Summary of Public Hearings and Comments on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan: NJ’s State Development & Redevelopment Plan (SSP)

(Last revised 11/09/2012)

Public Comment Opportunity Summary:

The State Planning Commission (SPC) approved the Draft Final SSP at its November 11, 2011 public meeting consistent with the State Planning Act and the State Planning Rules. The Office for Planning Advocacy (OPA) created and maintained a website for public information related to the Draft Final SSP. The SPC provided public notice of eight public hearings consistent with all statutory and regulatory requirements. The eight public hearings were held in Egg Harbor, West Long Branch, Morristown, Newark, Clayton, Mansfield, Toms River and Jersey City. Written public comment closed on 10/15/2012.

Total Comments Received on the Draft Final SSP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>General Support with Rec’d Improvements</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>General Opposition with Rec’d Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing Testimony*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that some individuals testified at numerous public hearings. These individuals were opposed or were generally opposed and recommended improvements to the Draft Final SSP prior to final adoption by the SPC. A small number of the public hearing testimonies could not be categorized as the commenter made no comments specific to the Draft Final SSP.

Total Written Comments Received 374
Total Public Hearing Testimonies 257
Total 631

Most Frequently Stated Reasons for General Support and Recommended Improvements:

- The Draft Final SSP is an improvement over the 2001 State Plan as the goals are clearer, the document is shorter and the focus on state agency coordination / alignment is long overdue.
• Support the discontinuation of the SPC Plan Endorsement process but would like some more details in the Final Plan on how proposed “scorecard” system would operate and how municipalities that have achieved SPC endorsement would be treated moving forward.

• Support balancing economic development with environmental protection priorities and see the identification of sectors of statewide importance and strategies to support the retention and expansion of them as good first steps that will require careful thought prior to implementation.

• More clarification is needed in terms of the application of municipal housing quotas under the Fair Housing Act.

• Generally support transition away from State Plan Policy Map as it can offer a true “bottoms up” approach within a statewide framework. Comments stated desire for more details in the Final Plan as to how the criteria-based system will be implemented and how it will interact with, for example, with DEP WQMP and CAFRA regulations moving forward. Several municipalities stated that they felt that the State Plan Policy Map that was agreed to during the last round of cross-acceptance should be adopted.

• Generally support a meaningful role for county governments in the state planning framework and are seeking more clarification in the Final Plan about the roles of various levels of government.

Most Frequently Stated Reasons for Opposition:

• The Draft SSP is a mechanism to implement United Nations Agenda 21 and will strip property owners of rights and will result in the loss of local control over land use decisions and individual control over where they choose to reside and work. Those commenting state that United Nations Agenda 21 is an international plot with the purpose of redistributing wealth from the United States to other nations. Disagree with the use of certain words like “sustainability” as they overlap with words from United Nations Agenda 21.

• The Draft SSP is too “top down” and results in another layer of bureaucracy.

• No State Plan should be adopted at all as all land use decisions should be made by private property owners and/or regulated exclusively at the municipal level.

• The Draft SSP does not protect private property rights.

• Not enough resident input went into the development of the Draft SSP. Additional public hearings should be scheduled, as many as one hearing per county.

• The Draft SSP does not do enough to protect the environment and as such, violates the State Planning Act. The State Planning Act is violated if an official “map” is not adopted as part of the Final Plan.

• The Draft SSP will violate the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan and the Highlands Regional Master Plan.

• The Draft SSP will work to block the use of Green Acres funding.

• Disagree with the characterization of the DEP Landscape Project.
Most Frequently State Reasons for General Opposition and Recommended Improvements:

- The narrative should be streamlined and avoid words that are not well defined. Include a glossary with terms and definitions.
- Economic development strategies should be weighted equally with environmental protection strategies.
- Language related to protecting the environment should mimic closely the language in the State Planning Act. Amend characterization of DEP Landscape Project.
- Less emphasis on “cities” and “urban centers”.
- Additional public hearings should be scheduled, as many as one hearing per county
- The Draft SSP should be clarified as to the role it plays in the Meadowlands, Pinelands and Highlands Regions.
- The Draft SSP should include a “transition” strategy from the State Plan Policy Map to the new criteria-based system.
- The Draft SSP does not protect private property rights. Consider including a “Property Rights Council” as a strategy to protect private property rights.

Written comments and public hearing testimony *generally* fell into the following four groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 – County and Municipal Governmental Units, State Agencies &amp; Commissions and Education-Based Institutions (38 written / 15 PH testimonies)</th>
<th>Group 2 – Planning Associations, Economic Development Associations, and Other Groups (29 written / 27 PH testimonies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3** – Environmental and Conservation Groups/Coalitions (226 written / 16 PH testimonies)</td>
<td>Group 4 – General Citizens and Other (77 written / 161 PH testimonies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**175 of the 226 written comments from Group 3 were auto-generated emails from the Sierra Club – NJ Chapter on behalf of individuals and included nearly identical language and focused on the following:**

The Sierra Club – NJ Chapter submitted on behalf of individuals auto-generated written comments during the public comment period that opposed the Draft SSP. The general email recommended that the State Planning Commission not adopt the Draft SSP as the revised and readopted State Development and Redevelopment Plan because of their belief that it does not meet the requirements of the State Planning Act and does not go far enough to protect the environment. Additional emails were customized.
Organizations providing Written Comments:

Group 1
The Pinelands Commission, New Jersey Meadowlands Commission, Arts Build Communities – Rutgers, Center for Sustainability Studies - Ramapo College, Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, Regional Center Partnership of Somerset County, Inc., Morris County Planning Board, Warren County Planning Department, Hudson County Planning, Monmouth County Park System, Salem County Department of Planning & Agriculture, Monmouth County Planning Board, Somerset County Planning Board, Somerset County Planning Board, Somerset County Planning Board, Bergen County Department of Planning and Economic Development, Middlesex County Department of Planning, Passaic County Agriculture Development Board, Mercer County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Township of Hardyston, Ridgefield Park Environmental Commission, Franklin Township (Somerset County), Township of Readington, City of Trenton, Township of Hanover, City of Vineland, Town of Newton, Township of Colts Neck, Township of Toms River, Lakewood Township

Group 2

Group 3

Public Hearing Testimony
A summary of each of eight public hearings is provided as Attachment 1 to this document. The testimony generally fell into the four groups referenced.

OPA recommends that the SPC concurrently release a “Questions and Answers – State Strategic Plan” document to, in simple terms, respond to questions received during the public comment process. See Attachment 2.

Attachments
1. Public Hearing Summaries
2. “Questions and Answers – State Strategic Plan” (Forthcoming)
Draft Final State Strategic Plan – Public Hearing Summary

The first public hearing convened on February 13, 2012, in Galloway Township, hosted by Stockton State College. The purpose of public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

**Resident:** Critical of Plan; considers it Agenda 21.
**Resident:** Not supportive of Plan; already overtaxed; SSP will add to burden.
**Resident:** The Plan is Agenda 21.
**Resident:** The data is skewed; this will lead to additional taxes; not supportive.
**Elected official/government:** Supportive of the SSP; Plan better than current Plan.
**Advocacy:** Supportive of Plan; glad that the Planning Area map gone, may need some maps like Sewer Services; challenge will be to encourage clustering while discouraging sewer service.
**Elected official/government:** Suggestion: Industry clusters should include AC and tourism.
**Resident:** Doesn’t see the incentives.
**Resident:** Suggestion: Would like to see more SPC members going on the road to get more community input.
**Resident:** Supports SSP.
**Resident:** No mention of private property rights.
**Resident:** Concerned with the 12 values of the plan and their source.
**Resident:** Concerned with Federal Government involvement.
**Resident:** The SSP doesn’t protect property rights.
**Resident:** Concerned with public private partnerships.
**Resident:** SSP is better than the current plan; should have more meetings.
**Resident:** Doesn’t think Plan will streamline government.
**Resident:** Plan is Agenda 21 and doesn’t protect property rights; Suggestion: Get an attorney to look at the Plan and revise it to protect property rights.
**Resident:** Has followed all the plans; no comments.
**Resident:** Supports targeted growth in plan. Will submit written comments.
**Resident:** Supports SSP focusing growth in targeted areas; but growth doesn’t equal social prosperity. Suggestion: We need to target growth.
**Resident:** Concerned with I capacity issues in limited growth and preservation areas.
**Resident:** Thinks SSP will supersede local planning decisions.
**Resident:** Made a connection to SSP and public housing.
**Resident:** Concern about decision making to fund new sewerage systems in SSP.
**Resident:** Critical of Plan; feels it an environment protection plan.
**Resident:** NJ is shrinking; concern about faulty environmental fears. Submitted written comments. Suggestion: The plan should be tabled until a full examination is conducted and all implications of the plan are studied in the public arena.
Elected official/government: Supportive of Plan; not sure if centers that expired previously will automatically return; concerned that center renewal process will be as costly as Plan Endorsement.

Resident: Plan just targets urban areas.
Resident: Concerned about criteria for limited investment and preservation areas.
Resident: Not supportive; believes the SSP is unconstitutional and conflicts with other acts like the Redevelopment Act. Suggestion: create a private property council.
Resident: Concerned the Plan sets up regional governments.
Resident: Plan is Agenda 21.

