



*Fiscal Year 1994*  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

----- of the -----  
*The New Jersey State Planning Commission*  
<\* and <8>  
*The New Jersey Office of State Planning*

**CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN**  
Governor

**BRIAN W. CLYMER**  
*State Treasurer*

*Prepared by:*

***Elizabeth H. Guididas***  
*Public Information Officer*

*Designed by:*

***Diane E. Chepega***  
*Graphics Coordinator*

New Jersey Office of State Planning

This Report is Printed on Recycled Paper

***Fiscal Year 1994  
ANNUAL REPORT***

*of the New Jersey State  
Planning Commission  
and The Office of  
State Planning*

# *Fiscal Year 1994*

## **ANNUAL REPORT**

---

*Coastal New Jersey is the engine that drives an \$18 billion statewide tourism industry. The State's aggressive efforts to protect the ocean and our beaches from pollution have contributed mightily to the rebounding shore economy. Age-old hazards continue to threaten the region, however, and following two straight years of devastating Nor'easters, a new public consensus for protecting the coast has emerged; Development there must respect the awesome power of nature.*

*How does government begin to serve these diverse constituencies? For most of our history and particularly in the decades following World War II, the conventional wisdom was to look solely to local governments to manage local resources and needs. Closest to the people that lived and worked within their boundaries, local government was, and is often still seen, as the best agent to resolve parochial issues. State government was to meet its constitutional mandate to protect the public health and safety. It could build highways or regulate industry or labor practices, but should stay out of the business of local governments — especially local land use.*

*Today, as we approach the 21st Century, the conventional wisdom has given way to stubborn realities. In today's New Jersey, it is rare to find a community that houses most of its workers or hosts jobs for most of its residents. It is rare to find a community that is not affected by the next town's decisions to build a mall or shopping center, to site an office park or erect a parking lot. It is rare to find a community or a business that does not have to deal with a State regulatory agency to accomplish some local mission. But it is also rare to find a community or State agency that has not considered how it must better manage its resources in light of our increasing interdependence.*

*In New Jersey today, most of our 567 municipalities and State agencies—particularly those involved in regulating or promoting development - have considered our interdependence because they have participated in the creation of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. For some, that participation may have been limited to reading and commenting on the many drafts we prepared and circulated. For most, participation involved hundred's of hours of hard work contributing to the development of goals, objectives, policies and strategic to which each level of government has agreed to aspire. And, the work has inspired a greater, continuing awareness of the importance^ coordinated planning in shaping local, county or State agency poli The State Plan is that critical, common link through which govern\* agencies can gauge the impacts of their decisions, and the private | tor can be afforded a measure of certainty about permitting and opment approvals.*

*The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is a compact on where we, a richly diverse state, seeking a prominent]^ among 49 others, intend to be after the first 20 years of the 21st C\$ ry. The State Plan and the planning process that established great promise for managing our resources — natural, built a as we move into the next century. Herein we report our progress #j| achieving our planning goals.*

### *Notes from the Executive Director* *Herbert Simmens, PP*

*The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is New Jersey's Plan, negotiated among each of the counties, municipalities and State agencies it affects, with full participation from the public. It has two distinct dimensions. The first is its vision for the 21st Century. Subtitled, "Communities of Place," it describes a kind of New Jersey that is possible, and challenges us — elected officials, bureaucrats, developers, financing agencies, organized interests and citizen activists — to make it a reality. These communities of place are not merely places we dream about — they already exist in New Jersey and throughout the nation. But in most cases, they began decades or even centuries ago as isolated, self-sufficient, self-contained and organically-planned, thriving communities.*

*Today's reality is quite different and the Plan acknowledges that. Even the most remote locations—particularly in New Jersey—are not that far removed from a major highway. With those highways came subdivisions and sewer systems, retail strip malls, housing developments and office complexes. Many of those original communities of place are now in danger of being subsumed by this modern age—no longer isolated, but still with only limited resources to support this influx of population and jobs. The State Plan looks at both the past and the present to chart a course for the future. It supports reinforcing the strengths of these historical communities; it seeks to help post war developments mature with their own distinctive—yet attractive and serviceable—features, places where future generations can delight in the heritage that has been created; where new development meets the needs of the new century. The State Plan charts a course where people have opportunities to experience their communities both inside and outside of their cars. These are communities where people can walk to school or to downtown shops; where pathways through town or out to the country are carefully integrated aspects of a well designed community plan, built and sustained through a partnership between government, civic groups and the private sector.*

