing Housing Costs: Streamlining the Permitting Process

Jff ISSQE: de County has stated that a mechanism is needed to speed review of permits and to enhance local understanding of the State permitting process.

KBSQUFs The PDC and I2C agree that mechanisms, such as data sharing/ fit-aiyforri i qp-hi nm of ffofra requirements, and a liaison between State and municipal agencies would reduce delays and will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

4. Negotiable Item #A17a2: Statewide Biological Diversity Policy 1.1 – Ecosystem Identification & Management

AT JSSUF: Because of the confidential and general nature of mapping endangered species, there is skepticism about the practicality of protecting endangered species.

RESQUF: The PDC and UC agree that procedures to encourage the exchange of information among counties, municipalities, N3DEP, and OSP to improve planning efforts will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Report of the SPC.

5. Negotiable Item #A22b: Statewide Recreation and Public Open Space Policy 1.7 - Recreation and Public Open Space: Stable Funding Sources

AT ISSDEs The PSERP policy states: "The State, counties and municipal MCR should devise a system of stable funding sources for the acquisition, development and maintenance necessary to implement a recreation and public open space program, making use of funds from both public and private sources."

The County believes that it is unrealistic to rely on public funding to meet future open space needs of an expanding population.

KESQCiFs The PDC and IMC agree that the Implementation Report will address an assessment of the fiscal impacts of open space acquisition. The parties also agree that mechanisms to promote private sector involvement in preserving recreational and open space, such as cluster development and HER, will be addressed in handbooks.

6. Negotiable Item #A27a: Statewide Water Supply Sources Strategy 1 - Protection of Water Supply Sources*

IT 1SSL4J: The County expressed a concern that although there are methods for identifying aquifer recharge areas, such as fracture trace analyses, the reliability of these methods are unknown. The County seeks clarification from the State of the reliability of these methods before utilizing them.

BESDCFs The PDC and INC agree that mechanisms to assist counties and municipalities in the identification of aquifer recharge areas and in undertaking capacity analyses will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance.

*Please Note: fflis issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer below to the "Concerns" section for the resolution of A27b.

7. Negotiable Item #A28: Rpgional Design. System - General

JKP ISSDB: The County believes that a number of issues, including landowner equity, sewage disposal and the limitations of -t-raHi-Hnnai zoning, must be resolved prior to implementation.

KBSDUF: The PDC and INC. agree that mechanisms to promote the Regional Design System/ such as Transfer of Development Rights, alternative methods of sewage disposal, and mixed-use zoning, may be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SFC.

MXDK IX: nriUM?ffiR UUUKCX

1. Negotiable Item #2: Higher Density Zoning and Development to Support Public Transit

AT ISSDB: Local officials need assurances that if they plan and develop at higher densities, public transit will be forthcoming. Local officials need an up-front commitment that if communities increase zoning densities, transit benefits will follow. Long-term Capital Programs (10-15 years) may indicate future transit programs and provide mini cipa 1 Ities goals and incentives for* higher density zoning.

KESDUT: She PDC and IXC agree that the "corridor planning" process described in the PSEKP jriRnt.ifies the need for interdisciplinary, mnltijurisdlfTt.irmnl planning for growth corridors. Growth corridor planning, including the need for State and local coordination in capital programming, will be addressed in an Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #3: Growth Impact on Developed Communities

XSSIE: Smaller cxmrunities, expecting little growth, are feeling the negative impacts of growth from surrounding jt-jggT ifenhanigma need to be established to enable communities to better coordinate their planning efforts with surrounding T^nni^lpa^ i"ties» County enabling

should be enhanced and strengthened. More municipalities should participate in regional planning boards as prescribed in the M^UT^MU^UA^P1 land Use law.

RESO2R The FDC and IWC agree that planning and coordination should continue to occur with increasing County coordination and assistance. The need for enhancement of County enabling legislation will be addressed in an Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

Negotiable Item #5B: Tier 6 and Landowner Equity

AT ISSGE: The County is concerned about the loss of land value due to Tier 6 delineation and restrictions placed on development. There will be no Tier 6 in Gloucester County designation without a clearly defined program of farmland compensation.

The FDC and **IXC** agree that the equity issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report prepared by the FDC's Implementation Committee, which will be released with the Interim State Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #6: Infrastructure Funding

AT I5EXE: The County is concerned that State infrastructure investments that would have been made in rural areas in the absence of a State Plan will instead be directed to urban areas. The Plan must include a clear statement that "all areas in need of infrastructure investments for maintenance purposes for the public health safety and welfare will receive funding."

RESO2D: The FDC and IMC agree that the maintenance of existing systems will continue to receive priority over new infrastructure construction. Capital facilities priority systems will be presented more comprehensively in the Interim Plan and in the accompanying Implementation Report.

5. Negotiable Item #10: Adequate Funding Resources

AT JSSUi: The Plan cannot be implemented without a clear understanding as to where the financial and technical resources will come from to support the Plan and its programs.

HESQUF: The PDC and UC agree that increased planning at the local level will enhance implementation of the final State Plan. This issue, nrifHl-innal assistance for local governments in order to support plan implementation, will be included in the Implementation Report that will be distributed with the Interim Plan.

VdUKXs Sttffi OXHEST

1. Negotiable Item #4: ^technical Assistance

AT ISSffi: Sfte County believes that the Plan be too expensive to implement (e.g. , rewrite zoning codes) . Municipalities need technical and financial assistance to enable them to conduct long-term planning programs.

BESOKC: The PDC and IWC agree that increased planning at the local level will enhance the implementation of the final State Plan. This issue, aridi'tlnm] assistance for local government in order to support Plan implementation, will be included in the Plan Implementation Report that will be distributed with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #5: Implementation of the Plan

KF XSSOB: It is unclear how the Plan will be implemented and how much implement fiti on will cost. There are several concerns revolving around implementation of the Plan for example, how will the concept of villages and hamlets be implemented? What zoning is canpat.lblp with various tier designations?

JftfiWF: The PDC and UC agree that a more thorough understanding of implementation devices is necessary to rnnt-lnnf* the County and local review of the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan (PSERP) . The Interim Plan will be accompanied by an Implementation Report/ both documents will be subject to public review and corment period before adoption of the Final Plan.

XI:

1. Negotiable Item #G-2: Funding and Technical Assistance for Planning Activities

IS ISSUE: The County considered that the PSERP recommends that mnijirtpam-iftB perform a whole host of planning

activities ranging from expanding planning capacity to preparing specific inventories, studies, and plans. If the State is encouraging local governments to perform these functions, the County believes State funding and technical assistance must be provided. In addition, some municipalities are currently working at an effective level of planning and do not have to upgrade their efforts.

RE3E2F: The PDC and UC agree that State funding and technical assistance for county and municipal comprehensive planning, which is raised for in the Preliminary Plan, is an important implementation issue. This issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report. In addition, the Interim Plan will clearly define the recommended planning studies necessary for effective planning, in accordance with the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law, and after consideration of specific language changes recommended by Monmouth County.

2. Negotiable Item JG-4: Legislation to Implement Plan Policies and Strategies*

Jff XStE: The County believes that numerous strategies and policies in the PSCR require new legislation for effective implementation. Moreover, the County recommends that the SPC work closely with the New Jersey Legislature in order to ensure implementation. This legal support must be in place before the SERF is formally adopted.

KBSOEF: The PDC and IMC agree that additional legislation is important for effective and equitable implementation of the Plan. Such recommendations will be included in the Implementation Report. Specific legislative recommendations made by Monmouth County (including but not limited to transfer of development rights and impact fee legislation), which the County deems necessary for implementation of the Plan, will be forwarded to the Commission for consideration for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

*Please Note: The OSP and UC agreed on specific language for this resolution. However, at the PDC/IWC meeting, the word "desirable" was changed to "important."^M

3. Negotiable Item IG-5C: Equity

JKP JSSfks The County recommended that more creative ways to preserve natural resources, other than lowering development densities to such an extreme, should be explored (See County's Tier 5 definition).

HE5QUT: The PDC and INC agree that the protection of land equity is an important concern to which the Plan will remain sensitive. The issue will also be addressed by a variety of implementation instruments included in the Implementation Report. The impact on land value needs to be addressed in all the -tiers, and ought to be applied not only to farmland, but to natural resource preservation and the timing and phasing of development. Bie OSP staff will forward Monmouth County's proposed new language for strategies and policies regarding i->"'« issue to the Plan Implementation Committee for consideration.

4. Negotiable Item #G-7: State Agency Coordination

XT ZSSKE: The County felt that conflicting policies and regulations exist among the various State agencies and even within 'the same agency. Sometimes, State policies and regulations change right in the middle of an approval process of a project, creating delays and confusion.

Ohe County believes that State agencies should have and enforce consistent and coordinated strategies, policies, and regulations.

HESQKF: The PDC and INC agree that there is a need for greater government coordination and permit streamlining within and between State agencies to ensure maximum efficiency in processing permits. This posit inn will be supported in tie Implementation Report.

Negotiable Item #M-3B: Historic Town and Sensitivity Buffer

AT XSSKs Monmouth County proposes an "Historic Town" designation and "Sensitivity Buffer" delineation, as defined and explained below:

"A town possessing an exceptional number of historic structures and places. In rural settings, these towns frequently exist as traditional centers surrounded by

historic landscapes. The p^lir^*^ fog* Historic Qtowns and Sensitivity Buffers would emphasize the preservation of these historic resources . "

The Borough of Allentown, for which the Historic Town category was created, does not want the wholesale redevelopment of its historic district that might be suggested by the existing Tier 3 policies and it is fearful that it would become the nucleus for additional ring development along its tenter if it were designated as a village. (See Volume III Guidelines for Villages and County of Monmouth checklist ccment on Tier 3 Policy 1.6) .

Special attention should not only be directed to historic sites, but also to the lands adjacent to officially-designated historic districts, in order to preserve their existing character. Because these areas may cross municipal boundaries, it is acknowledged that the State, counties, and should work together in determining reviewing procedures and guidelines for projects of regional significance that may have an impact on such district.

BESOE2P: The PDC and UC agree that all levels of government should establish review procedures and guidelines for developments impacting more than one municipality. This issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report that will be released along with the Interim SERF. The OSP will reccOTnend Ifanmouth County's wording regarding this policy to the PDC for consideration.

TOOK ZUs 1KMUS COCKS

1, Negotiable Item #P9: State Agency Coordination

Iff ISSEE: The County believes that a mechanism should be developed to determine If State policies, regulations, programs and spending plans are consistent with each other and compatible with the SERF. Should procedures be defined for State agencies to resolve conflicts to yield results compatible with the SERF?

HESKEff: The PDC and IMC agree that procedures for reviewing plans, programs, and spending by State agencies to determine consistency with the SERF will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPG. The SERF will include a monitoring and evaluation ~~program~~ that will determine the extent and effectiveness to which the SERF is being used to guide the actions of State agencies.

2. Negotiable Item #P10(2): Permit Project Streamlining

KF ISSDB: 3te County *is* concerned that permit streamlining might result In new responsibilities for county or local governments for which the State has traditionally been responsible. Should permit and project streamlining be initiated by government as an important incentive for continued growth?

KESO2P: The PTC and INC agree that the delegation of permit authority Is defined by the State Legislature, and therefore, Is beyond the scope of the SCKP. Practices for permit streamlining will be addressed In the Implementation Report of the SPC.

3. Negotiable Itan #P12: Technical and legal Support

Kf ISSK: The County believes the State should assist and defnd municipalities that enter litigation in implementing provisions of the SDRP. Should counties and be provided with legal and technical assistance from the State In Implementing the SERF?

BESOff: Bie PDC and UC agree that mechanisms by which the State may provide technical and legal assistance, including handbooks, reports, briefs, and affidavits to explain or interpret the provisions of the SDRP, will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

4. Negotiable Item tP13(2): Intergovernmental Coordination

Jff ISSQBs de County believes that regional coor*^ should be achieved through consensus without reducing local discretion and authority. Does statewide and regional growth management conflict with local discretion and authority?

HESOUT: The PIC and IMC agree that implementation concerns relative to intergovernmental coordination should be iripnt.lfifirt by municipalities for consideration in the preparation of handbooks and the Implementation Report.

5. Negotiable Item #P14: Tier System Implementation

JET 1SSOB: 2toe County reports that tier designations should not prohibit land uses permitted by local development ordinances, but should support local ordinances where

compatible with the SERF. Should the SERF Identify how State agencies will incorporate tier designations in decision, raking, and how designations will relate to local master plans and development ordinances.

EESOC2F: The PDC and UC agree that Morris County and its are concerned about the relationship of policies in the SERF to local master plans and development ordinances. The role of tier designations in State agency and local decisions will be considered by the Implementation Ccmnittee for inclusion in the SERF and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

Negotiable Item #P15(1): Financing BEplementation

JT ISSDE: The County believes that local governments should not absorb all the costs of implementing the SDRP. Implementation effectiveness should not be determined by-local financial resources. Should SERF policies be coordinated with the availability of necessary implementation ~~piegrdiis~~ and funding?

HESQUT: The PDC and INC agree that the need for programs and funding sufficient to support local government planning activities toward achieving compatibility with provisions of the SERF will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

7. Negotiable Item #P16: Linkage Fees

KT 15902: The County states that linkage relationships must be based on housing needs and legal authority. Off-site Impact fees should be realistic. Should linkage fees be used to finance housing development through economic development, and impact fees to finance off-site infrastructure improvements?

KESOUF: The PDC and I2C agree that the need for enabling legislation for linkage and impact fees will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

8. Negotiable Item fP17: Suburban Infrastructure

KF ISSDB: ttie County believes that specific methods of financing suburban infrastructure involving the public and private sectors should be suggested/ tested, and

implemented. Should the SCRP identify means to finance infrastructure and service needs associated with suburban development and redevelopment.

RESQKF: Obe PDC and INC agree that the County will prepare an assessment of suburban infrastructure needs in cooperation with the GSP* The means to finance infrastructure and service needs associated with new suburban development and redevelopment will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPG.

9. Negotiable Item fP18: Suburban Growth Management

AT ISSUBs Ote County believes that municipalities need a clear legal mechanism to manage orderly development and redevelopment. Should the timing and phasing of future suburban growth be conditioned by the availability of necessary public fanllltvieB and services, capacity of natural resources, etc.

KESDCF: The PDC and UC agree that the following will be supported in the SERF and in the Inplanentation Report of the SFC: legislation that enables jMTim'pa'Mt.lfia to promote, direct, and/or limit development based on existing or concurrent infrastructure capacity; natural resources carrying capacity, and other criteria; and ptugrduis to support planning that reconciles development regulations with irifrastructure investments.

10. negotiable Item #P19(1): Rural Land Equity

XT ISSUE: ohe County feels that growth management practices that adversely effect individual land values, municipal revenues, and agricultural operations should be minimized in all areas. Should more comprehensive solutions be provided to prevent disproportionate windfalls and wipeouts in the value of undeveloped land in rural areas due to growth management? Public comments supplementing the County's report also reflect this concern.

CEP/ISC. RESOQFs Implementation - Ohe OSP and LNC agreed that any adverse impacts on land values or agriculture operations resulting from the implementation of the SERF is an implementation issue that will be addressed in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim Flan.

VECftXC RBXEffs The PDC and UC agree that the of land equity is an important concern to which the Plan will remain sensitive. The issue will also be addressed by a variety of instruments in the Implementatlna Report. The impact on land value needs to be addressed in all the tiers, and ought to be applied not only to farmland, but to natural resource preservation and the timing and phasing of envelopment. The OSP staff will forward Morris County's proposed new language for strategies and policies regarding this issue to the Plan Implementation Committee for consideration.

11. Negotiable Item #P20: Regional Design Implementation Tools

KF XSSCE: The County notes that given development opportunities under existing zoning/ mechanisms are necessary for municipalities to shift growth into communities of place. Should the SQRP provide for design guidelines, infrastructure improvements, and regulatory authority necessary to establish communities of place?

KESOUF: The PDC and IMC agree that legislation, technical assistance, and financial assistance supporting the establishment and maintenance of communities of place will be addressed in the Implementatirjn Report of the SPC.