Elected official/government: Supportive of SSP: Plan directs state agencies to work together; economic development is not targeted to specific blocks and lots and recognizes that different parts of the state have different employment needs.
Resident: SSP should recognize the differences of regional needs.
Resident: $ should amend Plan based on comments.
Resident: Critical of process; not given enough time to digest Plan.
Resident: Against SSP: Plan doesn’t protect watersheds; doesn’t understand how open space will be accommodated in growth areas.
Resident: Critical of development patterns in the State.
Advocacy: Supportive of Plan; concerned about land protection.
Advocacy: Generally supportive. Suggestion: Add more protections for waterways; especially for local fishing industries.
Resident: Concern about contaminated sites in the State; Suggestion: The Plan needs more values that highlight the interconnected nature of the state.
Resident: Plan is weighted too much on the side of economic development. Suggestion: it needs to reflect environmental goals and not just economic goals.
Resident: The Plan is too one sided.
Resident: The regional idea is good.
Resident: Plan not balanced with environmental protection; local representation is missing from the plan.
Resident: Plan forces people to live in urban areas and town centers; crime, educational opportunities and poverty issues are not mentioned in the plan.
Resident: The plan is directed toward economic growth; no mention of rights of property owners.
Resident: Concerned about taxes.
Resident: Concerned about the recording of meetings.

Elected official/government: Plan is far superior to previous versions, especially the goals; targeting growth and creating jobs are important to creating vibrant regions; SSP recognizes every municipality and county is different while previous versions did not; encouraged by the creation of Departments functional plans.

Elected official/government: Supports Plan; it streamlines State government, making it more efficient so it benefits individuals, businesses and the environment.

Elected official/government: Endorsed SSP; recognizes NJ strengths; Plan offers choices; not enough money to pay for all that is needed; need to be strategic.
Resident: Has been asking for taxes to be better spent.
Resident: Suggestion: There should be 21 meetings, one in each county.
Resident: Critical of the Garden State Values; concerned with mixed-use development.
Resident: Concerned the Plan is going to force us to live in hubs; Plan is Agenda 21.
Resident: Plan is unconstitutional. Suggestion: There should be a few meetings held during the day.
Resident: Concerned with incentivizing local government, leads to corruption.
Resident: Plan doesn't protect property rights; encourages the use of eminent domain. Suggestion: The Plan needs specifics and should involve the Governor and Lt. Governor and law enforcement to address the corruption.
Resident: The adoption of Plan will lead to unintended consequences.
Resident: Meetings are not productive.
Resident: This is Agenda 21.
Resident: Concerned about property rights; Plan is Agenda 21.
Resident: Wants more information on criteria in growth areas.
Resident: Concerned how Plan will affect real estate values.
Resident: Plan unconstitutional.
Resident: Plan will override local zoning; concerned about eminent domain.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: Suggestion: Plan should be put on the ballot.
Resident: Plan protected the environment not personal rights.
Resident: Plan doesn't protect personal property rights; streamlining public agencies is good; Plan makes faulty assumptions; sprawl is not defined in the Plan.
Resident: Plan is top down plan; too broad; social engineering by telling people where to live.
Resident: Plan is too broad and needs a second look.
Resident: Feels Plan may be unconstitutional. Suggestion: have a citizen council/property rights council; hold more meetings.
Resident: Inaudible.
Advocacy: Supportive of Plan; it promotes shared benefits when investing in infrastructure in the proper places.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: The Plan is unconstitutional.
Resident: Plan doesn't protect personal property rights.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: Streamlining government is good; Plan needs to outline Department functional plans.
Resident: Repeat of above.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: Plan isn't clear on how Regional entities will effect local decisions. Suggestion: The SSP should be put on the ballot for the people to decide.
Resident: Critical of Plan; State not able to successfully implement SSP.
Resident: Didn't understand the need for the SSP.
Resident: Criteria for growth areas need to be defined.
Resident: Plan jeopardizes personal property rights.
Resident: Plan needs to be constitutional.
Resident: Inaudible.
Resident: Inaudible.
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

This Plan includes provisions basing the decision on whether to approve a development on the presence of a sewage system. Areas without an existing sewage system will not have development approved unless a sewage system is planned.

This raises two issues.

First, historically development preceded the installation of sewers. Only when the tax base could support a municipal sewage plant, lines, and pumps could the project be bonded and built. I lived for my high school and college years in a house that had originally had a septic tank, and was put on the municipal system a decade or more later. Requiring a sewage system to be in place first may shut down development permanently, or make it impossible for new communities to start without the sort of massive investment that only government can provide. Government’s record in building communities is not very good. How many public housing projects have been dynamited? And yet still the planners continue, hoping to get it right next time, oblivious to the wreckage they create: wreckage of lives, wreckage of families, wreckage of societies.

Next, given that a sewage system can be bonded and funded, who decides whether a sewage system may be built? This decision rests in the hands of government authorities that are, by design, sensitive to environmental issues. And thus they are sensitive to the voices of the Environmental movement and the well-funded Environmental Lobby. This movement is opposed to development on principle, regardless of the needs of people.

A final word on the Environmental movement: while the Press is not repeating it very often, please remember that the whole Global Warming alarm was raised on the foundation of fraudulent data and fraudulent analysis. Billions of dollars have been diverted from other uses to answer an alarm that turned out to be not fact, but the desires of interests so special that they can’t even be called Special Interests.

As a plan for the governance of the people of New Jersey, this plan is fatally flawed. I urge that this Plan be tabled until it can be fully analyzed in the public arena, as the Global Warming data was not. Only then can We The People of New Jersey adequately pass judgement on it.

Mark Terribile
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Questions?
Contact: GEORGE A. GALLENTHIN III, Esq.
EMAIL: [email protected]
MAIL: [redacted], Woodbury, NJ 08096
CALL: [redacted] FAX: [redacted]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone and E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lefkof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Manahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRMPA M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ellenboug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Garcia/student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maissa Mahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebele Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRZ, D H LSP</td>
<td>EMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft Final State Strategic Plan Public Hearing

Monday, February 13, 2012, 6:00 pm  
Richard Stockton College, Campus Center Theatre  
101 Vera King Farris Drive, Galloway, NJ 08205-9441

**PRESS SIGN-IN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone and E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin Dzienke</td>
<td>11 Deming Lane, Bensalem, PA</td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Struble &amp; Co</td>
<td>11 Deming Lane, Bensalem, PA</td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javed Vezir</td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryk Blackon</td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Redacted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second public hearing convened on February 16, 2012 in Gloucester County Clayton Complex, Gloucester County, hosted by County of Gloucester. The purpose of the public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

**Resident:** The SSP provides a great opportunity to rejuvenate planning in the State. Submitted written comments.

**Resident:** Supports the SSP. She's a former planner. This Plan is short, practical and in line with the State Planning Act. Wants to eliminate the farmland assessment program. State must address property taxes.

**Resident:** Opposed the Plan because he sees it as more government in our lives. Government doesn't do anything right. The newspapers are all liberal.

**Advocacy:** We need a State Plan. The SSP, at this point, is too vague. Does not agree with eliminating the State Plan Map. The Plan should dictate where growth should and shouldn't go. The SSP may allow fast tracking of questionable projects.

**Resident:** Wants to know why so few people are attending these hearings. Provided written comments. Suggestion: more meetings.

**Resident:** Doesn't like, nor does she trust the terms social, economic, environmental justice. Thinks this is an Agenda 21 Plan.

**Advocacy:** The SSP Plan is not a Plan. Believes the Plan will result in sprawl and loss of farmland. Does nothing to stimulate growth in the centers. Plan does not take into account water supply capacity. Provided written comments.

**Resident:** Doesn't understand how the Plan doesn't force people to live or work where they don't want.

**Resident:** Wants one Freeholder from each county to sit on the SPC. Complained that he can't vote in the town where he owns land because he doesn't reside there. This is connected to Agenda 21. The Democrats are passing bad legislation.

**Elected official/government:** Supports the Plan. Wants counties like Salem County to be included in Priority Growth Areas. Agricultural areas need protection. Ports are important areas for growth. Brownfields should be the focus of development also.

**Advocacy (Planning Group):** Compliments the Administration on focusing planning on economic growth. The Plan needs more specifics. Submitted written comments.

**Resident:** Doesn't like affordable housing programs. Doesn't want housing to be part of the SSP.

**Advocacy:** State Planning is difficult. Environment, especially water, is critical to New Jersey. Wants to see in the Plan that NJ will have enough clean water for everybody. The language in the SSP is too vague. Must protect recharge areas.

**Advocacy:** The SSP will result in sprawl and overdevelopment. Will be used to override environmental regulations and regional planning. The SSP can be used to justify development anywhere. Will impact water quality. Submitted written comments.

**Resident:** Likes the SSP and the alignment of State agencies. Growth Areas need to be clearly defined. Suggestion: need map
Resident: Some good things in the SSP. Would rather have kept the old Plan and improved it. This is a Plan to Plan. Would like to keep planning areas. Likes the coordination of State agencies. Should use landscape project data.

Resident: Concerned about private property rights. Does not like the HUD grant. Doesn't want local government to cede their authority to the State.

Advocacy: Likes parts of the SSP, but wants more protections for the environment. Disagrees that the landscape project data is flawed. Suggestion: restore the map in the Plan.