*The State Plan however is more than a vision of the future, it's a roadmap on how to get there. Along with the vision it promotes the Plan sends the distinctly clear message that the careful and comprehensive analysis and synthesis of information will help us create the kinds of communities we desire. What environmental constraints exist? Are the population and employment base expected to expand?*

*Fiscal Year 1994*  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

*Contract? Where will these people live? Work? Are the roads adequate to support them? What about the sewers? If we agree on a plan for our community, will State agencies support our planning agenda? Can we use this agenda to attract new developers or maintain the existing community character? How will developers respond? What about the courts?*

*When these questions are considered in the context of a local or county master plan, it presents the opportunity to save taxpayers money -an independent assessment of the State Plan confirms that. It also presents new markets for private investment by clearly showing where growth is to be encouraged, and where constraints exist.*

*Efficiency coordination and predictability are critically important to the success of the Plan, but it is first and foremost about creating communities in which we want to live, work, play, raise our families or retire. That means many things to many people. One aspect most would agree on is that community is about exchange- of commerce sociability, ideas, experience. Land use patterns can promote or inhibit that exchange. As planners, we seek to promote that exchange and, as you will see in the following pages, we are off to a good start.*

## Introduction -- The State Planning Act

The State Planning Act<sup>1</sup> of 1985 instructs the State Planning Commission to prepare, adopt, revise and update, the State Plan in consultation with local governments. The Plan should establish statewide planning objectives, coordinate planning activities and guide policies concerning economic development, urban renewal, natural resource preservation, land use, other infrastructure improvements and capital expenditures. It should also identify areas for growth, limited growth, agriculture, open space conservation and other appropriate designations. In addition, the Plan is to promote development and redevelopment in a manner consis-

tent with sound planning and where infrastructure can be provided at private expense or with reasonable expenditure of public funds.

The Office of State Planning is required to publish an annual progress report on achieving the goals of the State Planning Act. It should include a discussion of the Plan's effectiveness in promoting consistency among municipal, county and State plans, and an accounting of the State's capital needs and progress towards providing housing where such a need is indicated. This report responds to the Act's directives and includes a discussion of these issues in the pages that follow.

## The State Development and Redevelopment Plan -- An Overview

Adopted on June 12, 1992, by unanimous vote of the 17-member New Jersey State Planning Commission, the State Development and Redevelopment Plan responds to the legislative and public demands for organizing future growth into forms that meet the public's desires for attractive, appealing communities of character and integrity, where infrastructure can be provided efficiently and at a reasonable cost. The Plan calls this quality of life vision "Communities of Place." It suggests that New Jersey can create or recreate such places by strategic,

coordinated, intergovernmental investment. Such cooperation among public entities should, in turn, encourage private interests to develop in places where government investments are planned.

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan has two major sections: the Statewide Policy Structure and the Resource Planning and Management Structure. It is accompanied by a map that is a geographic expression of its goals, policies and strategies. The map also includes existing population and employment centers statewide.

# *Fiscal Year 1994*

## **ANNUAL REPORT**

---

### **The Statewide Policy Structure:**

The Statewide Policy Structure includes a discussion of the planning goals established in the Act that should be addressed by the Plan. Each of these goals is accompanied by a strategy statement to help guide each level of government and the private sector as they make policy decisions in any of these areas.

This section also includes a series of Statewide Policies that are to be approached in the same way. The Statewide Policies cover 17 subject areas: equity; comprehensive planning; resource planning and management; public investment priorities; infrastructure investments; economic development; urban revitalization; housing; transportation; historic, cultural and scenic resources; air resources; water resources; recycling and waste management; agriculture; and, the areas of critical State concern (i.e., Pinelands, CAFRA and Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission areas).

The Statewide Policies were developed in consultation with the agencies responsible for programming and regulation in each of these subject areas. Decision-makers should consider the applicable policies when working to integrate their plans and programs with the negotiated agreements established in the State Plan.

### **The Resource Planning and Management Structure:**

The Resource Planning and Management Structure considers growth in the context of plan-

ning areas and centers. It establishes policies to balance development and conservation objectives. Five planning areas define various levels of development intensity as well as the diverse characteristics of the State's geography. Each planning area — Metropolitan (PA 1); Suburban (PA 2); Fringe (PA 3); Rural (PA 4); and Environmentally Sensitive (PA 5) — includes a series of planning objectives, which are designed to guide the application of the Statewide Policies and to help communities decide the appropriate location and size of centers.