12. Negotiable Item #A2b(2): Statewide Comprehensive Planning Policy 2.2 - Coordinating Planning: County and Municipal Plans

Kf ISSOBs The County believes that Guideline c.-Preparing County/Municipality Implementation Plans, implies vertical integration (Policy 2.3), and counties and municipalities are concerned that the consequences of inconsistency with the SERF are unclear.

BStEffs The PDC and IXC agree that the issue is associated with policy issue #15 "Financing Implementation." Appropriate benefits to local governments to promote compatibility among county and municipal plans and regulations with the SERF will be addressed in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

13. Negotiable Item #A9(2): Statewide Economic Development Policy 3.2 - Capital Facilities and Public Services: Utility/Energy System

KC **18SQB**: The County reports that some irnninipnlities are troubled by "Guideline a. -Coordinating Utilities with Statewide Objectives." Sane TTBTm'nlpalit.ifts are concerned that lor*ai pan- jo i pat- i on will be excluded from the decision making process with respect to any prospective location of utility plants.

KfSOUT: The PDC and IWC agree that this issue is associated with policy issue #P9, "State Agency Coordination." Procedures for the consideration of SERF policies and local circumstances in the provision of energy facilities will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPG.

14. Negotiable Item #A10(2): Statewide Economic Development Policy 5.3 - Revitalising Redeveloping Cities/Suburbs: Facilities

AT **ISSK**: She County believes that cultural facilities should be ~~j-uxiiriled~~ and supported in centers of all scales.

KESU2F: The PEC and UJC agree that this issue is associated with policy issue P20 "Regional Design Implementation Tools." Mechanisms to ensure that Regional Design objectives are considered in the development of major cultural •fari'M-Haa will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

15. Negotiable Item #All(2)s Statewide Hausing Policy 1.1 - Reducing Housing-Costs: Streamlining the Permitting Process, Giideline d.-Consolidating Regulations

JET **ISSUF**: Bie County believes that the State should not institute a single, consolidated development regulation to be applied to all levels of government, as indicated by the above guideline.

BBSOUT: Bie FDC and UC agree the issue is related to policy issue #P10, "Permit/Project Streamlining." Mechanisms to consolidate regulations within each level of government that result in "significant economies, efficiencies, and savings in the development process" (State Planning Act) will be identified in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

16. Negotiable Item #A23(2): Statewide Transportation Strategy 2 – An Integrated and Efficient Transportation System

JKT ISSTC: Hfce County believes that New Jersey Transit and transportation management associations should be considered important entities and responsible agencies in this strategy. -.-

RESCEff: Hie PDC and IMC agree the issue is associated with policy issue #P9, "State Agency Coordination." The roles of transit agencies and procedures for their coordination will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

17. Negotiable Item #A24(2): Statewide Transportation Policy 2.1 – An Integrated/Efficient Transportation System: Highway Funding Prioritization

AT ISSCE: The County believes that mechanisms should be for relating capital improvement plans and transportation master plans with the SERF, particularly for recurring and backlog needs.

KESOUfc ' Tte PDC and INC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P17, "Suburban Infrastructure."¹¹ Mechanisms to define and incorporate SERF priorities in agency mnstRr plans, capital improvement programs, and related decision making will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

18. Negotiable Item #A25a(2): Statewioe Air Quality Policy 1.1 – Coordinating Development Patterns: Land Use Patterns, Guideline b.

Kf ISSCE: The County objects to this guideline, noting that requiring air quality assessments will further complicate development and contradicts permit streamlining policies in the SDRP.

RESffiF: The PDC and 12X2 agree that the issue is associated with policy issue #P15, "Financing Implementation." Die provision of air quality assessments in planning processes, as well as in development review, including technical and financial resources for such assessments, will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

19. Negotiable Item #A25b(2): Statewide Air Quality Policy 1.1
- Coordinating Development Patterns: land Use Patterns,
Guideline c.-Preventing Increases in Emissions

KTISSOE: The County is concerned that limited retail, parking spaces, as indicated in the above guideline, may be detrimental to the viability of business.

HESIEXs Hie PDC and UC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P15, "Financing Implementation." Legal, technical and financial resources to implement these approaches will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

20. Ifegotiable Item #A26(2): Statewide Air Quality Policy 1.4 -
- Coordinating Development Patterns: Alternate Travel Means,
Guideline a.-Encouraging Transportation Management Agencies

Kf ISSOB: Tie County believes that contributions should not only be encouraged in Tier 4. The guideline states that private or public contributions to a regional transportation management agency should be encouraged that will result in reduced overall contaminant of emissions for new development in Tier 4 and in Rural Development Areas.

BESOUFs The PDC and IWC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P15, "Financing Implementation." Legal, technical and financial resources necessary to implement alternative travel means will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

21. Negotiable Item #A27(2): Statewide Biological Diversity
Strategy 1 - Ecosystem Management

Kf ISSDBs A policy statement that addresses the prospective development rights and opportunities of wetlands areas should be included in the SCRP.

RESOUF: The PDC and I2C agree the issue is associated with policy issue £P12, "Technical and Legal Support." Constraints and opportunities for .development in critical habitats provided under existing statutes will be reviewed and, if appropriate, legislative and administrative changes will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

22. Negotiable Item #A28(2): Statewide Biological Diversity Policy 1.1 – Ecosystem Management: Ecosystem Identification & Management

AT ISS(Ei The County feels that critical habitats should be identified, but not as part of the SERF cross-acceptance process, as the policy indicates.

KESKiP: The PDC and IMC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P9, "State Agency Coordination." Procedures to encourage the exchange of information among counties, municipalities, DEP, and OSP to improve planning efforts will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

23. Negotiable Item #A32(2): Statewide Critical Slope Areas Policy 1.1 – Development and Redevelopment: Identification/Delineation

AT 3SSQE: The County believes that individual municipalities should determine what constitutes a critical slope.

RESORT: The PDC and INC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P9, "State Agency Coordination." Procedures to encourage the exchange of planning information will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

24. Negotiable Item #A33(2): Statewide Flood Control – General

AT ISSOB: The County reported that some municipalities consider the general intent and specific proposals of the Statewide Flood Control impractical from legal ("taking") and planning practices, as all development "effects" storm water runoff.

RESDUF: Die PDC and I2C agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P12, "Technical and Legal Support." Legal, technical, and financial resources necessary to implement these approaches will be addressed in handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

25. Negotiable Item #A37(2): Statewide Flood Control Policy 2.3
- Proactive Flood Hazard Controls: .. .Outside Flood Plains

AT ISSStE: The County noted that the current enabling legislation does not support the actions recommended by this policy.

KESQUf: The PDC and IWC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P12, "Technical and Legal Support."¹¹ Legal, technical, and financial resources to implement these approaches will be addressed in the handbooks, through technical assistance, and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

26. Negotiable Item #A43(2): Statewide Scenic Corridors Policy
1.1 - Identification: IdentificatInn/DelInpntion

AT ISSStE: The County feels that scenic corridors should be identified, but not as part of the SERP cross-acceptance process.

RESORT: The PDC and UC agree this issue is associated with policy issue #P9, "State Agency Coordination." Procedures to encourage the exchange of information among counties, municipalities, the D&P, and OSP to improve planning efforts will be addressed through technical assistance and in the Implementation Report of the SPC.

27. Negotiable Item #A49(2): Statewide Water Supply Sources
Policy 1.4 - Water Supply: Development Regulations for
Wastewater Dispensing, Guideline a. -Development Capacity
Analysis - Applying the Nitrate Dilution Model

AT ISSStE: The County reports that legal and technical assistance is needed to develop alternative approaches and to avoid misapplication of the nitrate model.

BES02F: The PDC and UC agree that the issue is associated with policy issue #P12, "Technical and Legal Support." Application of the nitrate model will be addressed in handbooks and technical assistance.

VDUW ZIUs mir.iib.jM>i

1. Negotiable Item #3: State Support for Local Activities

AT ISSUE: The County supports State funding for local activities initiated as a result of the Plan. The SERF calls for municipalities to perform increased activities including staffing of functions such as planning. Municipalities cannot provide the level of funding necessary to support these sophisticated functions.

BESEKR The PDC and UC agree that increased planning at the local level will enhance implementation of the final State Plan. This issue, regarding financial assistance for local government in order to support plan implementation, will be included in the Plan Implementation Committee's Report that will be distributed with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #17: Permit Streamlining

Kf ISSEK: The County cautioned that permit streamlining should not result in a less thorough review process or denial of a permit.

BBSQFT The PDC and UC agree that during the process of permit, streamlining the public interest served by permit, processes should be maintained. Permit streamlining will be presented in the Implementation Report which will be published in conjunction with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #22: Tiers 2 & 4 Housing Linkage, Policy 4.5 & 4.8

Kf ISSUE: There are no provisions for housing linkages in the Municipal Land Use Law. The linkage is employed in other parts of the country and is consistent with sound planning principals. This policy's application and the need for the linkage to implement should be addressed.

KESO2F: The PDC and UC agree that the provision of enabling legislation to establish linkages between housing and non-residential development is desirable. This issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report which will accompany the release of the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #24: Impact Fees

AT ISSIE: The County has noted the need to enact legislation to authorize the collection of impact fees and developer contributions to help defray the cost of providing and services to new development.

BESOHT: The FDC and I2C agree that legislation enabling the collection of impact fees is an implementation concern. Infrastructure provision and financing will be discussed in the Implementation Report which will be released along with the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #25: Toxic Waste Cleanup

AT ISSIE: The County has called for accelerated clean-up of ECRA sites, noting that its municipalities have also expressed this concern: "The cleanup and reclamation of already identified toxin waste sites should be tremendously accelerated."

KESOZT: The FDC and UC agree that cleanup and reclamation of toxin waste sites should not impede the revitalization of urban areas. This position will be supported in the SPC's Implementation Report which will accompany the release of the Interim Plan.

6. Negotiable Item #29: Implementation Funding

Kf ISSIE: Implementation must be clearly aligned with examples provided. The Plan needs to expand the discussion of State and local sources of funding for stated incentives stated in the Plan. The sanctions for non-compliance should be expressed in aridity! to the costs associated with

JKWF: The PDC and INC agree that some of the implementation devices for the State Plan are not clear in the FSERP. The SFC will release an Implementation Report that will address implementation devices, along with the Interim Plan.

TOOK XWs TMgaor CCIHK

1. Negotiable Item #1: Funding for Comprehensive Planning

JKP ISSIE: With many municipalities facing increased fiscal pressures, there is a need to provide State funding for and planning efforts discussed in the strategies and policies of the State Plan. The QSP should identify

funding sources for counties and municipalities to do the types of planning necessary to comply with these program guidelines.

BESOUF: The PDC and IXC agree that State funding of planning, for municipalities and counties statewide, is a critically important implementation issue, and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #4B: Capital Facilities - Development Financing of Infrastructure Improvements

KS ISSUE: The legality of requiring developments to provide adequate public open space is questionable except in cluster or P.U.D. development.

RESOUF: The PDC and INC agree that the issue of "linkages" as it applies to financing of public infrastructure is an implementation issue, and will be included in the Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #5: Affordable Housing - Linkage to New Development

Kf ISSUE: The extent to which new development should pay for lower-income housing is viewed as a legal issue. Existing rules and regulations do not permit such a housing linkage. New legislation would be needed.

RESOKT: The PDC and INC agree that linking affordable housing to new development is an implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

DOC DK X7: CFTHS MST CLUUX

1. Negotiable Item #2: Implications of Plan Adoption and Implementation

XT ISSUE: The County believes that Plan adoption implies Plan implementation. It should be clearly stated that the SERF is an advisory document, and that implementation can only be achieved by proper rule-making and legislation, as required by law.

BESOHF: The PDC and INC agree the legal status of the SERP is an implementation issue that will be addressed in the SPC's Implementation Report, which will accompany said Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #3: Funding for New Programs – State Mandate/State Pay

AT ISSUE: The need to provide State funding for any programs mandated by the SERP.

BESDCF: The PDC and HC agree that programs and initiatives in the SERP should be supported by all levels of New Jersey Government.

Negotiable Item #12: Cape May National Wildlife Refuge

KF ISSUE: The County believes that the proposed refuge should be recommended for adequate State and Federal funding in the SERP.

RESORT: The PDC and INC agree that PSERP Recreation and Public Open Space Policy 1.5s and Development Priorities supports the acquisition of unique lands in New Jersey, such as the proposed Cape May National Wildlife Refuge. However, the need for funding for the acquisition of lands is an implementation issue that will be addressed in the SPC's Implementation Report, which will accompany the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #13A: Funding for Beach Restoration and Protection*

KF ISSUE: The County believes the SERP should propose a stable funding source for beach restoration and protection.

BESQCTs The PDC and INC agree that a stable funding source is desirable for beach restoration and protection, however, funding for the implementation of the final SERP is an issue that should be addressed in the SPC's Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan..

*Please Note: Issue #13 was discussed and resolved as a two-part issue. The resolution of Issue #13B is reported under the "Concern" section on page 9.

5. Negotiable Item #22A: Conditions for Reinstating Tier 6 in the County Maps for the SDKP

AT ISSQ3: In order for the County to delineate areas, certain conditions must be included in Tier 6 policies. Such conditions would provide a basis for Cape May County to provide for Tier 6 in the tier napping system.

A policy strongly recommending a major bond issue of \$500 million for preservation of agriculture should be included as a Tier 6 policy.

KESTCF: The HE and LNC agree that funding for agricultural preservation is an issue that should be addressed in the SPC's Implementation Report that will accompany the Interim Plan.

TOOK XVI:

1. Negotiable Item #PS-1: State Funding

AT ISSDER The SERF should provide a specific methodology for the allocation, of State funding for, and should identify specific ~~programs~~ needed to meet, municipal infrastructure and service needs.

BESOHF: The PDC and LNC agree that this is an implementat.i nn item. Die Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) will address this issue as part of the Implementation Report which will be issued along with the Interim Plan.

- 2, Negotiable Item FPS-2: Funding Priorities

Jffi XSSDE: The SERF should define how the State will establish and implement reasonable and equitable procedures to set priorities for State spending for infrastructure, open space, and other ~~pl-og-i-dut~~ funding in relation to the tier and RDS Strategies of the Plan. j

RESDUft The PDC and UC agree that funding priorities in the t.iftr system and the RDS for infrastructure, open space and other programs are important implementation issues and may be included in the PIC Report to be released with the Interim Plan. :

3. Negotiable Item #PS-5: Permit Streamlining

AT IS9K: The SERP should define streamlined regulatory procedures for those areas of the State where growth tiers and regional design system elements are identified in the Plan.

HESQKT: The PDC and IMC agree that this is an implementation item. The PIC will address this issue as part of the Implementation Report which will be issued along with the Interim Plan. The Report will contain recommendations to the Executive and legislative Branches of government on Plan implementation.

4. Negotiable Item #PS-10B: RDS - Planning

KF ISSffi: The SDRP should recommend implementation mechanisms to include: transfer of development rights, public infrastructure funding programs, development phasing, impact fees, land development review for regional impacts, property tax reform, and flexible or performance standard approaches to land development regulation.

RESCEiT: The PDC and UC agree that the need for certain legislation to implement the RDS is an implementation issue and will be included in the PIC to be released with the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #PS-U: Agriculture Preservation.

Xf TaWBR: The County, supported by Middlesex County Agriculture Development Board in a letter of July 6, 1989, believes that the Plan should clearly identify Tier 6A and 6B as priority areas for implementation of agriculture preservation programs. These areas should not represent a request to establish agriculture zoning or land use restrictions of any kind.

RESQCF: The PDC and **I2C** agree that the utilization of the tier system for agriculture preservation programs is clearly an implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

6* Negotiable Item #PS-12: Agriculture Preservation

AT ISSDBs The County, supported by Middlesex County Agriculture Development Board in a letter of July 6, 1989

believes the Plan should endorse and seek adaption of legislation that will allow implementation of transfer of development rights or credits; continuing funding of agricultural easement purchase programs; and agriculture land envelopment cooperatives, corporations, or trusts, that will result in preservation of agriculture lands. The delineation of Tier 6A and 6B Lands should be conditioned upon the availability of such programs.