Resident: Wants protections for private property rights. Doesn't like the term "sustainability." Likes parts of the SSP, in particular, the alignment of State agencies. Thinks the SSP is a top down plan.

Resident: Thinks that sustainability is a concept that came from another country.
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Questions?
Contact: GEORGE A. GALLENTHIN III, Esq.
EMAIL: [redacted]
MAIL:  [redacted]
CALL: [redacted]
FAX: [redacted]
COMMENTS ON THE 2012 DRAFT STATE PLAN
FEBRUARY 2012

The new emphasis on strategic planning presents an important opportunity to re-energize the State Planning process. New tactics and new strategies are needed to infuse this the process with the vitality it has lacked during the past decade, a time when paralysis has characterized planning functions at the State level.

Examples abound.

Wastewater management planning has been crippled by overly detailed rules, micro-management of service area boundaries and a lack of funding.

Planning for affordable housing is mired in the Courts.

Efforts to achieve efficient land use patterns have failed, we use more land per housing unit then we did prior to the adoption of the current State Plan.

The State has experimented with a number of implementation measures, centers designation, plan endorsement, the big map, none of these programs have achieved much besides generating reports.

These measures all suffer from the same fatal flaw; they failed to make a realistic assessment of the capacity and resources required for their implementation. Wastewater management planning isn't impossible, we had a viable system for it back in the 1980's based on rules that recognized existing planning, engineering and administrative capabilities. The second round housing rules were flawed but implementable; the third round rules have collapsed under the weight of procedures, mandates, and reporting requirements.
Strategic planning could provide a remedy, a State Plan that fosters policies, plans and regulations that reflect a realistic appraisal of implementation capacity. We could have:

- Rules with achievable outcomes, and plans that adhere to statutory timelines.
- Programs and that recognize the constraints imposed by the economies, development technologies, and the capacity of local governments.
- A State Plan that provides workable and realistic guidelines for the policies it promotes.

The draft State Plan list five Guiding Principles for State Decision Making ".

A sixth should be added that states:

- Implementation capacity: State Planning measures and policies should reflect a realistic assessment of the fiscal, technical and administrative capacity of the public and private sector entities that will be engaged in their implementation.

The application of this principle would provide a means to avoid the gridlock that now mars both the New Jersey State Plan process and many other State planning efforts.

James A. Miller, AICP, PP

Moorestown, N. J. 08057
Good evening. My name is Cheryl Reardon and I am the South Jersey Bayshore Project Director for the Association of NJ Environmental Commissions and also serve as the Project Manager for the South Jersey Bayshore Coalition (www.sjbayshore.org).

Our organizations appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft State Development and Redevelopment Plan, especially with regard to its impact on the southwestern portion of the state.

The Draft Final State Plan is not a Plan. It lacks most of the critical components necessary to plan for continued growth in New Jersey. While it may fuel growth in new places, the majority of this growth will result in negative impacts that will diminish New Jersey's economic viability and cost NJ's taxpayers millions.

This Draft Plan's sole strategy for preserving NJ's remaining prime agricultural lands is through outright acquisition, but suggests no means to raise the money for such acquisition. It sets no PLAN to limit growth in agricultural or non-growth areas – a death sentence for our farms in the "Garden State" – especially in the South Jersey region.

Agri business jobs are long-term, good paying jobs that have fueled South Jersey's economy and Main Street businesses for generations. How many of our prime agricultural lands can be lost to unmanaged sprawl before the Garden State reaches the tipping point when agricultural jobs and businesses are no longer sustainable... yet another NJ industry lost?

This Draft Plan clears the path for new development across much of NJ's remaining farm fields and forests, essential to food and water supply, but it does nothing to stimulate growth in the many existing town centers and urban areas that are sadly rotting away. These town centers have the necessary infrastructure in place and are crying for re-development.
The main question we must ask is WHY this Plan... and WHY now? Do we need to stimulate building of new homes? NJ is currently over-stocked with homes sitting on the market – many vacant. Many have been on the market for months, and even years. With each passing month, their owners watch values further depreciate... and more homes come on the market decreasing their chance of saleability. This plan offers nothing to the owners of these homes.

Is NJ suffering from a deficit of warehousing, manufacturing and commercial space? Certainly not. Driving North to South, East to West across NJ, you see vacant warehouses, industrial and commercial spaces vacant along major transportation routes. Industrial parks across the state look like ghost towns.

Take a stroll down Main Streets and town centers across our state and you will see vacant storefronts and shopping centers with their anchor stores gone and vacancy rates over 50%.

Again, WHY this Plan... and WHY now? To stimulate construction more homes, warehouses, industrial and commercial spaces in new growth centers will certainly only add to glut of vacancies in existing developed areas and deprecate values even further. The Plan offers no strategies to encourage redevelopment or infill in areas with existing infrastructure. This is not a sound economic plan at any level. Who benefits from this plan... certainly not existing home and business owners.

NJ taxpayers continually deal with the devastating impacts of being the most densely populated State. Even here in rural South Jersey, we have coped with massive flooding caused by unsustainable sprawl and inappropriate development of areas upstream. Area roads and bridges are still closed due to damage and washouts from the last hurricane. To allow development in inappropriate places will certainly add to more flooding... costing taxpayers more money.

This draft Plan does not take into consideration the fundamental element to good planning... WATER supply and quality. Development in inappropriate places paves over critical recharge areas and allows overdraining on already compromised aquifers.

At even greater risk is Salem County's prime agricultural lands that sustain some of NJ's most thriving farms and agri-businesses. A proposed wastewater treatment plan would have the DuPont Plant in Salem County serve as a wastewater treatment facility. Existing sewer plants throughout Salem County would be converted to pumping stations connecting to DuPont for final treatment and disposal into the Delaware River.
The wastewater proposal would run sewer lines from southern Gloucester County throughout Salem County ultimately connecting to DuPont.

Pilesgrove Twp, where I served as a Township Committeewoman and Planning Board member, serves as an example of the consequences of poor planning. With Woolwich Twp, the fastest growing municipality in New Jersey, on its Northern border, Pilesgrove's prime agricultural lands have been under aggressive residential development pressure for over ten years. Woolwich had been a thriving agricultural area prior to the last residential development boom when its ag lands were converted to housing developments. Now, rows of those homes sit vacant.

To avoid the same fate, Pilesgrove's voters approved a dedicated tax to preserve agriculture and necessary open spaces. Pilesgrove spent tens of thousands of dollars on its Farmland/Open Space Preservation Plans, Water Quality Management Plan and Master Plan revisions that met State requirements in the former State Plan.

However, this draft Plan, coupled with the proposed DuPont plan, would bring miles of sewer pipeline through Pilesgrove Twp to connect adjacent Woodstown Borough's existing treatment plant to DuPont.

Residential developers will be targeting agricultural lands within several municipalities along the sewer line path heading to DuPont. Decades of work and thousands of taxpayer dollars protecting agriculture, agri-business would be flushed through the sewer lines as farmlands convert to large housing developments... more roads, more schools, more services... and more taxes!

This Draft Plan is not effective at any level – and certainly not economically.

New Jersey needs a strong, cohesive State Plan that provides a common vision, policy and clear implementation strategy across the state and between levels of government.

New Jersey needs a plan that discourages development that does NOT make sense. A plan that provides for redevelopment of our existing decaying town centers. New Jersey needs a plan that promotes reuse of abundant vacant warehouse and industrial spaces.
New Jersey needs a plan that protects investments already made.

New Jersey needs a Plan that includes the fundamental tools to chart a sustainable course and not fuel more sprawl and degradation that will cost NJ taxpayers millions in unending tax increases.

Thank you.
Good evening. My name is Matt Blake and I represent the American Littoral Society's Delaware Bay Program.

This is not a State Plan, in a state that needs a State Plan.

State planning should: Provide a predictable, unifying and common vision, policy and implementation strategy across the geography of the state and between levels of government, as well as between the public and private sectors, across a range of issues of importance to us as a state.

The proposed Strategic Plan doesn’t meet this “test” primarily because it is by design a work in progress: meant to be added to by “regional entities” on the go. For example, the detailed plans on agency implementation are not slated to be developed for 3 years.

In a state more densely populated than Japan, with more pavement than forest, and more polluted rivers than any other state, we shouldn’t be replacing the urgency for critical state planning with even more delay unless we’re willing to accept a diminished quality of life, lowered standard of living and prosperity for our residents and children.

In the absence of basic safeguards, unmanaged growth forces higher property taxes and other costs onto the public. The negative environmental impact lowers the value of our properties, while sprawl has destroyed more rural economies in this state than any other factor.

The proposed “criteria-based approach” is not a plan, because it is not predictable for either local government or the public, and this is only exacerbated by the repeal of the current State Plan map and the lack of analysis of the capability of the state, and regions to support growth for such essential public resources as critical wildlife habitats, available water supply, roads and wastewater treatment.

You need a map that everybody can follow that tells you where it makes sense to grow and where it doesn’t. For all its imperfections, the existing plan and map did this, and now we have nothing, but a vision statement that emphasizes development over all other critical considerations.

The proposed Strategic Plan fails to identify obvious and long-accepted tools needed anticipate, evaluate and make decisions around critical issues with some level of confidence in the outcome, and that just sets
the stage for more chaos, more lawyers, more inefficiency and waste at all levels. This glaring absence of any land use controls will only facilitate more costly sprawl development, which before the recession was eating up over 16,000 acres of precious remaining working farmland and forests per year. That’s not sustainable because NJ is rapidly running out of available land and clean water.