Centers are either existing or planned places where future residential, commercial and service development will be focused. Five types of centers are defined in the State Plan. All centers — Urban Centers, Towns, Regional Centers, Villages and Hamlets -- have a central core of public and private services and a development area surrounding it. In planning for creating, developing or redeveloping such centers, counties and municipalities can identify the central core and development area by drawing community development boundaries.

The State Plan identifies over 600 such centers. By identifying these places, the State Planning Commission has asserted that these areas either are now or have the potential to become the "Communities of Place" envisioned in the Plan. This identification merely begins the planning process for centers. The Plan asks those communities where such identifications have been made to continue this process by seeking an official



"center designation" from the Commission. The designation process is governed by Subchapter 8 of the State Planning Rules<sup>2</sup> and is included in the subchapter on map amendments. A designation results from a series of planning activities, which includes an examination of future population and employment projections; natural and built resource inventories and management plans; capacity analyses; and, the development of design guidelines.

*Via* designation, the Commission is supporting that community's plan to accommodate and manage its future growth with policies and strategies consistent with the State Plan. Designation

signals a number of important accomplishments. First, it demonstrates that the center is actively pursuing the goals discussed in the State Planning Act and thus engaged in a state-of-the-art planning process. Second, these activities should be supported and encouraged by State agencies also working toward the same goals. And, a designation shows the Commission's commitment to advancing the center's planning agenda among other agencies and the private sector. Additional support can come in a variety of forms, from priority treatment for infrastructure projects and discretionary State aid, to streamlined permitting or other benefits.

## Achieving Plan Goals

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is a comprehensive strategy to achieve the goals enumerated in the State Planning Act. The State Plan functions as a common planning guide for each level of government, and as such, it is the mechanism leading each level of government toward greater integration and coordination of their plans and programs. The State Planning Commission is supporting and encouraging these activities and provides technical assistance through the Office of State Planning.

Implementation is being accomplished on a number of important fronts: through the centers designation and consistency review processes; through strategic

revitalization and "urban complex" planning; through State agency coordination, including comprehensive coordination with the Council on Affordable Housing, the Departments of Environmental Protection & Energy, Transportation and others; and through the data-gathering and forecasting of infrastructure needs, demographic and economic trends; and modeling at municipal, county and statewide scales.

### Consistency Among Plans and Consistency Reviews

The State Planning Act recommends that municipal and county plans be consistent with the State Plan; it does not require consistency. The Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.A.C. 40:55 D - 1 et

# *Fiscal Year 1994*

## **ANNUAL REPORT**

---

*As of this writing, eight communities are preparing for consistency reviews or centers designation with funding assistance made available from the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions (ANJEC). The ANJEC project is supported by a grant from the Fund for New Jersey. ANJEC selected a variety of towns, which reflect the diverse planning challenges that exist throughout the State. These include Cranford (Union County), Cranbury (Middlesex County), East Amwell (Hunterdon County), East Greenwich (Gloucester County), Plumstead (Ocean County), Vineland (Cumberland County), Washington Township (Warren County), and West Milford (Passaic County).*

*One other New Jersey municipality, Randolph Township in Morris County, has submitted its master plan for review by the Office.*

seq.) requires municipalities with master plans to include a policy statement "indicating the relationship of the proposed development of the municipality as developed in the master plan to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan."<sup>3</sup> As of May 28, 1994, the Office of State Planning had received and reviewed 170 municipal master plans. Forty-one of these have been prepared since January 1992, and 39 of these make specific reference to either the SDRP or the Interim SDRP. In most of these cases, the master plans confirm consistency with the State Plan. Several communities do express concern with certain aspects of the SDRP; one clearly states that the Resource Planning and Management Structure is not compatible with the township. The Office of State Planning will continue its review of all available master plans during the year ahead.

Consistency among county plans is difficult to gauge. Although many counties continue to be actively engaged in planning, no county has adopted a master plan since the 1992 adoption of the State Plan. And, just as on the local and state levels, resources devoted to planning in many counties have diminished during the past several years. In fact, some county planning offices have been subsumed into other divisions or have been eliminated completely. Yet, even amid the reduced resources, many counties are actively working toward Plan implementation, particularly in the areas of map amendments and centers designations; reviewing

and commenting on population and employment projections; and coordinating activities in the review of CAFRA regulations in the coastal counties.