KESffift The PDC and IHC agree that agricultural preservation programs and legislation are critically important implementation issues and may be included in the Plan 3jimplementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

Negotiable Item #PS-15: Tier 7

AT *ISSUE*: The SDRP should reccnmend and seek adoption of legislation that will allow implementation of transfer of development rights or credits; continuing funding for environmentally-sensitive land acquisition; conservation easements; and land development cooperatives, corporations or trusts that will result in preservation of environmentally-sensitive areas.

RESH/T: The PDC and UC agree that additional legislation may be desirable for effective and equitable implementation of the Plan's strategies and policies for the preservation of environmentally-sensitive areas. The County' s reconrnendations will be considered in the Plan Implementation Report.

8. Negotiable Item #PS-16: Plan Implementation

AT *ISSOB*: The SERF should require the OSP to periodically update the status of implementation mechanisms that include: transfer of development rights or credits; refinements to zoning and land development control enabling law and model regulations to allow mixed-use, stronger clustering provisions, planned unit development and performance standard approaches; establishment of infrastructure, housing and open space trust funds or banks; better design standards; better coordinated wastewater management planning regulations; infrastructure extension phasing in relationship to development plans, ability to pay and resource capacity constraints; impact fees; county development review for regional impacts; and assistance to

development cooperatives, corporations or trusts to allow quality development while preserving open space, natural resources or agriculture.

RESOFFS Rie PDC and UC agree that the provision of periodic updates by the OSP on the status of implementation mechanisms is an important implementation issue and may be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

9. Negotiable Item #SG-7: Toxic and Hazardous Waste Site Clean-up

AT XSSQB: The SERF should include provisions that will expedite the clean-up of sites contaminated by toxic and hazardous waste.

REBOOTS The PDC and IXC agree that clean-up and reclamation of toxic waste sites must be addressed. This position will be supported in the SFC's Implementation Report, which will accompany release of the Interim Plan.

2VU: SORBET

1. Negotiable Item #2Bs Capital Facilities in Tier

XSSK: The County believes that State facilities should be a revitalization tool for Tier 1 communities. The State must ensure that the total impacts of its facilities are evaluated as part of the siting process. Some State facilities generate impacts that can and should be mitigated. For example, some State facilities draw populations that are in need of services from the municipalities as well. Without some type of mitigation for social and economic impacts, some State facilities may actually cost Tier 1 communities more than the benefits derived from them. Also, impacts must be part of the siting process from the earliest stages.

RBSOUF: The PDC and I2C agree that this is an implementation item. The Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) will address this issue as part of the Implementation Report which will be released along with the Interim Plan.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 15 in the "Concern" section for the resolution of 2A.

2. Negotiable Item #1: Funding and ^technical Assistance for Planning Activities

KC ISSEE: The PSERP recommends that municipalities perform a whole host of planning activities ranging from expanding planning capacity to preparing specific inventories, studies and plans. If the State is encouraging local governments to perform these functions, State funding and technical assistance must be provided. The Borough of Far Hills noted in its report to the SPC that the focus should be on long-range comprehensive planning.

RESORT: The PDC and UX2 agree that State funding and technical assistance for county and municipal comprehensive long-range planning, called for in the Preliminary Plan, is an important implementation issue. This issue will be addressed in the implementation Report. In addition, the Interim Plan will clearly define the recommended planning studies necessary for effective planning, in accordance with the New Jersey Municipal Land Use law.

3. Negotiable Item #5: Equity

Kf ISSKE: The County would like to see policies that address potential wireouts and windfalls created by the implementation, of the Plan. Prior to adopting such policies, however, the State should assess policies in place in other jurisdictions. For example, the public sector benefits from the increase in value caused by the location of subway stops in the Washington DC system.

Also, policies addressing significant loss of value caused by implementation of the Plan need to be addressed, specifically for farmland, open space and major environmentally sensitive areas. Tools such as Transfer of Development Rights (OCR), preservation programs, and Green Acres should be included within the Plan,

KESOR: The PDC and LNC agree that land equity is an important implementation concern and that the SERP will remain sensitive to the possibility of land value changes. One issue will also be addressed by a variety of implementation instruments included in the Implementation Report.

4. Negotiable Item #10: Capital Facilities Plan Review Process

AT ISSCB: Bernards and Montgomery Townships believe the State should not have review power over municipal and county capital facilities plans. Review of local plan items should be restricted to those that have an impact of regional nature.

HEKff: The PDC and IMC agree that this is an implementation issue. The PIC will address this issue as part of the Implementation Report which will be released along with the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #12: Waste Disposal

AT 3SSDE: One County, Far Hills and North Plainfield want to underscore the importance of regional solutions to solid waste management. The Plan's strategies and policies should emphasize source reduction, recycling and resource recovery.

BESEKfs The PDC and INC agree that facility impacts such as , source reduction, recycling and resource recovery are important factors in determining waste disposal sites. The State may assist in coordinating municipalities and counties with the facility siting process. This issue will be addressed in the Plan Implementation Report.

6. Negotiable Item #20: mm" dor Center Density

AT ISSUE: Montgomery Township suggested that varying levels of building intensity and forms of development should be permitted within corridor centers, depending on their regional role, community identity, and carrying capacity limitations.

KESUTs •- The PDC and INC agree that this is an implementation issue. The PIC will address this issue as part of the Implementation Report which will be released along with the Interim Plan.

7. Negotiable Item #26: Highway Access Management

AT ISSUF: Hie County recognizes the need for a (legal) basis for denying access on a county road. The Municipal land Use law and County enabling legislation, have not been amended to include this. Ote County is looking to the SPC to initiate this effort.

HESCEffc She PDC and INC agree that the State Highway Access Management Code allows counties and municipalities to set standards regarding highway access. Additionally, the PIC will aHHTKagg the issue of State, county and municipal coordination, including the regulating of infrastructure, in the Implementation Report that will be distributed with the Interim Plan.

8. Negotiable Item #28: Capital Facilities Financing and Development, Policy 1.3

AT ISSCEs She County, Bernards and Montgomery Townships noted that the implementation of Policy 1.3, the provision of adequate capital facilities as a condition for approval of new development, requires additional legislation.

RESORT: The PDC and IMC agree that the need for additional legislation necessary to implement the provision of adequate capital -farHii-Mfta as a condition for approval of new development will be considered by the PIC and recommendations may be made in the Implementation Report that will be distributed along with the Interim Plan.

9. Negotiable Item #29: Planning: Adequate Facilities

KF ISSCE: Bernards and Far Hi 11 s have recommended modifying the policy to reflect that approvals are subject to applicable case law and existing enabling legislation.

County supports the concept; however, "adequate f anilities" needs to be defined and State legislation is required to implement this policy.

HESffifc Ohe PDC and INC agree that planning for adequate facilities as called for in the Preliminary Plan is an important implementation issue. This issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report which will be issued with the Interim Plan.

XVHX: tiUSU (UMUf

1. Negotiable Item #P-8: Regional Design Implementation Tools

JEP ISSUE: Mm|if?ipai j-Hgg lack the •Ffgrai and regulatory support to provide the necessary facilities to implement the RD6. Should the SEEP provide for design guidelines and

regulatory authority and encourage State permitting and funding for infrastructure and transit services necessary to establish communities of place?

RESCUF: The PDC and IXC agree that legislation, technical assistance, funding and intergovernmental coordination to enhance incrementation of the RDS will be considered by the Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) for inclusion in the Implementation Report that will accompany the release of the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #P-10A: State Funding

AT ISSTE: The County notes that county and local governments are already fiscally over-burdened and believes that State-mandated programs should be funded by the State. The possible fiscal ramifications of the Plan should be addressed.

KESO/Pr The PDC and UC agree that program needs and sufficient funding to support local government planning activities toward achieving compatibility the SDKP will be considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SERF.

3. Negotiable Item #P-11C: State Agency Coordination

AT XSSIK: The County suggests that the compatibility of State agency functional plans with the SDKP may result in of funds and permits away from rural areas .

OSP/UC HESTCT: Deferred - OJie OSP and I2JC deferred resolution of this issue so that it could be discussed in greater detail with the PDC.

EDC/LK RESO/Ps Implementation - She PDC and IK agree that a policy to recommend appropriate mechanisms to ensure the formulation of procedures for the review of plans, programs and spending by State agencies, in order to determine consistency with the SDRP, will be considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report that will accompany the release of the Interim SDRP.

4. Negotiable Item #P-12B: Permit-Project Streamlining

AT ISSIE: The County believes that regionalism is best served by County and municipal cooperation. The County

feels that statewide uniform development regulations should not be implemented, and that equal priority should be given rural areas. Should permit and project streamlining be initiated by all levels of government as an important incentive for continued growth?

KESCEff: The PDC and IDC agree that principles for permit and project streamlining will be considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report that will accompany the release of the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #P-13s Technical and Legal Support

JET ISSEE: Although the Plan is not zoning, communities with zoning ordinances at odds with the Plan regarding development densities may have difficulty in defending their ordinances. Should counties and municipalities be provided with legal and technical assistance from the State in implementing the SERP?

OSP/LK BESETs Agreement in Principle – The QSP and INC agreed that if municipalities that review and amend their plans and ordinances to be compatible with the SERP, then technical and legal assistance, including affidavits, and interpretive statements, should be provided as appropriate by OSP.

H&UC KESOHT: Implementation – The FCC and I24C affirmed the language of the OSP/IHC resolution. However, the parties agree to reclassify Item #P-13 as an implementation issue.

6. Negotiable Item #P-14B: Intergovernmental Coordination*

JET IS5QB: The County notes that municipalities should maintain their own authority in implementation of SERP. How should implementation of the SERP relate to local discretion and authority?

BESHffs Tie FCC and INC agree that implementation concerns relative to intergovernmental coordination should be identified by municipalities for consideration in the preparation of handbooks and by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SDRP. The parties also agree that implementation of the SERP should emphasize incentives rather than sanctions.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 13 under the "Concerns" section of t*vin Update for the resolution of P-14A.

7. Negotiable Item #P-15: Rural land Equity

Kf ISS(E): The County feels that the use of mitigation programs to protect rural land equity (e.g., PER and TDR) should be better defined. Should more comprehensive solutions be provided to prevent disproportionate windfalls and wipeouts in the value of undeveloped land in rural areas due to growth management?

QSP/UC KESGKT: Deferred – The QSP and UC agreed to defer resolution of this issue, noting that legislation providing for measures such as, transfer of development rights (including sharing of tax revenues and infrastructure support for receiving areas); purchase of development rights; stable and guaranteed minimum funding in each county; as well as local administration of these programs and other measures, will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SDRP.

PDC/UC HGSOiT: Implementation – One PDC and IXC agree that legislation providing for transfer of development rights, purchase of development rights, and stable and guaranteed minimum funding in each county, as well as local administraticii of these programs and other measures, will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SCRP.

8. Negotiable Item #A-5: Statewide Natural and Cultural Resource/Tiers 6 & 7 Intent – General Protection of Natural and Cultural Resources/Agricultural Pressure

iff ISSre: Ofte County notes that landowner equity must be balanced with the protection of natural and cultural resources and with farmland preservation concerns.

QSP/UC RESUff; Deferred – The OSP and IflC agreed to defer this issue pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006, which gives the PDC authority to consider new statewide agricultural strategies.

HC/EHC BES02F: Implementation – 3he PDC and UC agree that the issue is associated with Item P-15 – Rural land Equity. The parties also agree that legislation providing

for transfer of development rights (including sharing of tax revenues and infrastructure support for receiving areas), purchase of development rights, stable and guaranteed funding in each county as well as local administration of these programs, will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SERF.

9. Negotiable Item #A-6B: Statewide Biological Diversity Policy 1.1 – Ecosystem Management: Ecosystem Identification & Management

ISSUE: The County notes that the identification of large tracts of existing woodlands of 50 acres or more or other critical habitats is beyond the resources of any local government/ except when a development of sufficient size is proposed that can generate that information.

The PDC and IMC agree that procedures to encourage the exchange of information among counties, municipalities, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and OSP in order to improve planning efforts, will be addressed in handbooks, through technical and funding assistance and will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

TTT- fMBJIJqj>

1. Negotiable Item #2: Permit Streamlining

ISSUE: The County believes the State Plan should be a vehicle through which the State can shorten the time it takes to get a permit, reduce red tape and coordinate permit objectives. This means that there must be considerable involvement of State agencies during the cross-acceptance and implementation phases of the planning process.

The PDC and UC agree that permit streamlining should occur, consistent with good planning practice, to encourage a more timely review of development and/or redevelopment applications. This issue will be addressed in the Implementation Report that will accompany the release of the Interim SERF. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County pertaining to permit streamlining will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) for their consideration

for inclusion in the Implementation Report. The proposed language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Implementation Report and technical assistance manigi p.

2. negotiable Item #3: Transportation Objectives

KF ISSTC: The County states that better coordination of State programs is needed to direct public transit, port development and rail and air transport projects. These are projects which clearly assume regional roles and since State funding is an integral part of project development, the State has a legitimate role in coordinating these activities.

BESQCTs Ofta PDC and IMC agree that there is a need for greater municipal, county and State coordination regarding transportation objectives. The issue of intergovernmental coordination will be addressed in the Implementation Report that will be distributed with the Interim SERF. Specific language recommended by Cumberland County pertaining to the coordination of intergovernmental coordination and transportation objectives will be reviewed by the OSP and recommendations will be made to the PIC for their consideration for inclusion in the Implementation Report. The proposed language regarding this issue will be submitted to the County for review and comment before inclusion in the Implementation Report and technical assistance

3. Negotiable Item #14: Intergovernmental Coordination

1ST ISSKs The County believes the Plan should be used to coordinate the planning and regulatory functions of local, county and State governments. "Coordination" implies a less than mandatory process for bringing planning goals and objectives into line. The cross-acceptance process is the vehicle through which this coordinating should occur.

WSfMSS The FCC and *IK* agree that there is a vital need for greater governmental coordination. Appropriate roles and procedures for intergovernmental coordination will be addressed in the Implementation Report that will be distributed along with the Interim PI ATI.

TOOK XX: UHRE& COKEY

1. Negotiable Item #3E: Agricultural and Environmental Protection

AT ISSDB: The County believes that although environmentally sensitive areas are best identified at the municipal and county level, local identification is often beyond the capacity of local government.

KEEKE2T: The PDC and **IXC** agree that procedures to encourage the exchange of information among all levels of government to improve planning efforts will be addressed in handbooks and through technical assistance and will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

2. Negotiable Item #3F: Agricultural and Environmental Protection

AT ISSDB: The County suggests that a determination should be made about the extent of funds available for land acquisition or easement agreements. It is unreasonable for the State to expect property owners to bear the financial burden of natural resources protection, for the entire State.

BESOCffs The PDC and LNC agree that the PIC will consider equity concerns – raised in the context of environmental protection and agricultural preservation issues – for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

3. Negotiable Item #4B: Adequate Funding Resources for the local Planning Process

AT ISSDB: The County notes that the Plan cannot be implemented without a clear understanding of where the financial and technical resources will come from to support it and its ~~programs~~. Due to a lack of funds and an eroding tax base/ many municipalities do not have the staff or funds to conduct local planning at the level recommended in the Plan. Municipalities require assistance in, the r-api-t-ai budgeting aspects of land use planning.

BESO2T: The PDC and INC agree that increased planning at the local level will enhance implementation of the final State Plan. The issue, as well as national financial assistance for local governments in order to support plan implementation, will be considered by the Plan

Implementation Committee (PIC) for Inclusion in the Implementation Report that will be distributed with the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #5A: Intergovernmental Coordination/Regional Planning

KF ISSQB: The County believes the SPC should coordinate the activities of State agencies before it regulates local planning initiatives.

RBXE2T: The PDC and IHC agree that procedures to facilitate State agency coordination will be considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SERF.

5. Negotiable Item #6A: Rural Land Equity

JET XSSIE: The County has stressed the fears of landowners about the SERF'S proposed restrictions on development of rural areas, which they feel, will deprive them of their land equity. This fear is causing farmers to flee New Jersey and is undermining the viability of farming. The SDKP should acknowledge that there is a cost to agricultural preservation. The Plan relies too heavily on TOR. A stable source of funding for farmland preservation should be established before a TER program is implemented; TER should be statewide.