If one thing is true in NJ, it’s that tax increases always follow suburbanization. Unless the plan honestly works to reverse consumptive land use patterns, in a few short decades there won’t be any countryside or rural heritage left in this state, while more and more communities pay higher taxes to subsidize bad development decisions to profit a few developers.

Land use decisions in NJ need a map; the repeal of which shifts the debate of where growth should or shouldn’t go from the existing and transparent public forums of (Cross Acceptance and local Plan Endorsement) to behind closed doors. Moreover, the criteria and approaches as proposed can rationalize almost any decision to add growth areas or direct state taxpayer funds to an industry: be it a so-called Redevelopment Zone in pristine farmland, or sending sewers into areas where municipalities propose conservation.

The existing State Plan map took years of costly back and forth compromise to produce. Now the state wants new mapping; the problem seems to to not be with having a map, but in using one that will be opposed by developers who don’t want the science to show where urban levels of growth should and shouldn’t go. To ignore the decades of sound science and GIS-based mapping technology produced by the DEP, simply shows a fundamental bias towards economic development over all other reasonable considerations: be it water supply or critical habitat for our nation’s symbol, the bald eagle.

No map, no capacity analysis, no comprehensive evaluation of where growth should go and how much – again, no predictability. This is not a plan but a cover for getting such key state planning tools as WQMP, Coastal Rules (CAFRA), State Water Supply Plan and Landscape Project.

On paper, the Strategic Plan recognizes how protecting the environment is essential to protecting the economy, but in reality, it fails to provide the necessary growth management tools needed to ensure that protection.

We’ve only preserved about half of the 500,000 acres of NJ’s best-remaining farmland that is essential to maintaining the economic viability of agriculture. You’re never going to preserve all that farmland, so you need a map to identify priorities, plus tools to make sure it happens.

The prior State Plan and Map took us in this direction: it’s not only critical to determining where to target limited preservation dollars, but to discouraging sewers and other growth-relating projects that undermines the public’s investments.

You can’t ask the public to support preservation, and then ask it to subsidize sending costly public sewers into the very areas another state agency or town is trying to protect – that’s the epitome of dumb growth and government working at cross-purposes.

With only 1 million acres left to work with, we need to be more efficient and make better decisions about growth and preservation less we burn through what little available land remains.

Our Region is expected to increase in population by 83% by 2100 (the end of this century). What is the state doing to assure water supply and food security for the millions to come?
Why hasn’t the state released the long-completed new draft State Water Supply Plan? This plan should provide a key basis for decisions about growth and wastewater planning. The 1996 plan shows that much of this region is already in water supply deficit, and we understand the updated plan shows an even more dire analysis of water supply in the region.

Yet, the Strategic Plan fails to recognize water supply as a limiting factor to growth in many areas of the state. How can you designate growth zones without first doing the necessary capacity analysis?

Under the Strategic Plan as written, it seems that projects like the proposed Gloucester-Salem Regional Wastewater Plan would be fast-tracked without any consideration to significantly increased demand on water resources in a region already designated for water supply deficit. That’s planning in vacuum.

Proponents of this plan want to send sewer lines to DuPont through rural Salem County to foster growth in the region. By sending all that treated wastewater out into the Bay instead of recharge to area streams and ground water as currently practiced, the existing water supply deficit will become a water supply crisis as streams and wetlands, as well as residential and agricultural wells go dry.

The “vision” section is dominated by economic development

The worthy goal of targeting the state’s financial support of specific priority economic sectors does not justify removing other balancing policies, sound local planning or having economic development at all costs be the only “real” policy.

We’ve learned the hard way time and again why the State also needs to protect its citizens from environmental poisons and reckless land use patterns that degrade and diminish available water supplies or put people at increased risk from increased flooding.

Reliance on land acquisition and local TDR to manage growth impacts will not be sufficient to protect the best of what remains, or our fisheries and water supplies. TDR could be a great tool for reconciling landowner equity with the equally important goal of protecting land, water, fisheries and food. But thus far, this tool is only being talked about and so offers little substance.

Land acquisition is not sufficient to provide the level of protection needed. Moreover, if piecemeal preservation efforts were enough, then Barnegat Bay wouldn’t be degraded to a point where you can’t swim in it. There are very real costs associated with not protecting the environment – just ask any waterman in Barnegat Bay who saw the hard clam industry collapse after two decades of unbridled development in Pinelands turned the Bay into a polluted bathtub. Over 900 working jobs in the shellfish industry lost.

We’ve had preservation since the early 1960s, but in a state where most of the land gets developed, you need real tools that will direct intensive growth away from our wetlands, waterways and prized open spaces lest we simply export the same problems that ruined one bay to another. I live along the Delaware Bay and can tell you most people in our region don’t want to look like the rest of New Jersey; they want to preserve their rural lifestyle and community character which this plan does nothing to protect.

Benjamin Franklin once said, “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” If anything, planning is about avoiding the mistakes of the past in order to make better decisions about the future. It will cost millions to fix Barnegat Bay: costs borne by the public, which could have been avoided had the State applied a little conservative precautionary principle and looked at the big picture (growing and protecting the shore-based economy and water resources for recreation and commercial fisheries) instead of giving developers’ a free pass to pave over a region so crucial to our coast.
Not does the so-called “Vision” seek to better integrate local municipal government – the focus on state government consistency is worthwhile, but incomplete given acknowledged importance of local land use decisions. Sprawl development and its impact on local taxes, property values, quality of life and environment come from bad haphazard local planning from 566 municipalities with no unifying vision: this must be addressed.

Recognize the Coast, Shore and Delaware Bayshore as regions of special, statewide significance and in need of restoration and protection

The coast, and the watersheds connected to its rivers, bays and ocean front should be recognized as a “region” and regional planning fostered specific to the challenges and special nature of the Shore.

The businesses and industries related to the Shore should be recognized as a priority for the state to support through protection of the environment on which they depend: no clean water, no beach season. It is the same with the regions’ large, yet ever shrinking agricultural areas: no farms, no food.

Require that the coast be protected in local and regional land use planning and economic development

Again, there are existing statutory directives to protect the coast and coastal resources; these need to be integrated into the proposed SSP as a priority.

The SSP recognizes the need to protect land and water based industries but fails to recognize the need to protect the land to protect them

We need environmental protection of water quality, quantity and the parts of the landscape that act as the “green infrastructure” for tourism, recreational and commercial fishing and other businesses at the foundation of the Shore economy

The SSP calls for “honest conversations about the strengths and weaknesses of regions” – at the Shore, along the coast, this requires understanding how fragile, and currently impacted the region is: we need to push for restoration of places like Barnegat Bay and protection of the Delaware Bay, not replicating the same costly mistakes that made the shore so much less than what it was to our parents and could be again.

Thank you!
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

This Plan will affect residents and landowners across New Jersey. There are about 8.8 million residents, of whom probably four to five million are adults.

If the other five halls are of similar size, fewer than 2,000 people will be able to attend. That's one twentieth of one percent of the people who may be affected. If one percent of the people whose life will be changed by this plan were to attend, there would be lines out the door, and traffic would be backed up out to the roads. With just four percent, the crowd would fill Met Life stadium. One percent would fill the NJ Performing Arts Center largest hall 58 times over.

Why are so few people in attendance? Are they unconcerned? Are they concerned but unable to come? Or are they unaware?

Can they get here? These meetings are scheduled for workday evenings. People who come home from work may not be able to get home and get here in time. That especially affects working parents. For many parts of the state, it will take most of an hour to reach one of the meetings during rush hour. For many people, attending a meeting will mean leaving work early, and some people will have to take vacation or personal time to do that.

Do people know about the Plan and these meetings? My experience, in speaking to people to publicize it, is that do not. It has received virtually no media coverage, and thus has not been part of the public debate. One might even think that this was the intent, since public debate is a messy thing that often disrupts the neat plans of administrators.

Even assuming that our Press cares to publicize the matter, the nation is embroiled in a hotly contested national election and a national debate about the future of our country. For the next none or ten months there will be no space in the newspapers or the electronic media for this debate.

On these grounds alone, this planning process ought to be delayed for a year. Generations to come will be affected by this Plan. We can afford to wait a year to hold a true open debate, and we can afford to spend another year engaged in that debate.

Anything less risks governing without the informed consent of the governed.

Mark Terribile
Aberdeen, NJ
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Draft Final State Strategic Plan – Public Hearing Summary

The third public hearing convened on February 23, 2012 in Newark, hosted by North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority. The purpose of public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

Advocacy: SSP doesn’t address capacity issues with regards to both drinking water and sewer service; process removes local participation for water allocation; concerned that SSP supersedes local Master Plan protection of water sheds.

Resident: Critical of Plan; SSP is social engineering and a threat to personal property rights; concerned that Plan takes away local decision making and is a top-down approach; concerned that it forces affordable housing where it’s not needed; Suggestion: define terms.

Resident: SSP is implementing Agenda 21; no protection of personal property rights; Plan encourages State/Federal partnership that has yet-to-be-realized negative consequences.