The Commission continues to support greater consistency with the Plan and has established procedures to broaden and encourage county and local efforts toward consistency. Rules have been promulgated by the Commission, which provide for any local, county or regional agency to voluntarily submit their master plans for consistency review by the Office of State Planning.<sup>4</sup> The functional plans of State agencies may also be submitted to the Office for consistency review. The Rules do not permit the Office to review any code, ordinance, administrative rule or regulations for consistency. The Rules do allow the Office to assist government agencies working to make their regulatory processes reflect consistency with the State Plan, as expressed in their master plans.

### **Centers & Map Amendments**

Many municipalities prefer to demonstrate consistency in conjunction with a centers designation request. Centers vary in scale and function, from the largest - Urban and Regional Centers, which have historically met the housing, retail, commercial, industrial and public-service needs of a wide geographic and economic region; to medium-sized Towns, and smallest Villages and Hamlets — primarily functioning to serve their own residents and businesses.

## Achieving Plan Goals

The centers designation process has been designed to be "user friendly," and is a planning opportunity available to both the public and private sector. Participants seeking designation are encouraged to coordinate their petitions through their respective county planning offices as well as with the Office of State Planning before filing an official petition. Designation requests may be made for individual municipalities or for groups of adjoining communities, which result in "multi-jurisdictional" centers. This process is aimed at establishing the places for growth and to advertise those places to State agencies and private sector developers through amendments to the State Plan Resource Planning and Management Map.

Eight urban centers are designated in the State Plan: Atlantic City, Camden, Elizabeth, Jersey City, New Brunswick, Newark, Paterson and Trenton. During the 1993/94 fiscal year, five centers were designated: Newton (Regional Center, Sussex County), Hopewell Borough (Village, Mercer County), Woodstown (Town, Salem County), Ridgefield (Town, Bergen County), and Vineland-Millville (multi-jurisdictional Regional Center, Cumberland County). The Office of State Planning is currently working with several dozen additional communities to advance centers development and the designation process.

Amendments to the Resource Planning and Management Map were made in two counties. In Cumberland, map

amendments were made at the request of the City of Millville and Deerfield Township. These communities filed a joint request for amendments to change certain planning area designations from 4B and 5 to Planning Area 4 in order to clarify the boundaries of a critical watershed.

A series of technical amendments were also made to areas throughout Hunterdon County. These changes were necessary to reflect agreements reached during the negotiation phase of cross-acceptance, but not shown on the Resource Planning and Management Map.

All map amendments are on file at the Office of State Planning and are available for public review.

### **Strategic Revitalization Planning and Urban Complex**

The Plan describes a new multijurisdictional planning opportunity known as an "urban complex." This is an agreement among two or more municipalities and a designated urban center residing in the Metropolitan Planning Area. An urban complex demonstrates socio-economic and public facility links; its redevelopment and development goals are coordinated through a "strategic revitalization plan," (SRP) that considers the contributions and responsibilities of each of the constituent municipalities. Hudson County and the municipalities that comprise it are working with the Office of State Planning to advance the region as New Jersey's first urban complex.

### **STATE PLAN DESIGNATED CENTERS**

#### **Urban Centers -1992**

- Atlantic City
- Camden
- Elizabeth
- Jersey City
- New Brunswick
- Newark
- Paterson
- Trenton

#### **1993 - 1994 Designated:**

- Newton  
*(Regional Center, Sussex County)*
- Hopewell Borough  
*(Village, Mercer County)*
- Woodstown  
*(Town, Salem County)*
- Ridgefield  
*(Town, Bergen County)*
- Vineland-Millville  
*(multi-jurisdictional Regional Center, Cumberland County)*

*New Jersey State  
Planning Commission  
and Office of  
State Planning*

# Fiscal Year 1994 ANNUAL REPORT

---

***"New planning initiatives are underway in many of the agencies in an effort to institutionalize planning as a means of setting and meeting long-range goals."***

The plan encourages communities experiencing distress (defined as the top 100 municipalities on OMB's Municipal Distress Index) to develop Strategic Revitalization Plans and Programs. Such plans should isolate key issues; assess a community's capabilities and identify and allocate resources. An action program should be developed in coordination with the SRP and should demonstrate a coordinated approach to achieving revitalization goals. The Office of State Planning is currently working with the Borough of Red Bank (Monmouth County) on its Strategic Revitalization Plan and Program.

## **State Agencies**

Coordination and cooperation among State agencies has improved dramatically since the inception of the State planning process and continues to improve during this post-adoption period. New planning initiatives are underway in many of the agencies in an effort to institutionalize planning as a means of setting and meeting long-range goals. Some State agencies have memorialized their State Plan implementation goals by signing Memoranda of Understanding with the Commission. These include the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) - September 1992; the Department of Environmental Protection & Energy (DEPE) - June 1993; and, the Department of Transportation (DOT) and New Jersey Transit Corporation - June 1993. These agencies are working to incorporate State Plan policies and strategies in a number of ways.