RESCUE: The PDC and LNC agree that TER is only one of many tax*lg available for agricultural protection. Legislation providing for transfer of development rights (including sharing of tax revenues between sending and receiving areas; and infrastructure support for receiving areas), purchase of development rights and stable and guaranteed minimum funding in each county/ as well as local administration of these programs and other appropriate measures will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report accompanying the Interim SERF.

6. Negotiable Item #9: Technical Assistance

KK XSSOE: One County believes that municipalities lack the technical and regulatory support needed to conduct the studies and provide the facilities necessary to implement the planning programs ^ tier and statewide policies of the SERP.

HES0Jr: The PDC and I2C agree that increased planning at the local level will enhance implementation of the final State Plan. The FIC is considering the nature and extent of technical assistance, handbooks/ guidelines and regulatory support fm- m-mim'pai jmpj cmgnhai!jn^t to be recommended in the Implementation Report. Any such assistance, handbooks or guidelines should be developed in consultation with County and local officials.

7. Negotiable Item #10B: Regional Design System

KS ISSffi: The County states that the Regional Design System proposes to induce development in rural communities of place and suggests severe restrictions on development in the surrounding countryside. This concept is inconsistent with the life-style and objectives of Warren County residents, many of whom left concentrated urban areas for rural areas. Municipalities (not developers) should control the size of communities of place. local determinations regarding appropriate growth should be recognized by State agencies .

The PDC and LNC agree that mechanisms to support municipalities that desire to control the ultimate size of a community - and the limits of services - will be considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

8. Negotiable Item #11: Regional Design Implementation Tools

JKP ISSUE: The Comity feels that tn^riimpai it-ips lack the fiscal and regulatory support to provide the necessary to implement the Pe*p'nnai Design System.

HE9X2F: The FCC and IWC agree that legislation, assistance, funding and intergovernmental coordination to enhance implementation of the Pegirmai Design System will be considered by the PIC of the SPC for inclusion in the Implementation Report that accompanies the release of the Interim STOP. Implementation recommendations should emphasize benefits of utilizing the Regional Design System rather than sanctions.

9. Negotiable item #12A: legal Support

XT ISSUE: The County feels that counties, and especially municipalities, are vulnerable to lawsuits concerning

strategies, policies and State Plan map designations, She SDKP will create another avenue for adversaries to litigate their cases.

KESQUS The PDC and LHC agree that if the Nainipai will review and amend their plans and ordinances to be compatible with the SERF, then technical and legal assistance, including affidavits, briefs and interpretive statements, should be provided as appropriate by the OSP. The PIC will consider recommending the creation of an "Office of Support" in the Attorney General's office, to provide legal support to

10. Negotiable Item #14C: Rural Land Planning and Development

M* ISSEE: The proposed density of 100 persons per square mile is inconsistent with existing patterns of development in Warren County; a carrying capacity approach is recommended. The nitrate dilution model is not well understood. Technical assistance is needed to enable the County to determine the level of existing resources, such as groundwater

RESORT: The PDC and IMC agree that detailed guidelines and procedures for non site-specific carrying capacity analyses, which measure cumulative impacts and recognize and evaluate existing municipal and county efforts, will be provided through handbooks and other technical assistance. The parties also agree that the State should provide funding and technical assistance to local governments in determining the level of existing resources, such as groundwater, in with carrying capacity analyses.

11. Negotiable Item #15B: Tier 5 Open Space Requirements

Kf ISSEB: The County reports that limiting development to 5 percent of a parcel is distributing to the public for two reasons: First, it infers that a taking of personal rights without compensation; and, Second, it is an erosion of the rule.

RESOUT: The PDC and UC agree that mechanisms to promote open space preservation will be included in handbooks, technical assistance and considered by the PIC for inclusion in the Implementation Report.

XXI: ESSBK COOKS

- 1. Negotiable Item #2: State Funding for Plan-Related Activities

AT ISSUE: Rie Township of Essex Fells believes the State Plan should address the Plan ' s over-reliance on local resources for its implementation.

County feels the PSERP faiaa to provide funding mechanisms for many of its proposed policies. The County added that it is unlikely that many of the goals and objectives outlined in the PSERP can be accompli shed unless there is an accompanying funding package to finance the implementation of the Plan.

RESORT: Ehe PDC and IMC agree that funding for Plan-related activities is a critically important implementation issue and will be included in the Plan Implementation Report to be released with the Interim Plan.

D.

DCUBK I: raw-Mi uuwent

- 1. Negotiable Item #12 - Econonic Development-State Dept.

JO? ISSUfs It is the County's opinion that payments in lieu of taxes for state-owned facilities should not be limited to local n»miripa Titles , Counties and school districts should also be the recipients of these payments.

KESOUT: ofte PDC and I2C agree that changes to the P.I.L.O.T. formula, to include counties and school districts, will be listfid as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

TOOK H:

No issues were resolved as concerns in Mercer County.

vane m: uuui CUUHH

- 1* Ifegotiable Item #7: O!he Role of the HMDC in the State Planning Process

JO! ISS(E; The HMDC should be actively involved in the cross-acceptance process to better promote regional comprehensive planning. The State Planning Act should be amended to include the HMDC within the State Plan's jurisdiction. The Plan needs to address the HMDC's standing within the statewide funding priority scheme. The HMDC should be assigned a higher designation for the purpose of funding priority.

KSXUP: The PDC and IMC agree that this issue will be as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

2. Negotiable Item #9: Bane Role

AT ISSKE: County and municipal land use controls will be in accordance with State statutes including the Municipal Land Use law and the County Enabling Act.

KK3E2T: ..The FCC and I23C agree to list this issue as a concern on the Interim List of Agreements and Disagreements. While it was agreed that the State Planning Act is not intended to contradict provisions of the New Jersey State Constitution, the New Jersey Municipal land Use law or the County Enabling Act, the County has requested that the above statement be inserted into the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #11: Reliance on Property Tax

IT ISSUE: The tax structure should be changed from the reliance on the property tax to a more equitable tax system. The County feels that tax reform to alleviate the reliance on property tax is critically Important to the implementation of the Plan.

HBSOR: The PDC and LNC agree that this issue will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

IVs

1. Negotiable Item #1B: Funding for Implementation of SERF.

Kf XSSffLE: Financial incentives and opportunities should play a key role in implementing the SERF. The County wants SERF to positively both recommend and identify funding sources and

programs necessary to Implement Plan. They specifically want open space and farmland preservation programs identified.

SBSMSz Tte FDC and IMC agree that the County's desire for adequate funds to implement farmland and open space preservation programs would be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #7: Participation of Division of Coastal Resources in State Planning Process and CWJRA regulations

JET ISSUE: In order to be effective in the coastal area, the SCRIP and State Planning process must coordinate all planning agencies, particularly the Division of Coastal Resources, to cxxperatively resolve common issues. The support and commitment of the State Planning Commission is essential. ?he County believes that the comparison phase resulted in better communications with other regional agencies, and wishes to continue this intergovernmental coordination.

HESOR: The PDC and IWC agree that the general lack of coordination of State policies and programs with respect to the coastal areas would be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

V: danaa

1. Negotiable Item #1: State Funding Appropriations

XC ISSCB: State manrintPd programs should be supported with adequate, long-term funding. Die County suggests pooling funding ty planning districts or through multi- town agreements. A mechanism at the State level to finance Plan policies must be established.

RESDEF: The PDC and IMC agree that multi- jurisdictional agreements to carry out Plan programs are encouraged and desirable. She parties also agree to record the County's concern with respect to adequate long-term funding in a list of concerns that will be forwarded to the State Adnistration, Tg>rp ai atiyys^ counties, ifflmi^{ff} ipali^t-^{'*}itg and the public, concurrently with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #3: Funding and Implementation of Existing Regulatory Programs

KF ISSCE: There needs to **be** follow through, funding and implementation of existing New Jersey statutory regulations before adfji-hion^i mandatory programs are adopted (e.g. , Stormwater Management Plans - 90% HT State funding; Municipal land Use Law, Chapter 291, 1975, 13C, 40:55-093).

This issue statement supports the content of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan with respect to the implementation of existing regulations concerning Stormwater Management policies. The funding in regulation and government initiatives is addressed in Camden County issue #1-

BESDUF: 2fe PDC and XltC agree that the inplementation of policy provisions of the PSERP will be addressed by the Executive and Legislative branches of government. Ohe County's concern regarding the funding of Stormwater Management planning will be included in the list of concerns that will be forwarded to the State Administration, Legislature, counties, municipalities and public concurrently with the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #14: A Coordinated Effort is Needed for Tax Reform and Equalization Programs to Replace local the Eatables Chase

IBSKE: The current practice of reacting to development application pressures must be replaced with better land use planning.

KEKEffs The PDC and **IXC** agree that tax inequities resulting in *ffiriifri|v*i-it:-ig>q chasing ratables undermines coordinated planning. The current administration has modi fled tax practices, which should minimize these inequities. The tax reform issue will be included in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipal itifts, legislature. State Administration and ^11 other parties.

4. Negotiable Item #15: KlertPd Officials Should Have a Larger Role in Flan Oversight

Xf ISSQB: The County believes that the -FI'T^I SCRP decisions will be mate by the State Planning Conmission. The New Jersey State Legislature and local government officials should have oversight and stronger decision making authority in this process. Municipalities emphasize the importance of continued local responsibility for land use planning and zoning.

RESCEifc One FIX: and U4C agree that after the Final Plan is adopted, elected officials should consider its policies and strategies while undergoing their own decision making processes. The implementation of the Plan will rely heavily upon the decisions of elected officials including imminipai and State officers. The parties also agree that Camden County' s concern regarding oversight and the role and responsibility of elected officials will be included in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the State Atnistrat.1 nn, legislature, counties, T"ni^{ffi}ipql i"Heg and the public.

5. Negotiable Item #17: The Need to Review and Revise the State Plan Every Three (3) Years

AT ISSDE: Lindenwold disagreed with the three year review and revision cycle for the State Plan, stating it created cumbersome and unnecessary paperwork for smaller

Camden County noted that the time frame for revisions of the SDKP (currently three years) and the municipal master plan, as governed by the Municipal land Use law (currently 6 years) should be eventually standardized to be completed in conjunct Inn with one another. This will cut down on cumbersome and unnecessary paperwork for all municipalities.

HBSoff: The PDC and UC agree that the three year revision cycle for the State Plan is manHa-t-pH ty the State Planning Act. The concern regarding the burden this cycle places on municipalities will be incorporated in a list of concerns that will accompany the cUstribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, "ini ^ p^l j .*" **? , Legislature, State Administration and other interested, parties.

6. Negotiable Item #20: Policy 4.9, Tier 3, Housing Development: Housing Linkages

AT ISSDBs This policy states that there should be a balance of land uses within a municipality and that non-residential uses should be directly linked to the availability of housing. Tfris also assumes that there is a precise and proportions X ~~correlation~~ between the availability of jobs and the location of residences. The policy ignores the possibility that urban or suburban areas may have regional employment centers.

The PDC and UC agree that the County and mTniri]TfllitipR have a concern about Policy 4.9 (Volume II,

page 64) becoming mandatory. The County and municipalities also believe regional instruments are needed to carry out the intent of -HIJH policy. Tills issue will be listprl in the Commission's list of agreements, disagreements and concerns that accompanies the Interim Flan.

7. Negotiable Item #28: Goal of the Plan

Kf ISSOB: Camden County believes that a broad consensus should be achieved that balances all key components of the Flan.

KISOBF: The FDC and INC agree that the Final Flan should reflect a broad consensus including legitimate planning, environmental, fiscal and economic considerations, while achieving a reasonable balance among them. Camden County's position regarding achieving a consensus on a reasonable balance will be included in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Flan to the Counties, ngminipai it^^g Legislature, State Administration and other interested parties.

vi: HUGH

1. Negotiable Item #1: Home Rule

Kf XSSDBs The maintenance of munlcipq'! jurisdiction over land use decisions is important to municipal itles. The County believes that the State Flan will rights to regulate their land uses. The Guidelines suggested in the State Flan should not be mandatory as they do not consider the unique character of each community.

For example, the County believes the State Flan forces redevelopment with increased density into Tier 1 without a statement of limits. (This was also tie concern expressed in Issue #17, which was merged with this issue at the FDC/UC meeting). The County would lite to see the following statement in the Interim Flan: "No increase in density could be irrposed -upon any municipality if it is in conflict with its current zoning, land use laws and master plans. "

BE5HX: The FDC and IMC agree that the issue of "Home Rule" will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements. Bie FDC and I24C also agree that Issue #17, which resulted in a disagreement between the

OSP and UJC would be combined with this issue and resolved similarly (i.e., concern).

2. Negotiable Item #4s Tax Reform

35SCE: The tax structure should be changed to reduce the reliance on the property tax. The State should review the strategies found in the SLERP Report and/ with some modifications, adopt them.

BESOHF: The PDC and IWC agree that the issue of "tax reform"¹¹ will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

3. Negotiable Item #8: Update of State Plan

AT ISSLK: .The State Planning Act requires an update of the State Plan every three years. The Municipal Land Use Law requires municipalities to update their master plans every six years. Changing the update of the State Plan to six years would make the processes consistent.

BESTCF: The PDC and INC agree that the suggestion to change the timeframe for revising the State Plan will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

4. Negotiable Item #14: State Plan Coordination with Council on Affordable Housing (COAH)

Xff XSSDE: One County is concerned that COAH's goals and objectives are not consistent with the State Plan goals related to preserving the character of fully-developed communities.

RESOUT: One PDC and INC agree that the issue of COAH coordination with the State Plan will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

5. Negotiable Item #23: Transportation/Aviation – Excessive Airplane Noise

KF ISSUE: Airport noise impacts can be significant and can include impaired hearing, tension, and the reduction in the attractiveness and value of property. This is a concern for communities in the vicinity of Newark Airport.

The State Plan indicates that the New Jersey Department of Transportation, in cooperation with municipalities and airport operators, should study the aviation system, evaluating its needs in terms of safety and capacity* This should be pigymrlpfl to include the impacts from airport noise. The State should coordinate efforts with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to modify arrival and departure routes to minimize noise impacts.

RESQHP: The FDC and IXC agree that the issue of excessive airplane noise in the vicinity of airports will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

TOOK Yhs GCXBH

1. Negotiable Item #2: Further Erosion of Home Rule

AT JKOJf: There is concern that the SDRP represents a widespread usurption of traditional municipal planning responsibilities. The SPC is seen as a new level of bureaucracy.

¹: The PDC and IMC agree to include the County's concern over any potential adverse effects of implementation on home rule in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements. This list will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #3: Timing and Phasing of Growth; The Need to Attract Ratables

AT XSSKS Municipalities are concerned about the need to include extensive land areas in growth tiers, because of the belief that the tier designations will never be revised. They want the SERF to ensure that they will be able to continue to add to their ratable base, in a manner consistent with municipal plans and community character.

BBSCEff: The FDC and UC agree that, while there is a legislative mandate that the SERF be reviewed and revised every three years, the County's concern that these periodic revisions may not occur, will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan. The County Negotiating Committee would like to

discuss a formal amendment procedure with the FDC for addressing issues that arise within the three year revision cycle of the State Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #4: The SERF is Perceived as a Statewide Zoning Device

AT ISSCE: Municipalities expressed concern that the SCKP would be used as a statewide zoning map.

KESOUT: The PDC and IWC agree to include the misperception about the use of the SCRP as a zoning device in a listing of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #12: Provision of Affordable Housing on islands

JKP ISSEEHE: Pacific Island communities question the reasonableness of requiring them to provide affordable housing beyond their indigenous need. Affordable housing policies should take into account that most barrier island communities are resorts.

KtfiWF: The PDC and UC agree that the provision of affordable housing on islands beyond their indigenous need will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements. This list will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties/ municipalities/ Legislature/ Administration and all other interested parties for review.