Elected official/government: Supportive of SSP; Plan recognizes importance of Counties involvement; encouraged by criteria based opportunities; process was transparent; supportive of moving away from Plan Endorsement; thought the SSP promoted a positive interdependence between jobs and housing.

Resident: SSP doesn’t address road congestion/capacity; Plan is a subversion of personal property rights and is Agenda 21; Suggestion: Plan should encourage the expansion of the road networks throughout the State.

Resident: Critical of Plan: meeting is a farce, outcome predetermined; SSP is Agenda 21; no economic benefit to most NJ residents; SSP is a top-down plan and dictates land use and local decision making in the development process; Plan is social engineering; Suggestion: More public hearings, create a plan to promote jobs.

Advocacy: Supportive of SSP; Clusters approach good for businesses; Plan is all about job creation; supports Garden State Values; plan fosters positive business values by promoting State agency cooperation; Suggestion: stay the course.

Resident: Plan does not lower taxes; Garden State Value #6 is Agenda 21; Plan jeopardizes private property rights; Suggestion: Alternative language to support private property rights.

Resident: SSP doesn’t protect environment and agriculture lands enough; Suggestion: Better language to support preservation of both agriculture and environmentally sensitive lands.

Advocacy: SSP not ready for adoption; criteria needs to be development, especially with public input; plan needs to promote education of local and State officials on land use; Counties need to be involved; SSP doesn’t address relationship between property taxes, home rule, development and the ratable chase; Suggestion: Plan should address affordable housing.
**Advocacy:** Plan doesn’t address criteria or incorporate capacity analysis in growth areas; SSP promotes spending public money in areas not suited for growth; not enough public involvement; SSP vague.

**Resident:** Critical of SSP, considers it a top down approach; Plan adds another layer of bureaucracy in State government, doesn’t protect personal property rights and is vague; Suggestion: More meetings.

**Resident:** Supportive of SSP; agency coordination is positive step; Plan positively recognizes Counties as a relevant partner in the planning process.

**Resident:** Plan creates false market choices and isn’t fair, not everyone wants to live in cities; SSP is an assault on private property rights.

**Resident:** SSP is invasive. Suggestion: define sustainable development; create a watchdog agency to balance personal property rights.
Good evening. My name is Robert Bzik, Director of Planning for the Somerset County Planning Board. I am here tonight to provide comments and the County’s perspective on the Final Draft State Strategic Plan.

Before doing so, I would like to point out that Somerset County has a long history of being a leading advocate of a workable and effective state planning framework for economic growth, quality communities and environmental preservation.

We have led three consecutive rounds of Cross acceptance and facilitated over 13 Center petitions in Somerset County including spearheading the first tri-municipal Regional Center petition and preparing the only countywide Redevelopment Report.

We have been actively engaged in the stakeholder meetings leading up to the release of the Draft Final State Strategic Plan, and appreciate the frequent interaction that has occurred between county planners statewide and OPA staff.

Somerset County is also in the process of updating its own “Sustainable Somerset” Strategic Master Plan, and is supporting the preparation of a Comprehensive Economic development Strategy Plans (CEDS). Currently, we are working closely with our municipalities to successfully apply the criteria-based Priority Investment Area Framework envisioned in the State Strategic Plan.

We would like to applaud the Governor and Lt. Governor for their leadership and support for revamping the State Planning Process, as well as the Office of Planning Advocacy and the State Planning Commission for making this renewed State Planning effort happen. First and foremost, the County strongly supports is the overall shift in the approach to State
Planning from a top-down directive placed on local governments to one that emphasizes the horizontal alignment of state agencies with state planning goals. *(This one sentence alone is why New Jersey needs a State Strategic Plan).* Other numerous policy shifts the County strongly supports include:

- Repositioning OPA within the Sec. of State’s Office lead by the Lt. Governor, so it has stronger visibility and increased authority within state government;

- Aligning OPA with the New Jersey Action Center so it can better carry out one of its core tenants of "enhancing opportunities for the attraction and growth of industries of statewide importance" and "prioritizing redevelopment, the re-use and remediation of existing sites and structures";

- Emphasizing the importance of building upon the state’s infrastructure and locational assets through a criteria-based approach to identifying Priority Investment Areas;

- Recognizing the need for a dedicated and sustainable source of funding for natural, agriculture, scenic, recreation and historic resources so counties like Somerset can continue its highly successful preservation programs; and

- Encouraging vertical planning integration through incentives, rather than mandates, respecting home rule and recognizing the need for planning at an appropriate scale which is led at the appropriate jurisdictional level – be it state, county or local;

While there are numerous policy shifts and elements of the Plan the County supports, we believe that the Draft Final State Strategic Plan could be further strengthened by providing greater clarity in some sections and expanding others. We intend to submit detailed written comments in a few weeks, but I will provide a few of our key recommendations at this time:

- One area in the Plan that Somerset County feels could be improved is recognizing the historical role counties have played with interacting with their municipalities, not only during cross acceptance, but a score of other planning programs ranging from farmland to open
space preservation, wastewater management and capital programming. The State plan should clarify the role of counties in continuing this vertical coordination of planning and empower and encourage counties to work in concert with state agencies to achieve mutual planning goals.

- Counties, on a voluntary basis, should also be the entities to verify the accuracy of any GIS based data sets associated with Priority Growth and Priority Preservation Investment Areas and lead efforts in coordination with their municipalities to advance the completion of Priority Growth and Priority Preservation Areas. Both growth and preservation should be on equal footing and a set of workable and effective incentives and target milestones outlined in the Plan.

- In order to improve the transparency of the process for achieving the horizontal alignment of state agencies, the County recommends that the guidelines for preparing State Agency Strategic Plans be appended to the State Plan and be subject to public review and comment prior to being applied. The Guiding Principles for State Decision making should serve as general framework for these state agencies guidelines, but should also be expanded to emphasize the efficient use of public dollars at all levels of government.

- We also support moving away from the time-consuming and unyielding Plan Endorsement process to a voluntary scorecard system to further award municipalities for aligning local and state planning goals. This process should only be undertaken after the Criteria – Based Priority Investment Framework is established for the State, and the State has demonstrated successful horizontal integration of state agencies plans, programs and activities.

- Lastly, Somerset County feels the Plan could better recognize the independence between an adequate labor supply that matches the needs of local businesses and industry and the importance of having a high quality, diverse and affordable housing stock.

We are grateful for this opportunity to provide some brief comments and look forward to providing more detailed recommendations and working with the Office of Planning Advocacy and the State Planning Commission moving forward. We want to keep the Planning momentum going and hope
the State will take the time to build the necessary partnerships particularly at the County level and empower us to carry the message.

Respectfully Submitted
Robert Rzik, AICP/PP
1. Introduce Self – Jeffrey E. Grant
   a. Licensed engineer and business man, born in NJ and a resident of NJ for most of my life.

2. Give outline of my remarks
   b. Proposed plan shortcomings.
   c. Guiding Principles – Sustainability
   d. Guiding Principles – Institutionalizing Change
   e. Wealth
   f. Garden State Values
   g. Conclusion.

3. From experience in analyzing similar language contained in the "Sustainable Somerset: The Strategic Plan for Somerset County Draft Updated Vision, Guiding Principles and Planning Objectives" the Proposed Plan has much of the same new and strange terminology that can and will result in many potentially different interpretations and therefore outcomes. I point this out because I have first-hand experience analyzing documents like the Proposed Plan for what they really are.
   a. The challenge in understanding documents like the Proposed Plan is that there is an immense gap between what the words mean and what the compilations of the words and sentences mean and what the outcome of implementing the plan might be. This is because there are numerous words that have meanings that can be interpreted in many different ways and phrases and statements that when coupled together leads one to see only what they might be inclined to visualize. The result being that the Proposed Plan fails to universally communicate its intentions.
   b. Specifically a critical shortcoming of the Proposed Plan is that there is no map illustrating the land use vision, transportation systems transformation and energy systems re-development that are advanced in the plan. Also there is no organizational chart showing the structure and responsibilities of existing and proposed agencies that will oversee or otherwise be involved in the Proposed Plan. For this and other reasons, because of its failure to convey these details, the Proposed Plan is a non-starter.
4. The paramount concern throughout New Jersey, and the Proposed Plan is no exception, is the subversion of Private Property rights and land wealth through the application United Nations Agenda 21 principles through its advancement of new and strange concepts of environmental justice and social equity.

   a. If you examine Page 5 of the plan – under the category of "Guiding Principles for State Decision Making" there are five criteria. One of them is:

      i. Sustainability – The State of NJ will plan for and respond to current and future challenges and opportunities through adaptive decision making that accounts for social, economic and environmental protection and enhancement.

      ii. What is Sustainability? Can anyone on the Board please define this term for me?

      iii. Coincidentally, the tenants of United Nations Agenda 21 are Sustainability as measured by the three "E's":
         1. Equity as in social equity.
         2. Environment as in environmental justice.
         3. Economy

      iv. It is no coincidence that the Proposed Plan does not say a single word about UN Agenda 21 its key tenants of Sustainability and the three E's are threaded throughout the entire plan.

      v. This Proposed Plan is United Nations Agenda 21 and that is a very bad thing for the state of New Jersey and therefore should be scrapped and started anew using a democratic process not what appears to be a pipe dream utopia cooked up by bureaucrat planners and elected officials that do not understand that they are being "had" by enviro-radicals and socialists.
b. Also, the last guiding principle in this group of five is:
   i. Institutionalizing Change: The State of NJ will ensure that progress made is institutionalized in a way that can transcend time without perpetual recasting.
      1. This means that if this plan is accepted there will be no way to reverse course.
      2. What if this Proposed Plan is yet another case of "Government Gets it Wrong Again?"
      3. It will take several years for the results of this plan to emerge and by that time all of the boards, council's agencies and processes that the plan advocates will be firmly in place.
      4. And by that time the bureaucracy that this plan creates metastasizes throughout our society it will be impossible to remove.
   ii. No plan in any rational business environment is complete without an "escape clause." This is a risk management technique that allows reversing or unwinding the plan to minimize adverse or undesirable unintended results. Yet this Proposed Plan regardless of its outcome is specifically intended to be irreversible.
   iii. For these reasons:
      1. This Proposed Plan is counter to any common sense practical approach found in any competent institution.
      2. This Proposed Plan is United Nations Agenda 21 under the guise of a document that happens to be titled as New Jersey's State Strategic Plan.
      3. Instead of being protected by its government, this Proposed Plan is a government sponsored Trojan horse, that will cause imminent tragedy for New Jersey citizens.