**COAH** discussion of statewide planning in New Jersey would be complete without special attention to the State's affordable housing needs. Indeed, the State Planning Act and Fair Housing Act<sup>5</sup> share a judicial history and were closely coordinated through the legislative process. As a result, COAH and the State Planning Commission have pledged to work closely to meet the affordable housing needs of our citizens in a manner that respects the goals of the Plan.

The Fair Housing Act directs COAH to give "appropriate weight" to the implementation of the State Plan in carrying out its duties. COAH's recently adopted rules<sup>6</sup> achieve this mandate in a number of ways. First, the rules emphasize that COAH encourage new inclusionary developments within centers where infrastructure is otherwise readily available. In the Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas (PA 1 and 2, respectively) would include the environs of the Fringe Planning Area inclusionary development encouraged within centers or, side centers if infrastructure; be easily extended from PA the Rural and Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (PA 4J 5), COAH will require inclusionary developments to be in centers. Where a municipality has more than one planning area, will encourage and may require the municipality to use the lowest numbered planning area. Similarly, COAH will encourage and may require

sites to which infrastructure may be extended prior to the creation of new infrastructure.

COAH also emphasizes the State Plan's preference for development in centers and in Planning Areas 1 and 2 in its procedures for granting site-specific relief to an objector to a municipal housing element.

Finally, the rule weights available land in each planning area as one measure of a municipality's capacity to absorb needed housing. Thus, the Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas receive more weight than PAs 3,4, and 5.

**DEPE**—*The* New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and Energy is utilizing the State Plan in three significant program areas: in its proposals to develop new regulations for the CAFRA region; in a pilot program emphasizing watershed planning as an effective approach to water quality management; and in its newly adopted Open Space and Outdoor Recreation Plan. These initiatives, as well as other components of DEPE's planning agenda, are discussed below.

The New Jersey Legislature amended the Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA)<sup>7</sup> in 1993 to provide greater protection of the State's coastal resources. The legislative amendments now require the application and development of State regulations in coastal communities to be considered in the context of a coastal growth management plan. It authorizes DEPE, working with the State Planning Commission in consultation with coastal counties and municipalities, to adopt new

rules and regulations that are "closely coordinated with the provisions of the SDRP."<sup>8</sup> The Office of State Planning has provided staff support to DEPE in order to ensure close coordination with the SDRP's Resource Planning and Management Structure and Statewide Policies. DEPE has issued a preproposal that incorporates the Plan's Resource Planning and Management Map as the basis for its determinations of appropriate development intensities.

In DEPE's Office of Land and Water Planning, a watershed planning approach to protect water quality and effectively manage wastewater is under development. This initiative is directly related to the State Plan, which encourages watershed planning in its Statewide Policies on water quality. A pilot project in the Whippany River Watershed is progressing; it seeks to address point source discharges, stress pollution prevention and source reduction, and focus on nonpoint pollution sources. In addition, the Office of Land and Water Planning issued a preproposal on reforming the water quality management process. It suggested that water quality management plans should consider their relationship to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

The Green Acres Program is utilizing State Plan policies in the New Jersey Open Space and Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Recently submitted to the National Park Service (NPS), the SCORP emphasizes the importance of implementing the SDRP as a "blue print for growth management." It includes a discussion of the State

*Fiscal Year 1994*  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

---

Plan's view of open space as a component of infrastructure that is critically important to the quality of life of our citizens. The New Jersey SCORP incorporates State Plan centers and Plan consistency in its criteria for ranking applications for assistance by municipalities and non-profit organizations. Each state seeking financial assistance from the Land Water and Conservation Fund for acquisition or development projects must prepare and submit a SCORP to the NPS.

The Municipal Wastewater Assistance Program has incorporated designated centers in its project selection criteria.

DEPE's Historic Preservation Office has begun a challenge grant program to stimulate greater interest in centers designation. Historic preservation planning grants are being awarded to municipalities seeking to link the historic preservation master plan element with the center designation process.