DOCDE VHI:

1. Negotiable Item #A27b: Statewide Water Supply Sources Strategy 1 – Protection of Water Supply Sources

JET ISSUE: The County expressed a concern that although there are methods for identifying aquifer recharge areas, such as fracture trace analyses/ the reliability of these methods are unknown. The County seeks clarification from the State of the reliability of these methods before utilizing them.

BE502F: The PDC and UC agree that the reliability of fracture trace analysis should be clarified.

IX: CTu • jwnflt UJUKDC

No issues were resolved as concerns In Gloucester County.

X: SUCH UUUMH

1. Negotiable Item #3: Erosion of Hone Rule

AT ISSUE: The County is concerned that the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) may increase the State's authority' over the local planning process. A clearer explanation of how the Plan would be implemented and to what extent it would impact the zoning powers of mmlnlplnllt1PB is necessary.

RESORT: She PDC and IXC. agree that the SERF'S effect on the practice of hone rule will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the Counties/ Municipalities, Legislature, State Administration and all other interested prticipfl for review.

VQUK XE: lottinti UUFHC

1. Negotiable Item 3G-3: Hane Rule

JET ISSEEs The County reccmnded that the State should provide •technical assistance and act as a funding source, not as a regulator of local planning. The strategies and policies should reflect this ryworp (See proposed language in -Monmouth County report).

IffisDUP: Ote FCC and I3C agree that tte issue of home rule will be lisl-pd as a concern in the Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will be released simultaneously with the Interim SERF. Specific language changes to the PSCRП recommended by Monmouth County will be reviewed by the OSP and reccmnqndati *?nq wj.ll be made to the PDC for their consideration for inclusion into the Interim Plan. Consistency among all strategies and policies and the accepted reconmerdations will be mainrainpfl throughout the SDRP.

TCUHB ZEE: MXRIS (11KIK

1. Negotiable Item fP13a: Intergovernmental Coordination

KS ISSDB: The County believes that regional coordination should be achieved through consensus without reducing local discretion and authority.- Does statewide and regional growth management conflict with local discretion and authority?

RESO3¹: The PDC and IBC agree that municipalities should identify to the county and the SPC and, where appropriate, recommend alternatives for specific policies that are interpreted to conflict with home rule, which will be considered for clarification in the SERF.

XIII; HMI.TMJHU

1. Negotiable Item #2: Erosion of Home Rule

JJT XSSCE: A clearer explanation of how the Plan would be implemented and the extent of its impacts on the zoning powers of municipalities is needed.

RESORT: The PDC and UC agree that the SDKP's effect on home rule will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, Legislature, State Administration and all other interested parties for review.

2. Negotiable Item #4: Tax Reform

AT ISSUE: The County has noted that the ratables chase undermines coordinated land use planning. Without a comprehensive tax reform and equalization program, municipalities will continue to compete for local ratables, frustrating all efforts to establish a coordinated, regional land use planning process.

RBSOLT: The PDC and INC agree that tax inequities that result in municipalities chasing ratables undermines coordinated planning. The current Administration has modified tax practices that should minimize these inequities. Ofte tax reform issue will be included in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties , municipalities , Legislature, State Administration and all other parties.

3. Negotiable Item #7: CQAH and the State Plan

J2P JSSQB: Pemberton Township, an Tfrhan Aid municipality exempt from prospective need, has stated that fixture inclusionary obligations should not be incurred.

PESOUPS The PDC and UC agree that possible future affordable housing allocations from CQftH are a concern in Pembertori Township. This concern will be included in a list of concerns that will be forwarded to the State Administration, Legislature, counties, municipalities and public, along with the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #15: Cross-Acceptance Procedures

AT ISSDB: Several process-related comments and questions have arisen through the comparison phase of cross-acceptance, and are noted below:

Municipal lti**s felt they were not given sufficient time to review the Plan; considering "the massive size of the three volumes which make up the Plan, and the considerable number of major policy issues, objectives and strategies covered in the Plan."

The County raised adrlitinnal process related concerns, including; 1) Cross-acceptance checklist was too detailed, confusing and slowed down the review process; 2) there is not a mechanism in the checklist process for establishing priorities. Simple majority of agreement/disagreement does not yield definable direction for policy or planning; and 3) there does not appear to be sufficient opportunity for public input in the negotiation and issue resolution phase of cross-acceptance.

BESOHF: The PDC and UC agree that many of these concerns are being addressed by the State planning process. The State Planning Rule <<fa<t-lflaft piKi in pqr*~i^^pat-inn and flexibility regarding the requirements for timely submissions of reports. These Garments will be incorporated into the list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribut.3 on of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities Legislature, State Aftni nl strati on and all other interested parties for review.

5. Negotiable Item #16: Planning

XSSTC: The County stressed that uniform controls regulating site plans and housing subdivisions should not be made mandatory by the Plan.

KESOEff: The PDC and IMC agree that any design or performance guidelines offered specifically by the SPC in the Plan or its supporting documents are recommendations for the purpose of technical assistance. The County's concern regarding uniform controls will be included in a list of concerns that will be forwarded to the State Administration/ Legislature, counties, municipalities, and the public.

6. Negotiable Item #26: Air and Water Pollution Standards

KF ISSUE: The County believes that the NJ Department of Environmental Protection should be required to rectify, by court action if necessary, the interstate impacts of air and water pollution where the quality is below NJ State standards.

UfiUJT: The PDC and LNC agree that there are environmental systems that require interstate coordination and management. This concern will be included in a list of concerns as part of the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the State Administration, legislature, Counties, Municipalities, and all other interested parties for review.

7. Negotiable Item #27: Adherence to Tier Delineations

JET ISSUE: NSW Hanover and Springfield townships stated that enforcement of a particular tier designation on a particular site may be undesirable where existing and/or pending development on the site is inconsistent with tier designation. Municipal development plans could be hampered if strict adherence to the tier designation is mandatory whether they be public sewer service areas, private sewer service areas or community septic systems serving a limited development. Any restrictions to be imposed on individual properties inconsistent with the tier in which they live raises serious concerns at the municipal level.

They are also concerned about and object to the State imposing density and lot size standards that are inconsistent with those which are in effect in the municipality.

RESCUE: The PDC and I2C agree that the misperception of the use of the SERP as a zoning device will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the Counties, Municipalities, legislature, State Administration and all other interested parties for review.

DGUE Xws "PagSftir UUUX

1. Negotiable Item *2A: less of Potential Tax Ratables

ISSffi: The effects of government actions on property values is a municipal concern in Passaic County. Some municipalities feel that there are proposals in the State Plan which could result in the lowering of the development potential of tracts of land. Tfrmlripalltlfir will probably resist attempts to place lands in low-growth tiers if they feel such areas have the potential for producing ratables. The municipal view is that these actions will lead to a loss of potential ratables without compensation. Property tax reform offers a potential solution to their problem.

BBSDUF: The PDC and IflC agree that the issue of property tax reform will be "list-fid as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and DJg^gi^gnientg to be released concurrently with the Interim Plan.

xvr: care May CIKQE

1. Negotiable Item #5: Policy Consensus

XT ISUf: The County believes that Plan policies should not be adopted and/or implemented unilaterally until a consensus has been reached. For this purpose, the SPC should develop and adopt as part of the SERF, a specific set of procedures for achieving this consensus and for the negotiation of disputed points.

HESDUfs The PDC and UC agree that the cross-acceptance process is a cooperative effort intended to give counties and municipalities an active role in shaping the SERF. The Final Plan should reflect a broad consensus on many, but not all/ of the difficult issues that face the State today. Die parties also agree to include the County's concern in a list of CGEncerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #14: Riparian Grants

AT XSSOE: Be County believes the riparian grant process should be reassessed with appropriate legislative recommendations in order to reduce the cost of grant acquisition to property owners, for whom claims were retroactively assessed by the Art.

RESULT: The PDC and INC agree that the County's concern regarding the riparian grant process and the costs of acquiring clear title to riparian lands will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

3. Negotiable Item #13B: Funding for Beach Restoration and Protection

AT XSSOE: The County believes the Shore Protection Master Plan should be updated.

RESULT: The PDC and INC agree that the County's desire to have the Shore Protection Master Plan updated will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

4. Negotiable Item #20: CAERA 25-unit Threshold

AT ISSDB: Existing CMKA regulations do not call for the review of residential developments of 24 units or less. As a result, the coastal area has been deluged with development applications for projects of 24 units that escape CMRA review and regulations. The County has stressed the need for a lower review threshold than the current 25 unit limit.

RESULT: The PDC and INC agree that the County's concern over the CAERA 25 unit threshold will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

5. Negotiable Item #21: CftIRA Agricultural land Mitigation Regulations

AT ISSDB: The County feels that the policy proposed by the Division of CPas***? Resources is unacceptable as a farmland

preservation policy. Ollis proposal would require mitigation within Tier 6 or Agricultural Development Areas, but not require mitigation, efforts in lands outside of these areas. Such a policy would not only be counter to SADC and County policy, but would have the effect of eliminating the farm preservation program in coastal counties. This policy would make agricultural mapping and designation undesirable to the point where no coastal counties would identify Tier 6, and eliminate ADA'S altogether.

BESDEFs The PDC and IDC agree that Cape May County's concern and objections to the Division of Coastal Resources CAFRA regulations regarding agricultural land mitigation will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan.

TOttK XVI: ^....JOJCT UUUMJ.1

No issues were resolved as concerns in Middlesex County.

VGUK XVH:

1. Negotiable Item f2A: Capital Facilities in Tier 1

KC ISSUE: The County believes that State facilities siting should be a revitalization tool for Tier 1 communities. The State must ensure that the total impacts of its facilities are evaluated as part of the siting process. Some State facilities generate impacts that can and should be mitigated. For example, some State facilities draw populations that are in need of services from the municipalities as well. Without some type of mitigation for social and economic impacts, some State facilities may actually cost Tier 1 communities more than the benefits derived from them. Also, municipalities must be part of the siting process from the earliest stages.

Jf1&UJF: The PDC and INC agree that changes to the P.I.L.O.T. formula, to include counties and school districts, will be listed as a concern in the Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements.

TOZHB XVJJJ.: SOESEK U1HTV

1. Negotiable Item #P-2B: Relationship of SERF to Out-of -State Plans

Kff ISSIE: The Sussex County transportation network is overburdened by commuter traffic and State funding for improvements has not been forthcoming. Should the relationship between the SERP and cut-of -State plans be defined?

HSBEffs The PDC and IMC agree the New Jersey Department of Transportation should improve Routes 15, 23 and 206 to meet needs generated by out-of -State development. This will be in the Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns that will be released in conjunction with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable Item #P-14A: Intergovernmental Coordination

AT ISSTC: The County notes that municipalities should maintain their own authority in implementing the SDRP. How should implementation of the SERP relate to local discretion and authority?

RESOUT: The PDC and INC agree that municipalities should identify to the County and the SPC and, where appropriate, recommend alternatives for, specific policies that conflict with home rule, which will be considered for clarification in the Interim SERP.

MTTWK TTT-

1. Negotiable Item #11: Tax Reform

XT ISSDB: The tax situation in New Jersey should be changed so local governments do not have to rely on the property tax. Too often, municipalities must choose between a land use they do not want and a rateable that they need. This kind of dilemma is counter-productive to proper land use planning and goes to the heart of the planning problem in New Jersey. The Plan should address this issue in a clear, concise and bipartisan fashion, or many of the recommendations of the Plan will be rendered meaningless.

BESOC2F: The PDC and I2C agree that tax inequities undermine coordinated planning. The tax reform issue, as expressed by the County, will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, Legislature, Administration and all other interested parties for review.

2. Negotiable Item #16: State Agency Involvement in Cross-Acceptance Negot.1at.1nns

iff ISSCE: There needs to be a greater involvement of State agencies in shaping the Plan. State agencies must be more involved in cross-acceptance. From State agencies reaction to some of the strategies and policies under discussion is essential.

HE3UC: The PDC and INC agree that State department and agency input in the cross-acceptance process is essential and has, in fact, been mandated by the State Planning Act, as well as encouraged by practice. State agency participation in the State planning process, as expressed by the County, will be included in a list of concerns as part of an Interim Statement of Agreements and Disagreements that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, legislature. Administration and all other interested parties for review.

1. Negotiable Item #2B: Rural Infrastructure*

ISSCE: There is a concern that the PSERP's growth management strategies for rural areas will preclude State investment in rural transportation improvements, even where public health & safety is an issue. A number of routes, such as 31, 46, 57 and 94, serving interstate transportation needs, require immediate attention by the New Jersey Department of transportation (DOT). DOT must recognize rural needs for adequate infrastructure to support economic development and not focus solely on urban revitalization.

BESHXs The PDC and INC agree to include concerns about the need for DOT to improve routes 31, 46, 57 and 94 (in order to meet the needs generated by interstate commerce) will be incorporated into an Interim Statement, of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns. The listing will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the Legislature, the State Administration and other interested parties.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page under the "Disagreements" section of this Update for the resolution of 2A.

revision cycle creates cumbersome and unnecessary paperwork for smaller municipalities. The County would like specific information about the process for revision to the Plan map between the three-year amendment cycle.

RBSQttF: The PDC and UC agree that the concern regarding the burden this three-year cycle places on municipal itles will be incorporated in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the Legislature, State adiriinistration and other interested parties.

8. Negotiable Item #23B: Phillipsburg's Urban level Clas

ISSK: The County reports that Phillipsburg is really a freestanding/core center city, totally within northwestern New Jersey and should be listpd as an "Urban Center" municipality, such as places like long Branch and Asbury Park, which are similar to it in size.

RESORT: The PDC and UC agree to include the County's concern that Phillipsburg should be liRtfvi as an Urban Level I, and not a satellite of the Allentown-Bethlehem USA., in the list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim plan to the counties, i^mlGipaij'fr'i-gg, the Legislature, the State A^ninistration and other interested parties for review.

XXE: KSK (UHBE

1. Negotiable Item #1: Tax Reform

XT ISSUC: The County reports that tax ratables that are generated by development do not support the sustained public costs of infrastructure and services. Municipal itlfis can no longer depend heavily on ~~pixyatly~~ taxes to finance the debt for public services. The State should provide alternatives to the ~~property~~ tax as a means of financing needed public services.

KESffiT: Ohe PDC and UC agree that the issue of tax reform will be included in the Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns to be released with the Interim Plan.

2. Negotiable item #3: Bane Rule

Kf 1££U£: Essex Fells states that there are strategies and policies in the State Plan that are in conflict with the practice of home rule. These strategies and policies refer to: controlling sprawl, redevelopment, infill development, permit streamlining, mixed-use development and maximum utilization of existing and planned infrastructure. The Township believes these concepts should be classified as "disagreements" and should be addressed in the Interim Plan.

County echoed the municipality's concern, noting that the State planning effort could ultimately undermine "home rule." The best effort in planning is provided at the local level. The State should address the roles and options of each level of government in relation to the State Plan.

BESKUFs The PDC and UC agree that the issue of "home rule" will be included in the Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns to be released with the Interim Plan.

TOIKE I: i*M3 GQCKET

There were no disagreements on Issues in Bergen County. H:

There were no disagreements on Issues in Mercer County.

TOOK TTTs

1. Negotiable Item #27: Funding for Planning - "Urban County" Priority

XTISSCEs Ti*** 1 nmjrpaij-t-iest and "urban counties" should receive priority for enhanced planning capability. "Urban counties" are ftflnpsd as those counties in which a majority of their ir>^n-i n]pai ij-i*aa are designated as Ti^1 municipalities.

BBSOUP: The PDC feels that planning capability should be enhanced statewide with no priorities afforded due to a location's urban, suburban or rural location.

2. Negotiable Item #1 - Urban Policy Area /Changing Existing Tier System

2. Negotiable Item #36: Agricultural and Environmental Protection

JET ISSK: Tlce County suggests that priorities should be set with respect to natural resource protection.

KESO2F: She PDC and I2C agree that the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (CEP) should consider the creation of pr*T*+•-•*«« for endangered species and natural resource protection. This will be included in an Interim listing of agreements, disagreements and concerns, which will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the Legislature, the State and other interested parties.