5. What is the source of all Wealth? Encourage members of the board to offer their input. Assure them this is not a trick question.
   a. Leave space to write down answers.
   b. Land is needed to grow food. Land is needed to mine minerals to make things, land is needed to extract fuel to heat our homes and fuel our cars. Land is the very resource that supports and facilitates every society. Private ownership of land is the only thing that separates American democracy from feudalism.
8. Garden State Value #6 (out of 10) Advance Equity – Consider the equity of property owners during planning and implementation. Improve access to opportunity, housing, jobs and schools for all New Jersey residents.

a. "Advancing equity" of opportunity, housing, jobs, education for all NJ Residents. What does this mean? What would a practical application of value #6 look like? What regulations might be written to build upon this? All of these questions are unanswered by the Proposed Plan. We do know however, this is what the United Nations Agenda 21 terms "Social Equity."

b. Coupling the concepts of Advancing Equity by considering the equity of property owners and social equity can easily compromise private property rights for the benefit of what some regulator feels are more important social equity objectives.

c. "Advancing equity" by MERELY "considering" the equity of property owners during planning and implementation might mean anything so I am not going to attempt to guess what this might mean. Still, because the Proposed Plan does not specify a requirement to affirm protection and advancement of private property rights as its fundamental controlling purpose this Garden State Value misses the opportunity to uphold the United States Constitution. And as this Proposed Plan fails to provide equitable recourse means should private property rights be compromised. I propose the following be inserted:

i. Property owner’s rights, as provided by the highest authority, the US Constitution, shall not be compromised either directly or indirectly. In any instance where property rights are found, through the applicable court of law, to be compromised, or potentially compromised at any time, the prevailing land owner shall receive treble damages plus reasonable court costs and expense reimbursements from the infringing party.

d. Treble damages serves to insure adequate legal resources are readily available to protect property owners that might not have the financial depth to defend themselves from otherwise illegal infringements or takings.
e. Uncompensated private property takings by the state are already the standard in New Jersey and this plan can further embolden such illicit action. If anyone in this room doubts that private property rights can be subverted by government plans like this Proposed Plan, just ask the 880,000 residents that occupy the Highlands region of the state. By the stroke of governor McGreevey's pen in 2004, the Highlands Act severely limited the development rights and therefore the land wealth of a land area that comprises almost one ninth of the state of New Jersey. The property owners were not compensated prior to the Act and to this day they are attempting to retroactively assess their lost wealth and compete for limited compensation funds.

f. In addition to the Highlands Act, illegal takings under the guise of open space preservation are already the norm in New Jersey and Proposed Plans like this will insure that there are plenty of economic, social equity and environmental justice reasons, courtesy of UN Agenda 21 groupthink to continue such illicit action.
7. Proposed Plan Terminology Frequency
   a. Sustainable – 23 times
   b. Green – 8 times
   c. Garden State Values – 10 times
   d. Agency – 17 times
   e. Council – 3 – Including a “Food Policy Council”
   f. Commission – 7, State Planning Commission - 20
   g. Public – Private Partnerships or investments – 12 times.
   h. Private Property – 1 time.

8. As my conclusion, I’ll share with you how I feel about the meaning of these terms and therefore the meaning of the Proposed Plan:
   a. Elected officials and bureaucrats immerse themselves in warm and fuzzy feel-good terms like “sustainability,” “garden state values,” “green” and “public private partnerships” to name a few. It all receives terrific press, spins off lots of political currency to fuel re-election and many new tasks for bureaucrats to act upon; yet few people have a clear, consistent idea of what all of these concepts mean. I call this a breakdown in leadership because if the labels are not correct, the language does not match reality; and if the language does not match reality there can be no unity and therefore no success.
   b. No competent leader would ever allow such amorphous terminology to found the basis for any conversation, especially one of the magnitude of this Proposed Plan.
   c. By merely “considering” the fundamental rights of private property owners, and by omission, the Proposed Plan’s failure to state as its single most fundamental controlling purpose: The Protection and facilitation of private property owner’s rights in accord with Amendment 14 of the US Constitution - means that the priorities of this Proposed Plan are out-of-order and fundamentally flawed.
   d. The Proposed Plan must be rejected in its entirety.
9. United Nations Agenda 21 - Have you heard of this program and if so can you describe its purpose and objectives?
   a. Leave space for answers...
   b. An "earth first" mantra that subverts rational thought and the needs of our Society to dupe citizens of developed nations into massive wealth transfer (especially property and property rights) to their governments (local, state and national) and from their governments to undeveloped nations, to rid the world of poverty thereby achieving a global, "Sustainable" utopia.
   c. We all know there can never be any utopia on earth no matter what we sacrifice to attempt to achieve it. Yet this is the siren song of the United Nations and

10. The **Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act** is a 2004 New Jersey law aimed at protecting the Highlands region of northwest New Jersey by regulating development within the region under the supervision of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. The Highland region covers 859,000 acres (3,480 km²), nearly one-ninth of the state, and is home to 880,000 residents. The area is primarily in Warren, Morris, Hunterdon, Passaic, and Sussex counties. The act is intended to preserve both large volumes of New Jersey's fresh water sources for 5.4 million residents and the biodiversity in the area, in the face of increasing development in the exurbs of New York City. The act was signed into law on August 10, 2004, by Governor of New Jersey James McGreevey. The provisions of the Act are monitored and controlled by the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council. The Council has 15 members, with a minimum of eight officials named from the Highlands Region, at least five of whom are municipal officials and three of whom must be county officials.
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

I draw your attention to a family of contradictions in the foundation of this Plan. The Garden State Values (as listed, page 28) include several whose purpose is to encourage people to live in (and presumably, purchase homes in) certain areas, while promoting "equity." Equity is a term that is used for many things, but as used here its core meaning is "fairness." Again, we can argue about what's fair, but it is not fair to offer someone a sweetheart deal and then punish him for it over decades or generations.

I recall from my youth breakfast cereal packaged in boxes, each an individual serving, and the individual boxes sold in packaged "assortments." I recall that in each package there were one or two cereals that everybody wanted, and at least one that nobody wanted. But somebody had to eat the booby prize for breakfast.

When the State, rather than the marketplace, decides what "assortment" of choices will be available, somebody will be left with the least desirable choice. And while not everybody wants the same things, it's very unlikely that the State will get it right. One can argue that the marketplace can't fully meet everybody's needs, because resources are finite and therefore scarce. But in the marketplace, prices convey information and direct resources to their best use. Contrariwise, if the State insists, over time, on preferring one sort of housing (city and downtown) to another (backyards and picket fences) the market distortions will continue to grow.

Moreover, the long-term effects will be perverse. People who were locked out of suburban or rural home purchases because of the price and forced into city or downtown purchases because they were cheap may hope to see their home values rise, but if ever more urban housing is pushed onto an unwilling market by these policies, home values in these areas will stagnate, making it harder for people to plan for retirement, pay for their children's college, or start a business. It will also make it harder for them to sell if and when they wish to move somewhere else.

On the other hand, the few who were able to afford more desirable homes will find their values growing disproportionately with time. One struggles in vain to find any notion of fairness in this scheme. And it is the same if we reverse the roles of city and suburban housing. Artificial scarcity helps those who are able to buy into it early; artificial abundance hurts those who are forced into it. These are the iron laws of economics; they cannot be made to dance to the Planners' tune nor will they bow to the gods of the Garden State Values. There is no "equity" here, but a wall, erected by government, that creates a permanent chasm between the well-to-do and the everyman.

Nor does this address a very real problem with urban neighborhoods; their exquisite sensitivity to crime, drug use, and other forms of civic disorder. To its credit, the Plan mentions them, and admits that their solutions are beyond its scope. But the solutions are not made a precondition for herding people into the cities, even though we should have at least a decade (if not a generation) of proven success before assuring people that their lives, property, and family will
be secure under this scheme.