.DOR-NJDOT proposes to transform State Highway Access management to reflect the planning areas and designated centers under the State Plan. Specifically, in place of the "urban" and "rural" delineations based on the decennial U.S. Census, DOT proposes to use corresponding planning area delineations and center designations (i.e., Urban = Planning Areas 1 & 2 and designated centers; Rural = Planning Areas 3, 4 & 5). DOT also uses a priority ranking for infrastructure improvements. Its evaluation instrument now emphasizes designated centers and incorporates SDRP poli-

cies in assessing system management and new capacity highway projects. In addition, the agency is working toward building other components of the SDRP in its evaluation processes, such as consideration of a municipality's ranking on the Office of Management & Budget's Municipal Distress Index, and multijurisdictional planning.

The Department's Bureau of Statewide Planning is working with intra-agency bureaus, such as Capital Policy and Programming, Local Highway Design, Traffic Engineering and Safety, and Transportation and Corridor Analysis, to ensure greater application of State Plan policies and strategies in their programming.

The Office of State Planning continues to provide collaborative support and technical assistance to the Department in designing programs to comply with federal Clean Air Act<sup>9</sup> standards and implement Scenic Byways programs.

New Jersey Transit is including a review of SDRP policies on all project-specific issues. The agency is also developing a "Handbook on Planning Transit-Friendly Communities," which incorporates the Plan's centers strategies. OSP provides support to NJT in the identification of transit corridors and site selection for station development and redevelopment.

*Department of Agriculture*~The State Agricultural Development Committee has incorporated provisions for consistency with the SDRP, as well as county and local plans, in its priority rat-

ing for farmland preservation areas. Soil conditions compatible with the Rural Planning Area (PA 4) criteria established in the State Plan are included among the SADC's selection criteria for the preservation program.

**Department of Community Affairs-** Communities applying to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for Community Development Block Grants are required to address consistency with the State Plan's goals, objectives, strategies and policies. Grant applicants to DCA's Neighborhood Preservation Program are also required to do so.

Under the direction of the Governor's Office of Policy and Planning, DCA is coordinating the federal Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community program, which closely mirrors the SDRP's Strategic Revitalization Plan and Program. As many as 12 New Jersey communities are developing strategic plans, which can serve as the blueprint for coordinated State agency support and financial assistance, as recommended in the State Plan.

**Treasury—**The State Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning is directed by legislation<sup>10</sup> to prepare an annual State Capital Improvement Plan that is consistent with the goals and provisions of the the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. This commission is responsible for submitting a capital budget to the Governor and Legislature by December 1 each year for their consideration. The Office of State Planning has reviewed and com-

mented on the fiscal 1995 capital budget submissions of 13 State agencies.

### **Regional Agencies**

#### ***Pinelands Commission--***

The State Planning Commission and the Office of State Planning have established a working relationship with the Pinelands Commission to ensure that the Plan's statewide priorities are sensitive to the Pinelands National Reserve. In addition, the Office and Pinelands Commission staff coordinate their efforts in order to ensure that the policy objectives of each management plan are mutually supportive and effectively applied in those areas with common boundaries.

#### ***Metropolitan Planning***

**Organizations--**Three metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) facilitate planning and capital program reviews under new federal mandates resulting from the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)<sup>11</sup> and the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. The MPOs are divided among the following regions: the South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization (SJTPO), covering Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland and Salem County; the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), an interstate compact with Pennsylvania planning for the New Jersey Counties of Burlington, Camden, Gloucester and Mercer Counties; and the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, which includes

# Fiscal Year 1994 ANNUAL REPORT

---

*"Population forecasts for the year 2010 range from 8,250,200 to 8,572,900. Employment (nonagricultural) for that same year ranges from 4,136,000" to 4,320,000". Housing need for the forecast period ranges from 430,850 new units (or 20,540 per year on average) to 542,425 (27,120 per year)."*

Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Sussex, Union and Warren Counties. Each MPO is required to develop a regional transportation plan; all are coordinating their plans in some measure with the provisions of the SDRP. The Office of State Planning is also now a member of the board of directors of the DVRPC.

## Statewide Housing Needs

A wide variety of population and employment forecasts exist for New Jersey in the year 2010. For this report, the Office of State Planning is using a range of numbers furnished by the Center for Urban Policy Research<sup>12</sup> in its 1992 impact assessment of the Amended Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan, and from the consulting firm of Urbanomics, \* which developed projections in 1994 under contract to the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Population forecasts for the year 2010 range from 8,250,200 to 8,572,900. Employment (nonagricultural) for that same year ranges from 4,136,000" to 4,320,000\*. Housing need for the forecast period ranges from 430,850 new units (or 20,540 per year on average) to 542,425 (27,120 per year). The latter housing need forecast was generated by OSP's Population and Employment Distribution Model using assumptions provided by NJDOT.