3. Negotiable Item #13B: Rural COM! Allocations

KF ISSCE: The County reports a perception, that communities that have developed affordable housing plans must be in "growth" tiers, especially where the proposed developments are at densities that require extensions of sewer and water facilities. A supply of affordable housing is essential for economic development in Warren County.

BESDHF: The Warren County INC recommends that CQfiH should postpone its 1993 allocations pending adoption of the final SERF and -that allocations should relate to carrying capacity/ should be considered by CQftH. This concern will be incorporated in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the legislature, the State Administration and other interested parties.

4. Negotiable Item #19B: Open Space Preservation,

ISSOSs Die County reports that communities that actively save open space feel penalized by the smaller tax base that results when property is removed from the tax rolls, There should be a mechanism to compensate municipalities for lost tax revenues.

RESORT: Bie PDC and INC agree that the County's concern about funding or tax relief mechanisms should be included in the Interim Statement of Agreements, Disagreements and Concerns. Specifically, the County feels that these measures should be established for municipalities preserving open space for statewide use and benefit, when such preservation creates an infrastructure or service turden on the

municipality. This list of concerns will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities/ the Legislature, the State administration and other interested parties.

5. Negotiable Item #20: Tax Reform

AT ISSCE: The County feels that the tax situation in New Jersey should be changed so local governments do not have to rely entirely on the property tax. Too often municipalities must choose between a land use that they do not want and a rateable that they need. This kind of dilemma does not promote proper land use planning and goes to the heart of the planning problem in New Jersey. Without recommendations resulting from the Plan to address this issue in a clear, concise and bi-partisan fashion, many of the recommendations of the Plan will be rendered meaningless.

HKtiUUP: .The PDC and UC agree that the inequity resulting in chasing rates not only undermines but actively works against sound and coordinated planning. tax reform issue will be included in the list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the Legislature, the State Administration and other interested parties for review.

6. Negotiable Item #21: State Planning Commission Representation

IBSKs The County believes that the northwest region of the State is not represented on the SPC. The urban areas are sufficiently represented but the rural areas have no one and, the County feels, this is reflected in the bias of the SPC. The northwest should, participate in the development of policies that will ultimately affect them.

KESOf: The PDC and IMC agree to include the lack of a representative on the SPC from the northwest in a list of concerns that will accompany the distribution of the Interim Plan to the counties, municipalities, the legislature, the State Administration and other interested parties.

7. Negotiable Item #22A: Reexamination of the State Plan

J3F ISSKs The County suggests that in order to be consistent with the Municipal Land Use law, the SERF should be re-examined at least every 6 years. The three-year review and

JKP I5SDB: The County feels that any restructuring of the tier system at this stage in the planning process the stated planning goals/ strategies and policies in the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment plan, and significantly undermines the cross-acceptance process. If this takes place, the entire process of cross-acceptance should start over.

In responding to the Preliminary Plan, the County expressed general satisfaction with the tier designation as it relates to Hudson County. Any changes to the system will have to include assurances the the priority's presently afforded to Hudson County, with the exception of issues that have been disrupted during the comparison and negotiation phases, would remain intact and the the County, as a whole, would be treated uniformly.

KB50RF: The PDC notes the LNC's concern about changes with respect to Tier 1. Given the nature of Hudson County, this issue is of obvious and significant concern to the County. The PDC and IDC agree that before any changes are made in this regard, the County will be afforded an opportunity for meaningful participation in the analysis of options/ and the PDC will make an effort to take Hudson County's concerns into account.

yp State Plan. Deepcense:

Public investment priorities are no longer tied to any one "tier/" or what are now known as "Planning Areas." Generally, the Plan's public investment policies give priority for projects and programs in distressed urban communities while providing opportunities for non-distressed communities to meet their needs as well. State agencies are encouraged to consider many different factors when determining the allocation of discretionary funds, so that those communities actively working to implement the State Plan can be given appropriate assistance toward achieving those goals. Highest priority will continue for public health and safety/ and for infrastructure maintenance and repair/ regardless of location.

Although the public investment priority system has been revised/ there remains ample opportunity for Hudson County to retain the high priority treatment suggested in the Preliminary Plan. This can be achieved if the county takes advantage of the following priority indicators:

(1) Planning Area 1 - PA 1 remains "a principal priority of State, regional and local programs." The entire county is as FA 1;

(2) Centers - In addition to the designated urban center (Jersey City), identify appropriate regional Centers and towns;

(3) Distress - Hudson County retains the same number of distressed municipalities as listed in the Preliminary Plan;

(4) Critical Environmental Sites - Identify sites where appropriate;

- Establish a county-wide complex;

Plans—

Encourage municipalities to undertake these planning efforts if they haven't already done so;

(7) ~~*5agpjtfnl^ jrf LJfr*fl y^ BengFft;~~ — Hudson County's density should, in most cases, place the county at or near the top of this list; and

(8) ~~XeBeeage Prvate C?*pitt*!~~ — Public/private partnerships should be an integral part of the county's economic Development efforts.

MfiUff: The UC disagrees with the PDC position that there remains ample opportunity in the Interim Plan for Hudson County municipalities to retain the high priority treatment suggested in the Preliminary Plan.

VQUME IV: 3CTTJUMW

There were no disagreements on issues in Atlantic County.

TCUK Vs norta*

There were no disagreements on issues in ramrfpn County.

vane vi: uHiai amr

There were no disagreements on issues in Union County.

VX2HK YTEs GBBH CtHTY

There were no disagreements on issues in Ocean County.

VOICE YJJJ.s

There were no disagreements on issues in Hunterdon County.

TOUR IX: GTfUTf?nflt UJUKCX

1. Negotiable Item #5A - Tier 6 and Landowner Equity

AT ISSOE: The County is concerned about the loss of land value HIM to Tier 6 d^i fn^«*-1." and restrictions placed on development. There will be no Tier 6 in Gloucester County without a clearly dRflwd. program of farm! and compensation.

KESQKP: The PDC and UC agree to defer the issue until statewide strategies and policies for agriculture are developed for their consideration to the IMC.

State Plan

The Tier System has been abandoned in favor of a Resource Planning and Management Structure that contains Planning Areas and Centers. The Rural Planning Area, containing agriou] tan-al lands, has delineation criteria that incorporate County Agricultural Board input (See page 110). The idept'if irafJ⁰" of rural ^rfias is necessary for the application of policy supportive of the agricultural industry. The Interim Plan strategy and policies focus on the long term viability of agriculture in the defined Rural Planning Area.

Additionally, a Statewide Agriculture Policy has been added for the Interim Plan to respond to the concerns expressed by-Gloucester County in the cross-acceptance process. The agricultural policy addresses agriculture as an industry and contains elements covering innovative land use tools, timing and sequencing and transfer of development rights to accommodate growth in Centers within the Rural Planning Area.

Lastly, the Infrastructure Investment Statewide Policy targets agricultural lands in the Rural Planning Area for agricultural preservation programs.

BESOUP: The I24C disagrees with the PDC that the Interim Plan adequately addresses the County's concern.

VGCOK X: SBIH! COUCH

1. Negotiable Item #2: Tier 6B, 7/Environmentally Sensitive Areas – Rejection of Natural Resource Policies and the County's Inability to Accept Environmentally Sensitive Area Designating

AT ISSCE: The policies regarding Tier 6B & 7 are perceived to be regulatory in nature and municipalities are unsure of what they might mean; how the designation might effect a municipality's ability to develop and its home rule powers. Moreover, the area delineated is too large (the entire Maurice River watershed) . The impact of a Tier 6B & 7 designation landowners should be clarified. The OSP pointed out that the identification of Tier 6B & 7 is to protect the natural resources of the County and State. The responsibility to protect these areas should be shared by all levels of government.

HESQUP: The PDC and I2C could not resolve this issue to the satisfaction of both parties.

2. Negotiable Item #5A – Tier 6 and Landowner Equity

JKT 35SDB: The County has not designated agricultural areas for several reasons. The County feels that the Plan is perceived to be regulatory, and will restrict land to agricultural use only (confusion with zoning) ; banks will be influenced by the Tier 6 designation when considering the farmers ' collateral, and their ability to borrow money may be hindered* . Farmers were unwilling to commit land to the agricultural designation because they did not wish to restrict land use (leave the decision to the landowner whether to sell or continue farming) ; farmers are in debt and need to the ability to sell land to remain solvent and continue in agriculture; fear of loss of State capital funding; and, several municipalities consider Tier 5 a more desirable designation for the area in question.

the PDC and I2C agree that the State Planning Commission has recognized the concerns expressed by the Salem County agricultural community. The PDC has directed staff to consider the development of a set of Statewide Strategies and Policies for agricultural development. The intent of creating such strategies is to be responsive to these concerns and concerns by strengthening agricultural viability through the establishment of statewide policies. The emerging strategies and policies will focus on the long-term viability of agriculture in the defined regions. These policies will be available for review by the IWC and

agriculture community prior to the release of the Interim Plan.

» **Stflts KLBD.**

Tier System has been abandoned in favor of a Resource Planning and Management Structure that contains Planning Areas and Centers. The Rural Planning Area, containing flgr-imrit-in-fti lands, has rig*i inftaf.jm criteria that have been designed to incorporate County Agricultural Board input (See page 110) . The identification of rural areas is necessary for the application of policy supportive of the agricultural industry. The Interim Plan strategy and policies focus on the long term viability of agrij^ulture in the defined Rural Planning Area.

ackJ 1 t-rjnnal ly r a Statewide Agriculture Policy has been for the Interim Plan to respond to the concerns expressed by Salem County in the cross-acceptance process. The agricultural policy addresses ftfpHrmitni-na as an industry and contains elements covering innovative land use tools, timing and sequencing and transfer of development rights to accommodate growth in Centers within the Rural Planning Area.

the Infrastructure Investment Statewide Policy targets agricultural lanrte in the Rural Planning Area for agricultural preservation programs.

RE50UFX The UC disagrees with the PDC that the Interim Plan adequately addresses the agricultural equity issue.

XT: >>>*!•« uaurr

1. Negotiable Item \$4-2: Suburban Corridor — 3%e Definition of Center

XfISSUfs The County recommended that the definition of corridor center should be eatpanfted to include Jtanmouth County's "Suburban Corridor" definition: An economic development area which would contain mixed-uses, excluding housing, and would have a maximum F.A.R. of 0.4.

KtfiWFs The *FCC* and UC disagree with the Monmouth County recommendation to expand the corrector center defigrfcinn to include suburban corridors.

TOOK XH: MHOS GUUKH

1. Negotiable Item #P19(1) - Rural Land Equity

AT ISSUE: The County feels that growth management practices that adversely affect land values should be minimized. More comprehensive solutions should be provided to prevent disproportionate windfalls and wipeouts in the value of undeveloped land.

REIQUF: The PDC and UC agree to defer resolution of this issue since the PDC is drafting new agricultural policies pursuant to SEC Resolution #90-006 dated May 25, 1990.

m State Plan. Response:

One New Jersey Department Of Agriculture's Agricultural Policy Statement expressed concern over this issue and offered recommendations for equity protection. These equity options included, the following: continuation, and expansion of the farmland preservation program; creative funding options; and creative land use options. The State Planning Commission incorporated these suggestions in the Interim State Plan and the interim Implementation Report.

The Interim State Plan's Statewide Agricultural Policy incorporated the creative land planning recommendations proposed by the Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Policy 7 recommends creative land use tools, such as clustering, as a means of maintaining the viability of agriculture and protecting equity.

The Interim Implementation Report recommends enacting legislation to provide for a stable source of funding for the continued purchase of development rights. The Report also incorporated the Agricultural Policy Statement's recommendation that legislation enabling counties and 1-ties to undertake tax-exempt installment purchases of farmland be enacted. One Report also recommends the enactment of a statewide Transfer of Development Rights program.

The PDC emphasized that the Interim State Plan is a public investment strategy document for State government. The Interim Implementation Report contains recommendations to enhance the Plan's effectiveness. One Plan does not dictate zoning to local government, zoning and land use powers will remain a local responsibility. The interim State Plan and the Interim Implementation Report suggest tools for better planning and equity protection. It will be incumbent upon

citizens to ensure these and other legislative and administrative initiatives are undertaken to guarantee equity for all New Jerseyans.

The Morris County IMC disagrees with the Plan Development Ccnmittee that the Interim Plan and the Interim Implementation Report adequately address rural land concerns.

X&U: HKTilHTItU UUCEX

There were no disagreements on issues in Burlington County.

TTVs

1. Negotiable Item #7: Tier 7 - Critprla Appl inability in Developed Areas

AT IS5CE: Many municipalities in Passaic County feel the pressure to add ratables to their tax base, causing conflicts in sane communities having lands which could be designated as environmentally sensitive. For example, there is an area in the Borough of Ringwood that is zoned for, and partially developed with, industrial uses. Ohe County believes Ringwood hap established proper planning guidelines and controls. This area presently contains a Tier 7 designation, but, due to its level of development, should be designated as Tier 5 instead. In order to avoid other such inconsistencies, the OSP should review the criteria for Tiers 5 and 7 as they pertain to areas where development patterns have already been established.

The OSP explained that Tier 7 may also include areas that are already developed. Ifthere may be cases where "micro-tiers" (less than one square mile in size) would be created if developed areas were "pulled out" of Tier 7 and placed into another tier.

RESOUfe The OSP and PDC disagree with the proposed tier change since the PSERP allows existing development to be accommodated within Tier 7. The PDC had suggested that the area in question be designated a "village." The I/C and the municipality were not receptive to this reccmmendation. Therefore, the result remains a disagreement.

TOOK 27: CKPE BUT GOCHnr

There were no disagreements on issues in r^p^ Hay County.

TOOK XVI: HIJMSKX. CI1HH

There were no disagreements on issues in Middlesex County.

TCUK XVH: anmaxw COOSOS

There were no disagreements on issues in Somerset County.

MXIK XVULLs SU3SK&UUUKEX

1. Negotiable Item #P-11C: State Agency Coordination

AT XS9E: The County feels that municipalities should have control over State agency implementation.

BESOKFs Disagreement — The IIC believes that State agency permits should be granted without regard to tier or policy area designation. The PDC did not agree with this aspect of the resolution.

TCUHBXIX: GOEHCUH) OJUKI3

There were no disagreements on issues in Cumberland County.

DQUHB XX: WRREH OCXKE7

1. Negotiable Item #1A: Bane Rule

JKF ISSDE: Bte Plan, and particularly the standards recommended in the Plan, are perceived by sane municipal Itles to be regulatory in nature and to usurp municipal land use authority. How should implementation of the SERF relate to local discretion and authority?

MfiWFs The PDC and I2C could not come to agreement on a resolution to -fchig issue. de PDC explained that the Tntpn'm Plan will include language to explain its relationship to the Municipal land Use Law, the Fair Housing Act, the Council on affrnriaKift Bousing and other appropriate statutes and State agencies. This was not acceptable to Warren County.

2. Negotiable Item #2A: Rural Infrastructure

AT I3SCK: There is a concern that the PSEKP's growth management strategies for rural areas will preclude State investment in rural transportation improvements, even where public health & safety is an issue.

The PDC and INC could not come to agreement on a resolution to this issue. The PDC noted that policies in the State Plan would emphasize that funding should be available to preserve communities of place and for public health and safety needs, throughout the State.

3. Negotiable Item #3B - Agricultural and Environmental Protection

KS ISSUE: The County supported the consolidation of the Preliminary Plan's Tiers 5,6 and 7. It has stated that, in terms of the Interim Plan, a separate planning area designation for environmentally sensitive areas is unnecessary because existing local constraint ordinances and State wetland regulations provide adequate protection for most of these areas. To the extent there are other areas that are sufficiently important to require preservation, the County feels that these areas should be purchased through a State-funded program. With respect to Planning Area 3 (formerly Tier 5), the County believes that farmland preservation programs and efforts should be focused, and money should be available, wherever large blocks of prime farmland exist, and are consistent with the determinations of the county agricultural development board.

KESQttfe Ohe PDC and IN? agree to defer resolution of this issue since the PDC is re-examining the tier system and is considering the consolidation of some of the tiers into a rural policy area, pursuant to SPC Resolution #90-006.

Interim state Plan.