For whatever reason, these problems have bedeviled our cities since the 1960s, and only when the city government was passionately committed to restoring civic order (for example, the Giuliani administration in New York City) have these conditions been reversed. Nor have the actions needed been popular; they run counter to a legion of social theories and agendas, not to mention entrenched interests. Unless we believe that these problems have or soon will disappear, it is simply irresponsible to offer people incentives (via market distortions) to move into the cities without giving them the tools to deal with them. But what tools will serve? Barricaded neighborhoods? Private armed security forces on every corner? Vigilance committees? It seems unlikely that the authors of the Plan would be receptive to these means. The results are neither livable nor walkable.

Where city neighborhoods have come back from the dead, it has been contrary to the wishes of planners. People have created loft apartments in violation of building codes, because that’s all they could afford. Then the city belatedly acknowledges their existence and either allows them or evicts everybody. Then, if people are not evicted, the neighborhood improves. Gentrification, of whatever kind, is a bottom-up process in which the stakeholders are the tenants and homebuyers whose sweat equity creates real equity (of the economic kind). It is not a gift bestowed from the panelled halls of the planners.

Finally, we should be deeply suspicious of government influence and government power in the real-estate markets. Anyone who doubts this should look back at the real-estate bubble from which we have still not recovered. This bubble was created by government policies stretching back to the 1970s, as aptly chronicled by Morgenson and Rosner in Reckless Endangerment. The more government tries to run things, the more power it must have. The more power it takes, the more opportunity there is for the unscrupulous to bend it to their own ends, with dire consequences when the music stops, as stop it eventually must.

These contradictions render this Plan self-defeating in that the means for one of its ends must inevitably work contrary to another of its ends.

Mark Terrible
Aberdeen, New Jersey
Resolution Exposing United Nations Agenda 21

WHEREAS, the United Nations Agenda 21 is a comprehensive plan of extreme environmentalism, social engineering, and global political control that was initiated at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992; and,

WHEREAS, the United Nations Agenda 21 is being covertly pushed into local communities throughout the United States of America through the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) through local "sustainable development" policies such as Smart Growth, Wildlands Project, Resilient Cities, Regional Visioning Projects, and other "Green" or "Alternative" projects; and,

WHEREAS, this United Nations Agenda 21 plan of radical so-called "sustainable development" views the American way of life of private property ownership, single family homes, private car ownership and individual travel choices, and privately owned farms; all as destructive to the environment; and,

WHEREAS, according to the United Nations Agenda 21 policy, social justice is described as the right and opportunity of all people to benefit equally from the resources afforded us by society and the environment which would be accomplished by socialist/communist redistribution of wealth; and,

WHEREAS, according to the United Nations Agenda 21 policy National sovereignty is deemed a social injustice; now therefore be

RESOLVED, the Republican National Committee recognizes the destructive and insidious nature of United Nations Agenda 21 and hereby exposes to the public and public policy makers the dangerous intent of the plan; and therefore be it further

RESOLVED, that the U.S. government and no state or local government is legally bound by the United Nations Agenda 21 treaty in that it has never been endorsed by the (U.S.) Senate, and therefore be it further

RESOLVED, that the federal and state and local governments across the country be well informed of the underlying harmful implications of implementation of United Nations Agenda 21 destructive strategies for "sustainable development" and we hereby endorse rejection of its radical policies and rejection of any grant monies attached to it, and therefore be it further
RESOLVED, that upon the approval of this resolution the Republican National Committee shall deliver a copy of this resolution to each of the Republican members of Congress, all Republican candidates for Congress, all Republican candidates for President who qualify for RNC sanctioned debates, and to each Republican state and territorial party office.

Chief Sponsor:
**Helen Van Etten**
Republican National Committeewoman for Kansas

Co-Sponsors:
**Carolyn McLarty**
Republican National Committeewoman for Oklahoma

**Kim Lehman**
Republican National Committeewoman for Iowa

**Paul Reynolds**
Republican National Committeeman for Alabama

**Demetra DeMonte**
Republican national Committeewoman for Illinois

**Solomon Yue**
Republican National Committeewoman for Oregon

**Donna Cain**
Republican National Committeewoman for Oregon

**Cindy Costa**
Republican National Committeewoman for South Carolina

**John Sigler**
Republican State Chairman for Delaware

**Steve Scheffler**
Republican national Committeeeman for Iowa

**Peggy Lambert**
Republican National Committeewoman for Tennessee

**Jim Bopp**
Republican National Committeeeman for Indiana

**Bruce Ash**
Republican National Committeeeman for Arizona

**DeMarus Carlson**
Republican National Committeewoman for Nebraska
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### Draft Final State Strategic Plan Public Hearing

**Thursday, February 23, 2012, 6:00 pm**

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, One Newark Center, 17th Floor
NJTPA Conference Room, Newark, NJ 07102
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Draft Final State Strategic Plan – Public Hearing Summary

The fourth public hearing convened on February 27, 2012 in Morristown, Morris County, hosted by Frelinghuysen Arboretum. The purpose of the public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

Resident: Many similarities between the SSP and the central planners of the Axis Powers in Europe. Parallels between Cuba, Nazi Germany and Eastern Europe. Suggestion: Recommended reading the book The Road to Serfdom.

Resident: Against centralizing the decisions for 566 towns to one department within the State.

Advocacy: Supports the Plan and thanks the State for the work in drafting the Plan. Feels that this is the right direction for NJ and makes it easier for companies to come to NJ and grow. Starting to pay dividends already.

Advocacy: Supports the Plan and feels it’s important to have a strong State Plan. The SSP is a great opportunity and should have stakeholder input to implement, develop strong links between urban centers and industry clusters and focus resources on the clusters. State should test the criteria and make adjustments as needed. Should develop a transparent process for how projects are chosen for support. Should have strong protections for the environment. Good to align government.

Advocacy: The SSP needs to achieve its goals, but also needs the cooperation of the municipalities. New Jersey needs a strong State Plan. Feels the Plan should go through the cross-acceptance process again. The Plan needs to preserve land and protect drinking water. Suggestion: Would like to see the Plan discourage sprawl.

Resident: Happy the Plan was taken out of DCA and put into the DOS. Likes the idea of coordinating State agencies. Felt the other Plan was too long and that the new Plan is a practical length. Also likes the focus on job creation.

Advocacy: Supports State planning, but can’t support the SSP because it doesn’t set boundaries for growth. Urges the SPC not to adopt. Needs predictability about where to grow and what areas to protect. Should be adequate time for public to review the revisions to the Plan. Suggestion: incorporate location criteria, i.e., a map.

Resident: Doesn’t like the fact that there aren’t more hearings – would like one in every county.

Resident: Complained about the restrictions put on her property by the Highlands Act. Doesn’t want to be told what she can and can’t do with her property.

Advocacy: Other states are out competing NJ. Supports the Plan. Likes the focus on jobs and feels it gives the local municipalities more control. Feels we need this Plan.

Elected official/government: As written, wouldn’t know how to execute this Plan locally and that it needs to be more specific with what the State wants from towns. Frustrated at local flooding. The State needs a plan, but this is too ambiguous. Feels it needs substantial “redrafting.”

Resident: SSP is too vague. Too much emphasis on social goals or social engineering. Believes this Plan will decide where people can and can’t live and that environmental groups have too much power.
Resident: Doesn’t like the way the hearing was set up for public questions and comments.

Advocacy: Supports the SSP. It is a good step in the right direction for the State’s future prosperity. Planning is important and he thanked the State for working on this. He likes the concepts of industry clusters and priority growth and preservation areas. Suggestion: elaborate on criteria.

Resident: Doesn’t want to be told he has to live near his job. He likes his 50 mile commute each way to work. Doesn’t like the SSP or the government. The SSP takes away his private property rights.

Advocacy: Planning is necessary. Important for the Plan to protect water.

Advocacy: Doesn’t support the SSP. Feels it’s too weighted in the favor of developers and needs much stronger environmental protections. Said it’s not an Agenda 21 plan, but more like a Century 21 plan.

Resident: Doesn’t like the use of the term “equity” and feels it leads to wealth redistribution and social engineering.

Advocacy Group: Planning important to the State. Likes a lot about the Plan. Provided written comments.

Elected official/government: Supports State planning. The SSP moves the State in the right direction. Provided written comments.

Elected official/government: Supports the SSP. Has a lot of value – likes that it doesn’t dictate to the municipalities.

Resident: This is an Agenda 21 plan.

Elected official/government: Supports State Plan. Likes the SSP. Spoke about what Somerset Co. is doing and how it aligns with the SSP. Applauds the Governor and LG for all the work they’ve done toward developing the SSP.

Advocacy: Pleased with SSP. Would like to further define PGIAs, expand discussion of housing. Submitted written comments.

Resident: Doesn’t like the plan. Agenda 21 Plan.

Resident: Doesn’t like the plan. Agenda 21 Plan. Top down control. Doesn’t like solar panels.

Resident: The State was better in the 1950’s. No income tax, no Mt. Laurel, low taxes. Agenda 21.

Elected official/government: Agrees with the Agenda 21 opponents.

Resident: Doesn’t see how the SSP helps economic growth. Wants lower taxes, less regulation, less government.

Advocacy: Planning is important. Supports the SSP. Provided written comments.

Resident: The Plan is Agenda 21.

Resident: Doesn’t like the Plan. Believes the Plan will force people to live in cities.

Resident: Agenda 21 opponent. Doesn’t like the Plan.

Resident: Thinks most people don’t want to live in cities.