Statistics on dwelling units<sup>14</sup> authorized by building permits appear to be within this range since the State Plan's adoption:

### *dwelling units authorized*

1990	-	18,008
1991	-	14,777
1992	-	21,676
1993	-	24,549

In 1990, the Office of State Planning mapped a statewide inventory of developable land totaling 2,087,334 acres. The 1992 impact assessment projected that 117,000 acres would be needed by 2010 for development in patterns recommended by the State Plan.

The Office of State Planning continues to refine its research to discern the types of housing that will be needed in various regions of the State over the next 10 to 20 years. Its models anticipate household sizes and incomes, and the needs of school age and elderly populations. Scenarios for nonresidential development and land demand are also under development. This information will be available to municipalities in the routine review of their master plans and development ordinances to ensure that opportunities are provided meet the anticipated market demand. It will also be available to State, county and regional agencies to support their planning for the infrastructure needed to serve this development.



### Capital Needs

The State Planning Act requires the Commission to prepare and adopt an Infrastructure Needs Assessment as part of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The Assessment, published in 1992 along with the SDRP, identifies \$116 billion in infrastructure investments needed by the year 2010. More than half of this is required for local community needs, and nearly two-thirds of that total is needed to overcome existing deficiencies at municipal, county, regional and State investment levels. Over 40% of the total projected need was for roads, bridges and tunnels. Revenue projections for the same period amounted to \$96 billion, leaving a shortfall of \$20 billion. These infrastructure needs are based on trend development patterns.

Implementation of the State Plan offers an improved scenario. The Center for Urban Policy Research assessment of the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan concluded that implementation would lead to capital cost savings of \$700 million in roads, \$562 million in water supply, \$178 million in schools, and \$380 million annually in municipal and school district operating costs by 2010.

**Policy Simulation and Evaluation-** The 1989 amendments to the State Planning Act required an independent assessment of the State Plan, which is

described above. The amendments also required the State Planning Commission to establish a Monitoring and Evaluation program to gauge the Plan's success in achieving its goals and targets. The Monitoring and Evaluation program should consider variables pertaining to economic, environmental, infrastructure, community life and intergovernmental conditions.

The Office of State Planning is currently tracking some 30 indicators that support these variables. This data will be compiled and published in preparation for the second cycle of cross-acceptance, which is slated to begin in 1995.

**Policy Simulation Models—** The Office of State Planning has developed policy simulation models that can compute and display future population and employment distribution; infrastructure costs for roads, school buildings, and wastewater facilities; and municipal and school district operating costs. These models have been used by the New Jersey Department of Transportation and other governmental agencies, private non-profit groups and academic institutions since the adoption of the SDRP. Model refinements, which will deliver additional detail and will be linked to the in-house geographic information system (GIS), are advancing. The Office continues to offer significant technical assistance and data support to users at all levels of government.

*"The Center for Urban Policy Research assessment of the Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan concluded that implementation would lead to capital cost savings of \$700 million in roads, \$562 million in water supply, \$178 million in schools, and \$380 million annually in municipal and school district operating costs by 2010."*

*New Jersey State  
Planning Commission  
and Office of  
State Planning*

*Fiscal Year 1994*  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

---

**Public Education & Information**

Public participation and education are critically important components of any planning process — at the community, regional or statewide level. The State Planning Commission and Office of State Planning participate in hundreds of educational presentations and organizational meetings each year; from the annual meetings of groups like the New Jersey League of Municipalities and the NJ Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, to local planning board meetings and chapter sessions of the League of Women Voters. In addition, OSP publishes a newsletter, which is mailed to every municipality and county planning board, and other interested parties.

Continuing education for local planners can only enhance the attributes that each community can offer its citizens, and that the State as a whole can offer to residents, businesses and newcomers. The Commission and OSP are eager to support such efforts. Examples of these activities are highlighted below:

- ***Strategic Revitalization Works hop--for*** local officials involved in policy development or implementation. Twenty seven counties and municipalities were represented in this examination of the concept of strategic revitalization planning and its applications to local concerns and conditions. State agency participants were on hand to discuss how such plans would

improve their focus on local issues and needs. The Office of State Planning presented the workshop in partnership with Rutgers University and New Jersey Future.

- ***NJ Transit Training Course--for*** managers and planners at the State transit agency. The three-day seminar was organized to familiarize participants with the State Plan, local planning issues and their application to transit policy. It was sponsored by Rutgers University with Office of State Planning staff leading the discussion.