The Interim Plan replaced the Tier System with the Resource Planning and Management Structure. This Structure is comprised of Planning Areas and Centers. Planning Areas are large masses of land that share certain characteristics. These characteristics suggest that growth must be guided to certain locations and in certain patterns within the planning area to take advantage of or protect the characteristics of the planning area.

Fringe Planning Areas (PA 3) are at the edges of areas. The Rural Planning Area (PA 4) describes areas without major growth supporting infrastructure where the primary economic activity may be natural resource industries, such as mining and agriculture. Planning Area 5, the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area, contains land areas with valued ecosystems and wildlife habitats. Tlnds contained in these three Planning

Areas are quite distinct from one another, which would be obscured if combined in a single tier or planning area.

The Interim Plan also includes Statewide Policies on Public Investments/ which recognize the different land attributes and needs of the Planning Areas. Investment policy decisions would be difficult to make if these attributes and needs were obscured by grouping them together in a single tier or planning area.

The Centers concept accommodates growth and economic development in all Planning Areas. Growth should be attracted and accommodated in Centers rather than allowing growth to sprawl randomly across the landscape, and counties are responsible for identifying existing Centers and planning for new Centers to accommodate the anticipated amount of growth in their region.

KESOHP: The IWC disagrees with the PDC that the Interim Plan adequately addresses the concerns underlying the desire to consolidate Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5.

4. Negotiable Item #6B - Rural land Equity

Kf ISSEE: The County and some of its landowners fear the State Plan will deprive them of land equity. The Plan should acknowledge there is a cost to agricultural preservation. Statewide TIB and a stable source of funding for farmland preservation should be established before the Plan is implemented.

RESTCT: The PDC and TJC agree to defer the suggestion to consolidate Tiers 5, 6 and 7 to avoid equity loss due to rural "tier del Inflations, pursuant to the SPG Resolution #90-006 of May **25**, 1990.

*Please Note: This issue was discussed and resolved in two parts. Please refer to page 12 under the "Implementation" section of this Update for the resolution of 6A.

- **State plan Response:**

The New Jersey Department Of Agriculture's Agricultural
•pnliry {-statement expressed concern over this issue and offered reconrnendations for equity protection. These equity protection options included: conf.lnnntlnn and expansion of the Farmland Preservation Program; creative funding options; and creative land use options. The State Planning Commission incorporated these suggestions in the

Interim State Plan and its accompanying report on Interim Implementation issues.

The Interim State Plan's Statewide Agricultural Policy incorporated the creative land planning recommendations proposed by the Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Policy 7 recommends -creative land use tools, such as clustering, as a means of maintaining the viability of agriculture and protecting equity.

The Interim Implementation Report recommends enacting legislation to provide for a stable source of funding for the continued purchase of development rights. The Report also incorporated the Agricultural Policy Statement's recommendation that legislation enabling counties and to undertake tax-exempt installment purchases of farmland be enacted. The Report also recommends the enactment of a statewide Transfer of Rights program.

The PDC emphasized that the Interim State Plan is a public Investment strategy document for State government. The Interim Implementation Report contains recommendations to enhance the Plan's effectiveness. The Plan does not dictate zoning to local government, zoning and land use powers will remain a local responsibility. The Interim Plan and the Implementation Report suggest tools for better planning and equity protection. It will be incumbent upon citizens to ensure these and other legislative and administrative initiatives are undertaken to guarantee equity for all New Jerseyans.

The IMC disagrees with the PDC that the Interim Plan and the Interim Implementation Report adequately address rural land equity concerns.

TOOK XXI: ESSEX COUNTY

There were no disagreements on issues in Essex County.

FLIPPING ISSUES

X. Jarring

During the negotiation process many counties and municipalities misapplied the -Interim Plan criteria because of the following:

- 1) misunderstanding of the Interim Plan's criteria, which has required clarification by the Commission of the description/ intent and/or

criteria of Planning Areas, Centers and Critical Environmental Sites in the Amended Interim Plan;

2) lack of documentation provided to justify the counties' and municipalities' application of the criteria; or,

3) a lack of time to make the changes after PDC/UC negotiation sessions .

The following is a list, of the remaining mapping application issues identified and discussed with counties and municipalities:

Warren County

The County mapped developed areas of the County that are sewered as PA 2. The majority of these were not adjacent to PA 1. Phillipsburg was identified as an Urban Center. Phillipsburg meets the criteria for a Regional Center. The County mapped large areas as Planning Area 3 that did not adjoin PA 2 and which also met the criteria for PA 4 or PA 5.

Passaic County

The County mapped areas as Planning Area 3 that did not adjoin Planning Area 2 and which also meet the criteria of Planning Area 5. The County misinterpreted the application of Planning Area 3 because the Interim Plan did not clearly emphasize the importance of the Planning Area abutting Planning Area 2. The County was also not aware of documentation in the area of environmental factors.

Agreement was reached with the municipalities, however, not with the County.

Monmouth County

The County and one municipality misapplied Planning Area 4, because of a lack of awareness of certain Planning Area 5 documentation (part of a potable watershed area) , and the importance placed upon that factor by the Commission in identifying Planning Area 5.

In the Monmouth County circumstances the County did not have time to rectify these issues with its municipalities and change its application of the Interim Plan mapping criteria.

Burlington County

The County and a few municipalities misapplied the criteria of Planning Area 2 to an area that meets the criteria of Planning Area 1. The County and

misunderstood the Commission's and Plan's role of broadly applying the criteria, rather than misapplying them. These smaller areas should be addressed by the plans developed by other levels of government, such as counties and municipalities.

Salem County

The County and municipality misapplied the criteria for Planning Area 2 to an area which meets the criteria of Planning Area 3. The County and municipality did not document in-form infrastructure planning for the areas.

Coastal

Ocean County

The County and several municipalities misapplied the mapping criteria of Planning Area 2 by extending it into areas that should be identified either as Planning Area 4 or 5 with Urban Centers. The areas in question possess environmental factors (coastal wetlands) that meet the criteria for Planning Area 5. The County and the municipalities also did not have documented planned or existing urban infrastructure. Further discussion resulted in an agreement with the County and a disagreement with the

IX* Main G

During the negotiation process many counties and municipalities misapplied the Interim Plan criteria because of concerns about how the Planning Areas, Centers and Critical Environmental Sites will be implemented by various agencies. The following mapping concerns are reviewed below.

Hartman

Sussex County

The County did not submit maps to the Office of State Planning within the 150 day deadline for negotiations. No negotiation session was held with the County.

Bunton County

The County did not submit maps to the Office of State Planning within the 150 day deadline for negotiations. No negotiation session was held with the County

County

The County identified a city as an Urban Center, although, it does not meet the Urban Center criteria of the Interim Plan. The County, in concert with the city, did so because of their concern about funding priority. The State Planning Commission disagreed with the County and municipality.

Somerset County

The County Triarrt-if-igri an area as Planning Area 4B, while the municipality -_____it as Planning Area 5. The County objected to changing its i- greater regulation and could not be ^HgiKio for farmland preservation funding. The State Planning Ccnmission agreed with the municipality, however, they disagreed with the County.

Gloucester

The County and several municipalities idpatiflpd areas as Planning Area 2 although they lack existing or planned urban infrastructure before the Year 2010. The misapplication was based on local concerns about property values and development opportunities. The areas in question meet the criteria of Planning Areas 3, 4 and, in sane cases, 5.

Salem County

The County and a number of municipalities identified areas that clearly meet the criteria for Planning Area 4 and 5, as Planning Area 3. This was largely based on a concern about property values .

Coastal

Cumberland County

The County and municipal ItlpR did not map any areas as Planning Area 4B, although staff has irfpntviffgH areas, especially in the CAERA zone which meet the 4B criteria. The County and municipalities are concerned about adfHtiinTvii regulation and the loss of property value ty identification of Planning Area 4B.

APPENDIX A

RECEIPT OF COMPARISON PHASE REPORTS

r

COUNTY	DHE
Mercer	July 9, 1989
Cumberland	August 3, 1989
Morris	August 11, 1989
Salem	October 27, 1989
Atlantic	December 6, 1989
Monmouth	December 15, 1989
Cape May	December 18, 1989
Somerset	December 19, 1989
Bergen	December 20, 1989
Middlesex	December 21, 1989
Hunterdon	February 21, 1990
Gloucester	February 26, 1990
Passaic	February 27, 1990
Burlington	February 28, 1990
Camden	February 28, 1990
Union	March 12, 1990
Ocean	March 30, 1990
Hudson	April 2, 1990
Sussex	May 16, 1990
Warren	September 21, 1990
Essex	February 7, 1991

APPENDIX A (Continued)

RECEIPT OF INDIVIDUAL MUNICIPAL REPORTS

DKIE

Hopewell Borough (Mercer)	July 21, 1989
East Windsor (Mercer)	July 28, 1989
Lawrence Twp. (Mercer)	August 3, 1989
Pennington (Mercer)	August 7, 1989
West Windsor (Mercer)	August 12, 1989
Hopewell Twp. (Mercer)	February 2, 1990
Princeton Twp. (Mercer)	March 12, 1990
Washington Twp. (Mercer)	March 30, 1990
Commercial Twp. (Cumberland)	March 28, 1990
Vineland City (Cumberland)	March 30, 1990
Milleville City (Cumberland)	April 2, 1990
Deerfield Twp. (Cumberland)	April 2, 1990
Jefferson Twp. (Morris)	February 7, 1990
Absecon (Atlantic)	March 29, 1990
Ocean Twp. (Monmouth)	January 11, 1990
Wildwood City (Cape May)	March 29, 1990
Far Hill (Somerset)	June 27, 1989
No. Plainfield (Somerset)	November 22, 1989
Franklin (Somerset)	December 13, 1989
Bedminster (Somerset)	December 27, 1989
Montgomery (Somerset)	February 2, 1990
Bernardsville (Somerset)	February 7, 1990
Branchburg (Somerset)	February 14, 1990
Bernards (Somerset)	February 28, 1990
Green Brook (Somerset)	March 9, 1990
Perth Amboy (Middlesex)	March 29, 1990
Clinton (Hunterdon)	March 19, 1990

APPENDIX A (Continued) RECEIPT OF
INDIVIDUAL MUNICIPAL RESORTS - Continued

West Milford (Passaic)	March 30, 1990
Ringwood (Passaic)	March 30, 1990
Bloomingdale (Passaic)	April 5, 1990
Mansfield (Burlington)	March, 1990
Moorestown (Burlington)	March, 1990
Springfield Twp. (Burlington)	March, 1990
Surf City (Ocean)	February 15, 1990
Fredon Twp. (Sussex)	July 6, 1990
Sparta (Sussex)	July 25, 1990
Wantage (Sussex)	July 25, 1990
Washington Twp. (Warren)	March 22, 1990
Essex Fells (Essex)	March 26, 1990
Nutley (Essex)	March 26, 1990
West Orange (Essex)	April 12, 1990
Montclair (Essex)	August 9, 1990
Cedar Grove (Essex)	March 7, 1991
Millburn (Essex)	March 7, 1991

APPENDIX B

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS I.

Comparison Phase - OSP Field Meetings

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
1/12/89	Atlantic	1/9/89	Mercer	1/19/89	Bergen	1/19/89	Warren	1/24/89	Camden
1/19/89	Atlantic		Middlesex	1/24/89	Bergen	1/23/89	Morris/ Morristown	1/26/89	Salem Burlington
	Cape May	1/11/89	Monmouth	1/26/89	Bergen				
1/20/89	Cumberland	1/17/89	Monmouth	2/8/89	Union	1/25/89	Hunterdon	1/30/89	Camden
1/25/89	Atlantic	1/18/89	Monmouth	2/16/89	Bergen	1/26/89	Sussex		Gloucester
1/26/89	Cape May	1/31/89	Somerset	2/17/89	Passaic	1/30/89	Hunterdon	2/1/89	Burlington
1/27/89	Cumberland		Mercer		Essex	1/31/89	Hunterdon	2/2/89	Burlington
2/3/89	Cumberland		Somerset	2/21/89	Hudson	2/7/89	Morris	2/3/89	Camden
2/7/89	Cape May	2/1/89	Monmouth		HMDC	2/16/89	Warren	2/7/89	Camden
2/16/89	Cumberland	2/4/89	Middlesex	3/23/89	Bergen	2/23/89	Warren	2/9/89	Burlington
2/21/89	Cape May	2/17/89	Mercer/ W. Windsor	2/27/89	Bergen/ Hasbrouck Hqts		Sussex		Camden
2/23/89	Atlantic			2/27/89		2/27/89	Hunterdon	2/16/89	Gloucester
2/37/89	Atlantic	2/28/89	Somerset	3/1/89	Essex	3/9/89	Hunterdon	2/22/89	Burlington/ Florence
2/28/89	Cumberland	3/2/89	Somerset	3/8/89	Essex	3/15/89	Warren/ Liberty Twp		
3/7/89	Ocean	3/9/89	Middlesex	3/16/89	Union			2/23/89	Burlington
3/8/89	Cape May	3/13/89	Mercer/ Lawrence Twp	3/21/89	Union		Morris	2/27/89	Burlington
3/17/89	Cumberland			3/30/89	Bergen		Sussex/ Andover		Gloucester
3/18/89	Cumberland	3/14/89	Honmouth		Hudson			2/28/89	Salem
3/23/89	Atlantic	3/15/89	Middlesex	4/7/89	Bergen	3/20/89	Sussex/ Still water	3/1/89	Burlington Salem
	Cape May	3/21/89	Middlesex		Passaic				
3/29/89	Cumberland	3/23/89	Monmouth/ Freehold Boro	4/18/89	Bergen		Morris/ Dover	3/6/89	Salem Burlington/ Burlington City
4/3/89	Ocean			4/19/89	Bergen	3/21/89	Warren/ Lopatcong Twp	3/8/89	
4/4/89	Ocean	3/27/89	Middlesex		Passaic			3/11/89	Salem
4/5/89	Cape May	3/29/89	Monmouth/ Middletown Twp	4/25/89	Essex	3/21/89	Morris Chester	3/14/89	Camden
4/12/89	Ocean			4/27/89	Essex			3/17/89	Burlington
4/19/89	Cape May		Mercer	5/5/89	Passaic		Warren/ Washington Twp		Camden
4/20/89	Atlantic/ Buena Boro Buena Vista Twp	3/30/89 4/4/89	Mercer Mercer	5/9/89	Essex Newark			3/18/89	Salem
4/24/89	Ocean/Jackson Twp	4/5/89	Monmouth/ Millstone Twp	5/11/89	Union	3/22/89	Sussex/ Andover Twp	3/20/89	Camden
4/25/89	Ocean/Plumstead			5/25/89	Essex			3/23/89	Burlington
4/27/89	Ocean/ Absecon	4/10/89	Monmouth/ Upper Freehold	6/2/89	Essex/ Newark		Warren/ Hardwick Twp	3/22/89	Burlington
4/27/89	Cumberland	4/12/89	Mercer	6/5/89	Bergen/ Ridgefield Park		Warren/ Hopewell Twp	3/27/89	Burlington
	Cape Hay	4/13/89	Middlesex/ N-S Brunswick			3/23/89		3/28/89	Burlington Salem
5/10/89	Atlantic			6/13/89	HMDC		Warren/ White Twp	3/29/89	Burlington
5/25/89	Cumberland/ Vine land	4/20/89 4/25/89	Mercer Mercer	6/7/89 6/22/89	Hudson Hudson		Sussex/ Sussex/	4/5/89 4/10/89	Camden Salem

to
won

APPENDIX B (Continued)

THE NEU JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS 1.