- \* ***Education for Planning Board Members*** -- Working with Brookdale Community College, Rutgers University, and the Monmouth County Planning Department, the Office of State Planning organized two-day continuing education course for local planners. Eighty-five participants discussed the relationship of the State Plan to local plans, emphasizing the need to broaden the local perspective to consider regional issues and the importance of local master planning.

In addition to these outreach efforts, the Office of State Planning has published over 100 technical papers, providing research findings and innovative techniques to support sound planning activities to practitioners and communities throughout the State ~ and in some cases — across the country.

### Budget

The appropriation for the State Planning Commission and the Office of State Planning for Fiscal 1994 was \$714,000, down from \$1.4 million in Fiscal 1993. The Department of Treasury allocated an additional \$270,000 in support. Contract work for the Pinelands Commission, New Jersey Department of Transportation and New Jersey DEPE, amounted to \$180,000 (described in greater detail below). In total, the fiscal 1994 budget for all State Planning Commission and Office activities was \$1,164,000.

Governor Whitman proposed a Fiscal 1995 budget of \$1.4 million. This appropriation was supported by the New Jersey Legislature in its budget bill.

### Inter-agency Contracts

The Office of State Planning supplemented its legislative appropriations by undertaking several projects and delivering products to several State agencies.

***Pinelands Commission--***  
Working with Pinelands Commission staff, the Office of State

Planning produced research papers on farmland preservation techniques and cumulative impacts of development. Mapping services, using OSP's GIS system, were also provided to the Pinelands Commission. (\$26,000)

***DOT--As*** detailed earlier in this report, staff conducted the planning study required to secure federal funding for Scenic Byways programming. In addition, the Office prepared municipal level forecasts of population, employment, household and household characteristics, based on DOT's regional forecasts. These have been used by to DOT in designing programs to comply with federal Clean Air Act mandates. (\$114,000)

***DEPE-Vnder*** contract to DEPE, staff has provided considerable resources to support that agency's revisions to proposed regulations governing development on the Coast. Area staff has been working with CAFRA staff to ensure that its proposals for new regulations reflect the appropriate State Plan policies, as required by the 1993 amendments to the CAFRA laws. (\$40,000)

*Fiscal Year 1994*  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

**End Notes**

1. N.J.S.A. 52:18A-196et.seq.
2. N.J.A.C. 17:32-8.1 et. seq.
3. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2:(d)(3)
4. N.J.A.C. 17:32-7.1-7.6
5. N.J.S.A. 52:270-301 et. seq.
6. N.J.S.A. 13:19-1 et. seq.
7. N.J.S.A. 13:19-17(b)
8. N.J.S.A.52:18A-206
9. Title 42 USC, Section 7401 et. seq.
10. N.J.S.A. 52:9S-3(a)
11. PI. 102-240, Dec. 18,1991
12. Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, Impact Assessment of the New Jersey Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan, Report 1.
13. Urbanomics, NJ Baseline Forecast for New Jersey Population and Labor Force by County (Unpublished).
14. New Jersey Department of Labor, "Residential Building Permits, 1992." (N.B. 1993 Data is preliminary.)

N.B. In July 1994, the name of the Department of Environmental Protection and Energy was changed to the Department of Environmental Protection,

## **Office of State Planning Staff**

**Herbert Simmens**

*Director*

**Charles P. Newcomb**

*Assistant Director, State Agency Coordination*

**Robert A. Kull**

*Assistant Director, Research*

**Elizabeth H. Guididas**

*Public Information Officer*

**Carol Schulz**

*Chief of Office Services*

**Diane Chepega**

*Graphics Coordinator*

### **Planning**

**Thomas G. Dallessio**

*Northwest Area Planning Manager*

**David J. Hojsak**

*Southwest Area Planning Manager*

**David K. Mask!**

*Northeast Area Planning Manager*

**William S. Purdie**

*Coastal Area Planning Manager*

**Teri Schlick**

*Special Assistant*

### **Research**

**William Bauer**

*Research Planner*

**James Reilly**

*Senior Research Planner*

**Steven Karp**

*Cartographer-GIS*

### **Administrative**

**Sheila Bogda**

*Secretarial Assistant*

**Carol Cavallo**

*Administrative Analyst*

**Sandy Giambrone**

*Secretarial Assistant*

**Mary House!**

*Executive Secretarial Assistant*

**Denise Johnson**

*Technician-MIS*

**Wendy Monk**

*Secretarial Assistant*

*New Jersey State  
Planning Commission  
and Office of  
State Planning*