Comparison Phase - OSP Field Meetings

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
5/26/89	Atlantic	5/1/89	Mercer	6/28/89	Bergen/ Hopatcong Twp				Gloucester
5/31/89	Cape May	5/8/89	Monmouth/ Englewood					4/12/89	Camden
6/9/89	Cumberland		Wall Twp	7/6/89	Hudson			4/25/89	Burlington/ Burlington City
6/9/89	Cumberland		Wall Twp	7/6/89	Hudson				
	Cape May	5/9/89	Middlesex	7/12/89	Hudson	3/27/89	Warren/ Byram	4/27/89	Burlington
6/20/89	Ocean/P I urns tead		Mercer	7/20/89	Bergen			5/4/89	Burlington
6/29/89	Cape May	5/15/89	Mercer	8/16/89	Hudson	3/28/89	Warren/ Allamuchy Twp	5/5/89	Salem
7/5/89	Cumberland	5/23/89	Mercer/ Hopewell Twp	8/29/89	Union Roselle Park			5/10/89	Salem
7/25/89	Cumberland							5/15/89	Camden/ Clement on
8/10/89	Cape May		Mercer	9/14/89	Union Kenilworth	3/29/89	Warren/ Knoulton Twp	5/18/89	Burlington
8/15/89	Ocean	5/30/89	Somerset					6/1/89	Camden
10/23/89	Cape May	6/7/89	Middlesex	9/28/89	Essex			6/2/89	4 Counties
11/1/89	Atlantic		Mercer	10/10/89	Essex	3/29/89	Warren/ Sparta	6/9/89	Camden / Salem
1/5/90	Cumberland	6/8/89	Somerset	10/18/89	Essex			6/12/89	Gloucester
1/29/90	Cape Kay	6/14/89	Mercer	11/1/89	Essex			6/14/89	Burlington
	Atlantic/ Atlantic City	6/15/89	Middlesex	12/7/89	Bergen	4/3/89	Warren/ Blairston	6/27/89	Burlington
		6/21/89	Middlesex	11/1/89	Essex			7/19/89	4 Counties
1/30/90	Gloucester	6/29/89	Mercer		Keni Iworth	4/4/89	Hunterdon/ Readington-	8/10/89	Salem
3/9/90	Atlantic	6/30/89	Middlesex	1/9/90	Passaic			8/19/89	Salem
3/14/90	Cumberland	7/19/89	Monmouth	2/14/90	Union			8/28/89	Camden
3/22/90	Bridge ton		Somerset/ Bedminlster Twp	2/20/90	Hudson	4/6/89	Warren/ White-Hardwick	9/7/89	Gloucester
	Cumberland			2/26/90	Hudson				
3/27/90	Gloucester	8/4/89	Somerset	2/27/90	Hudson				Salem
3/30/90	Camden	8/7/89	Somerset/ No. Plainffeld	3/1/90	Hudson	4/7/89	Hunterdon/ Lebanon	9/9/89	Gloucester
				3/13/90	Essex			9/11/89	Camden
		8/10/89	Middlesex	3/15/90	Essex	4/10/89	Warren/ Washington Twp	9/18/89	Gloucester
		8/20/89	Middlesex	3/20/90	Hudson			9/23/89	Salem
		8/30/89	Somerset	5/4/90	HMDC	4/11/89	Warren/ Allamuchy Twp	9/25/89	Gloucester
		9/1/89	Middlesex					9/26/89	Gloucester/ Clayton
			Mercer						
		9/28/89	Mercer					9/27/89	Camden
		10/30/89	Mercer					10/5/89	Gloucester
		11/8/89	Mercer			4/13/89	Warren/ Independence	10/13/89	Burlington
		11/9/89	Somerset					10/18/89	Salem
		11/13/89	Middlesex					11/1/89	Burlington
		11/21/89	Monmouth					11/3/89	Burlington
		11/27/89	Somerset					11/6/89	Burlington

ro

APPENDIX B (Continued)

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS I.

Comparison Phase • OSP field Meetings

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
		11/27/89	Mercer				StHLwater Twp	11/9/89	Burlington
		1/3/90	Monmouth			4/14/89	Uarren/Franklin	11/13/89	Burlington
		1/5/90	Middlesex			4/17/89	Hunterdon/ French town		
		1/25/90	Middlesex			4/24/89	Hunterdon		
		3/21/90	Somerset			4/25/89	Hunterdon/ Delaware Twp		
		4/18/90	Somerset			4/27/89	Uarren		
		4/24/90	Monmouth				Sussex/Andover		
		5/2/90	Mercer/ Freehold			4/28/89	Uarren/White Twp		
			Middlesex/ New Brunswick Twp			5/1/89	Uarren/Al lamuchy		
		5/4/90	Middlesex			5/2/89	Hunterdon/Franklin		
		5/10/90	Monmouth			5/3/89	Sussex/Sparta- Byran		
		5/11/90	Monmouth/ Middletown			5/4/89	Hunterdon/K i ngwood		
		5/11/90	Mercer/ Lawrenceville				Sussex/Stanhope		
		5/11/90	Middlesex			5/9/89	Morris		
			Monmouth			5/9/89	Essex/ Newark		
		5/17/90	Middlesex			5/10/89	Uarren/Liberty		
		5/17/90	Mercer/ Lawrence Twp				Morris/Mendham		
		6/6/90	Mercer			5/11/89	Sussex/Montague		
		6/8/90	Middletown				Hunterdon/ Lambertville-		
		6/13/90	Mercer				Sandyston		
			Trenton				Uarren/ Hope		
		6/15/90	Middlesex/ New Brunswick Twp			5/15/89	Uarren/ Frank Mn-		
		6/16/90	Mercer				Independence		
		6/20/90	Mercer/ Trenton				Hunterdon/ French town		
		6/22/90	Mercer			5/16/89	Uar r en/G reerw i ch		
		6/25/90	Mercer				Sussex/ Sussex/Sparta		
						6/1/89	Sussex/Sparta		
						6/5/89	Sussex/Stillwater		

N)
u>
oo

APPENDIX B (Continued)

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

I... Comparison Phase - OSP Field Meetings

I N COASTAL REGION ' • ; -		II C E N T R A L REGION "		N O R T H E A S T REGION		N O R T H W E S T REGION "		S O U T H W E S T REGION	
DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
						6/19/89	Hunterdon		
							Sussex/ Hamburg		
						6/20/89	Warren/ Washington Twp		
						6/22/89	Sussex/Wantage		
						6/27/89	Hunterdon/ Alexandria		
						7/6/89	Sussex/Sparta		
						7/11/89	Sussex/Sparta		
						7/12/89	Sussex/Lafayette		
						7/13/89	Hunterdon/Clinton		
						7/14/89	Sussex/ Ogdensburg		
						7/19/89	Sussex/ Hardyston- Hampton		
						7/20/89	Warren/Hardwick		
						7/26/89	Morris		
						8/2/89	Morris Warren/Hardwick		
						8/9/89	Sussex/Vernon		
						8/10/89	Sussex/ Ogdensburg Boro		
						8/15/89	Sussex/ Branchville		
						8/26/89	Sussex/Franklin Boro		
						8/29/89	Sussex/ Hardyston Twp		
						9/1/89	Warren/Hardwick		
						9/7/89	Sussex/Byram		
						9/12/89	Warren/Allamuchy		
						11/20/89	Morris		
						11/30/89	Hunterdon		
						1/11/90	Warren		
						1/18/90	Sussex/ Hamburg		
						1/30/90	Warren/ Washington Twp		
						2/13/90	Hunterdon		

to
LO

<

APPENDIX B (Continued)

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS 1.

Comparison Phase - OSP Field Meetings

<u>COASTAL REGION</u>		<u>J I CENTRAL</u>		<u>J I MOBTHEAST REGION</u>		<u>J I HQRTHWEST REGION</u>		<u>SCXJTHWESr REGION</u>	
DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ HUHICIPALITY

3/27/90	Sussex
3/15/90	Morris
3/21/90	Hun tendon Horn's
4/11/90	Sussex
4/24/90	Sussex
5/16/90	Uarren Sussex
6/27/90	Hunter don/ Alexandria

APPENDIX

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

!•_ PDC Pre-Negotiation Meetings

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY								
3/7/90	Atlantic	1/24/90	Mercer	4/4/90	Bergen	3/21/90	Hunterdon		
	Cape May	3/7/90	Middlesex	5/9/90	Passiac		Morris	1/31/90	Salem
	Ocean	3/21/90	Somerset		Essex	5/16/90	Sussex	4/18/90	Gloucester
4/18/90	Cumberland	5/2/90	Monmouth	5/30/90	Hudson		Warren		Camden
6/6/90	Ocean								Burlington
								6/1/90	4 Counties
								6/14/90	Salem
								6/18/90	Burlington
								6/21/90	Salem

APPENDIX C (Continued)

THE NEW JERSEY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

II. Negotiation Process

A. OSP/County Planning Staff

to be

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
9/17/90	Cape May	9/28/90	Monmouth	6/21/90	Bergen	7/5/90	Morris	9/6/90	Camden
9/28/90	Atlantic	10/18/90	Middlesex	6/27/90	Union	8/13/90	Sussex	9/11/90	Burlington
10/13/90	Cumberland	10/21/90	Mercer	6/28/90	Bergen	8/13/90	Hunterdon	9/17/90	Salem
10/24/90	Ocean	11/7/90	Somerset	6/29/90	Hudson	8/23/90	Morris	9/24/90	Gloucester
				8/16/90	Union	8/30/90	Morris		
				7/5/90	Hudson	9/7/90	Morris		
				7/6/90	Bergen	9/12/90	Hunterdon		
				7/9/90	Hudson	9/21/90	Morris		
				7/13/90	Hudson	10/3/90	Sussex		
				8/21/90	Union	11/5/90	Sussex		
				9/17/90	Hudson	12/17/90	Warren		
				9/21/90	Passaic	1/13/91	Warren		
				10/3/90	Essex	1/14/91	Warren		
				10/4/90	Passaic				
				10/12/90	Essex				
				11/29/90	Essex				

1/31/91 Essex
2/26/91 Essex
 Nut ley
2/27/91 Essex
 Essex Fells
3/4/91 Essex
 Essex Fells

APPENDIX C (Continued)

B. 05P/LHC Meeting

UJ

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
9/17/90	Cape May	8/8/90	Mercer	8/8/90	Hudson I	9/19/90	Hunterdon	9/18/90	Camden
9/28/90	Atlantic	9/11/90	Middlesex	9/4/90	Bergen	10/4/90	Morris	9/24/90	Gloucester
10/13/90	Cumberland	10/4/90	Monmouth	9/6/90	Union	10/15/90	Morris	9/26/90	Burlington
10/24/90	Ocean	11/13/90	Somerset	9/24/90	Hudson II	10/18/90	Hunterdon		
				10/25/90	Passiac	11/20/90	Sussex		
				3/5/91	Essex	12/5/90	Sussex		
						2/4/91	Warren		
						2/11/91	Warren		

C. PDC/LMC Meetings

DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY	DATE	COUNTY/ MUNICIPALITY
9/8/90	Ocean	9/26/90	Mercer	9/11/90	Bergen	10/25/90	Hunterdon	9/14/90	Salem
10/3/90	Atlantic	11/1/90	Honmouth	10/1/90	Hudson	1/7/91	Morris	10/18/90	Camden

10/29/90 Cumberland
11/9/90 Cape May

11/13/90 Middlesex
11/19/90 Somerset

10/19/90 Union
11/8/90 Passiac
3/26/91 Essex

1/24/91 Sussex
2/27/91 Warren

10/26/90 Gloucester
11/7/90 Burlington

APPENDIX D IV; STATE

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1/30/90	Regional Design System	"Main Street", Voorhees
2/2/90	Natural Resources	Frelinghuysen Arboretum, Morristown
2/14/90	Housing	Morris 2000, Morristown
2/28/90	Regional Design System	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
3/16/90	Natural Resources	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
3/23/90	Housing	Devco, New Brunswick
3/28/90	Business & Labor	PSE&O Headquarters, Newark
4/4/90	Regional Design System	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
4/20/90	Natural Resources	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
5/2/90	Regional Design System	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
5/11/90	Housing	COAH, Lawrence Twp.
5/15/90	Business & Labor	PSE&G Headquarters, Newark
5/24/90	Natural Resources	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
6/13/90	Regional Design System	Hannoch Wetsman, Trenton
6/19/90	Natural Resources	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
7/9/90	Regional Design System	Hannoch Weisman, Trenton
7/12/90	Housing	Stockton State College, Patnona
7/23/90	Natural Resources	The Farmhouse, Farm Bureau, Trenton
9/11/90	Housing	Rutgers Law School, Newark
9/17/90	Regional Design System	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
10/22/90	Regional Design System	Chamber of Commerce of Southern New Jersey, Pennsauken
10/23/90	Natural Resources	NJDEP, Trenton
12/6/90	Peer Review	Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick
12/7/90	Peer Review	Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick
1/21/92	Natural Resources	Rutgers University, New Brunswick
1/24/92	Housing	St. Joseph's Plaza, Newark
1/28/92	Business ft Labor	Prudential, Newark
1/29/92	Resource Planning ft Management	City Hall, Camden
2/19/92	Resource Planning ft Management	Somerset Co. Administration Building, Somerville
2/21/92	Housing	NJAR Headquarters, Edison
2/25/92	Business ft Labor	NJ Bell Data Center, Freehold
2/27/92	Natural Resources	Tatum Park, Middletown
3/9/92	Resource Planning ft Management	PSE&O Headquarters, Newark
3/12/92	Housing	Municipal Building, Cherry Hill
3/20/92	Natural Resources	Morris County Cultural Center, Morris Twp.
3/24/92	Business ft Labor	Raritan Plaza II, Edison
5/1 5/92	Business A Labor	Princeton Forrestal Training Center, Plainsboro
5/15/92	Housing	Princeton Forrestal Training Center, Plainsboro
5/18/92	Resource Planning ft Management	Princeton Forrestal Training Center, Plainsboro
5/18/92	Natural Resources	Princeton Forrestal Training Center, Plainsboro

APPENDIX E

March 4, 1992
 Revised: December 11, 1991
 January 10, 17, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 1992
 February 5, 7, 1992
 March 4, 1992

o«n-w^^r7^^Rrt-i««

Counties	Interim Plan Receipt period	Initiate Negotiations (150 day-Date	Meeting/ Notice days priori	Legal Date (15 PDC/IfLC Meetina	End Negotiations	No. of ttunic .
<u>Northeast</u>						
Beroen	Sept. 26	Oct. 26	Feb. 1 7	Mar. 3	March 23	70
Essex	Sept. 23	Oct. 23	Feb. 25	Mar. 11	March 20	22
Hudson	Oct. 2	Nov. 1	Mar. 7	Mar. 23	March 28	12
Passaic	Sept. 17	Oct. 17	Feb. 28	Mar. 13	March 14	16
Union	Sept. 26	Oct. 26	Mar. 3	Mar. 18	March 23	21
<u>Northwest</u>						
Hunterdon	Sept. 30	Cfct. 30	Mar. 11	March 26	March 27	26
Morris	Sept. 17	Oct. 17	Feb. 12	Feb. 27	March 14	39
Sussex	Sept. 23	Oct. 23	Mar. 3	Mar. 19	March 20	23
Warren	Sept. 17	Oct. 17	Feb. 4	Feb. 19	March 14	21
<u>Central</u>						
Mercer	Sept. 23	Oct. 23	Jan. 19	* Jan. 29	March 20	13
Middlesex	Sept. 19	Oct. 19	Feb. 24	Mar. 10	March 16	25
Monmouth	Sept. 21	Oct. 21	Mar. 1	Mar. 16	March 18	53
Somerset	Sept. 23	Oct. 23	Jan. 77	Feb. 11	March 20	21
<u>Southwest</u>						
Burlington	Sept. 30	Oct. 30	Feb. 26	March 12	March 27	40
Camden	Sept. 30	Oct. 30	Mar. 9	March 25	March 27	37
Gloucester	Sept. 18	Oct. 18	Feb. 24	March 10	March 15	24
Salem	Sept. 18	Oct. 18	Feb. 21	March 9	March 15	15
Atlantic	Sept. 17	Oct. 17	Feb. 18	Mar. 4	March 14	23
Cape May	Sept. 17	Oct. 17	Mar. 4*	f Mar. 11	March 14	16
Cumberland	Sept. 18	Oct. 18	Feb. 4	Feb. 19	March 15	14
Ocean	Sept. 18	Oct. 1?	Feb. 27	Feb. 12	March 15	33

t - tentative
 * - exception 10 days prior to meeting
 ** - exception, meeting was confirmed March 3, 1992