Resident: Taxes are too high. Things were better years ago. This is a top down plan.
Recommendation for Amendment to the NJ Municipal Land Use Law

The purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law includes the encouragement of municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of land in the manner which will promote the public welfare (NJSA 40-55D-2) and the municipal Master Plan is specifically authorized to include the use of land in a manner which promotes the general welfare and includes, as one of its elements, an Economic Plan as part of the municipal Master Plan (NJSA 40-55D-28).

Proposals and applications for site plans, variances, building permits to authorize new construction and developments are matters which affect the general welfare, and decisions thereon have a profound impact on the economic health and welfare of a municipality and its residents through new residential uses, employment opportunities, the sales of supporting services and products during and subsequent to construction, and potential public revenue following construction.

Emphasizing the economic development and stability of the municipality is a matter promoting the general welfare and a factor which should be considered by the governing body, the Planning Board, the Zoning Board of Adjustment, and other appropriate authorities in considering zoning changes and other proposals and applications.

Recommendation for Amendment:

"Therefore, the municipality's Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment may consider in the course of hearings and determinations on applications for site plan approval and variances the impact that the approval or denial may have on the economic development and stability of the municipality and any segment thereof."

Bridgewater Township Economic Development Advisory Committee
Daniel J. Hayes, Jr., Mayor
John B. Schmitt, Jr., Chairman
Howard Turbowitz, Economic Development Officer
100 Commons Way
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
908 725-6300
www.bridgewaternj.gov
Comments of Wilma Frey, Senior Policy Manager,
New Jersey Conservation Foundation
On the Draft Final State Strategic Plan
Monday, February 27, 2012
Frelinghuysen Arboretum Haggerty Center
Morristown, NJ

New Jersey Conservation Foundation strongly supports state planning for New Jersey; however, we cannot support the Final Draft State Strategic Plan in its current form.

We believe that it is essential to plan for the future of our state. State planning should provide a predictable, unifying and common vision for the State. It should provide policy and implementation strategy across the entire state and between levels of government, as well as between the public and private sectors, across a range of issues of importance to us as a State.

Unfortunately, this Draft Final State Plan is not a State Plan. A State Plan, by definition, must be a comprehensive plan. However, this Plan is not. It does not set boundaries for growth, nor does it acknowledge constraints on development, or the need to plan based on the capacity of our natural systems, including water and septic. It is, unfortunately, a plan to not plan.

We urge the State Planning Commission not to adopt this Draft but to revise it, taking into consideration a number of recommendations.

In order to be acceptable as a State Plan, this Plan should, at a minimum, incorporate the following proposed revisions.
1. The State Plan must incorporate criteria to determine where growth should occur (and where it should not occur). For the State Strategic Plan to replace the current State Development and Redevelopment Plan it must have specific and objective location criteria that enable the public and governmental agencies to know where the state will support growth and where it will not. The location criteria must be incorporated into the plan, identifying priority growth areas (including criteria for the “regional innovation clusters”), limited growth areas and priority preservation and protection areas (agricultural and open space). The proposed priority investment area criteria are inconsistent with the State Strategic Plan.

2. The State Plan must include specific and objective “investment area” criteria so that there is predictability and transparency. In addition, adequate opportunity for public review and comment on the investment area criteria must be provided.

3. The Plan must strengthen the goals for protecting natural resources and public health. The first requirement in the State Planning Act for the State Development and Redevelopment Plan is to “protect the natural resources and quality of the state…” This Plan does not protect the environment. There is no reflection of the fact that we need to plan our development within the capacity of our natural systems to sustain it.

This proposed State Strategic Plan addresses only land preservation through acquisition. It does not acknowledge and does not contain strategies for the protection of environmentally critical areas, which are spelled out in the State Planning Act as “wetlands, flood plains, stream corridors, aquifer recharge areas, steep slopes, areas of unique flora and fauna, and areas with scenic, historic, cultural and recreation value.” It does not address the need to protect water, air, wildlife and other natural resources wherever they are located – not only in areas targeted for preservation through acquisition. It does not adequately address environmental quality issues nor the cumulative impacts of pollution felt by already overburdened cities cited in the plan for more development and industrialization.

[The State Strategic Plan must be amended to meet this goal, by:
• Adding “protection” to the Vision statement and Mission Statement and Goal 3.
• Amending Goal 2 so that effective planning involves both "appropriate growth and preservation/protection."

• Expanding the narrative and objectives under goal number 3 to recognize that land protection requires more than land purchase, including natural resource protection measures such as using wastewater planning to prohibit sewers from environmentally sensitive areas, establishing septic densities protective of water resources, and concentrating new development in areas where infrastructure (water, sewer, transportation) with capacity already exists.

• Clarifying policy for development in each of the "investment areas," calling for "promoting" growth in priority growth areas and "accommodating" it in limited growth areas.

• Reflecting the State Planning Act requirement to "discourage development where it may impair or destroy natural resources or environmental qualities..." by incorporating consideration of large-scale environmental constraints and infrastructure capacity into the designation of priority growth investment areas.

• Including the priority preservation areas and limited growth areas in the discussion of "effective planning for vibrant regions" on page 25, last paragraph.

• Clarifying that environmental protection and preservation are on equal footing with economic development initiatives in objectives 3.2 and 3.3.

4. The State Plan must respect the legislative autonomy of the Highlands and Pinelands regions, and the Meadowlands. The State Plan must respect and coordinate with the comprehensive regional plans of the Highlands and Pinelands through memoranda of understanding (MOU's). The State Planning Commission has no legal authority to dictate planning policies in the Highlands and Pinelands. It should clarify the State's deference to the regional planning entities for the land use decisions that they are authorized by statute to make.

5. The State Strategic Plan attempts to draw its legitimacy from the State Planning Act. Therefore, the State Strategic Plan and its various implementation components must be consistent with the State Planning Act in spirit, intent and the letter of the law, with regards to both substance and process. There are
inconsistencies between the State Strategic Plan and the State Planning Act that are problematic.

6. The State Planning Commission must have a full contingent of appropriate members qualified to support the goals of the Act, prior to adoption of the Strategic Plan. Currently, most public member seats remain unfilled, with a majority of the members representing the Governor’s cabinet and State agencies.

New Jersey Conservation Foundation is planning to submit additional comments in writing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Good evening. My name is [Redacted] and I am affiliated with the New Jersey Builders Association. I am also involved in the building industry as a [Redacted].

On behalf of the NJBA, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft State Strategic Plan.

1. We are delighted that the Administration has chosen to breathe new life into the state planning process with the release of this Draft Strategic Plan. The state planning process has been adrift for many years and we believe it is very important to put it back on track. We recognize that there are no easy or simple solutions and we appreciate the Administration's willingness to take this on.

   We are particularly pleased with the Strategic Plan's emphasis on aligning state agency programs and policies. The development community has struggled for many years with conflicting and contradictory requirements and regulations from funding state agencies. These have substantially increased the cost of housing and hampered our ability to provide new housing at affordable prices.

   We believe that in order to make NJ more competitive with respect to other states, we need to provide housing, at prices our residents can afford, close to where they work. The Strategic Plan can help make this happen.

2. With this in mind, we would like to suggest ways for improving the proposed framework for prioritizing state resources. Priority Growth Investment Areas should include all lands currently mapped as Planning Areas 1 and 2, along with all lands within existing (or planned) sewer service areas. All designated Centers (including lapsed Centers and Coastal Centers) should be included, along with lands targeted under existing state programs, such as the Transit Village program, Urban Hub Tax Credit program, Brownfields Development areas, and others, as well as lands targeted locally under the redevelopment statute or as affordable housing sites.

   It is important to note that existing environmental regulations remain in place, and would continue to be enforced within these designated areas. As such, there is no danger that inclusion in a priority Growth Investment Area would result in environmental degradation.

3. The "limited growth" category should be limited to lands not in existing (or planned) sewer service areas and not targeted as Priority Conservation Areas.

4. The Strategic Plan should also provide greater definition of what is meant by "growth" in the Priority Growth Investment Areas. The Strategic Plan should not encourage sprawl, and new large-lot single-family development or corporate office
parks in areas where no infrastructure exists to support such uses. Instead, the Strategic Plan should encourage more efficient use of land – an increasingly scarce resource. The state should not encourage additional employment growth in regions with severe housing deficits, but rather seek to encourage a greater balance between housing and employment, and between different types of housing, including rental and workforce housing.

5. Finally, we would point out that the 1985 State Planning Act was clearly intended by the New Jersey Legislature to provide a statewide planning framework to facilitate implementation of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act. The current Draft Strategic Plan does not address the constitutional issue of affordable housing. We believe that this can be overcome by providing further definition to the Priority Growth Investment Areas, as previously suggested, in ways that create tangible opportunities for the housing industry to build a wide variety of housing types in appropriate locations and at appropriate densities.

The New Jersey Builders Association will submit formal written comments on the Draft State Strategic Plan to the State Planning Commission in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.
Laurette Kratina, PP, AICP, Supervising Planner
Somerset County Planning Board

FINAL DRAFT STATE STRATEGIC PLAN
PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY
353 East Hanover Ave, Morris Twp.
February 27, 2012

Hello. I am Laurette Kratina, Supervising Planner with the Somerset County Planning Board. I am here to provide the County’s perspective on the Final Draft State Strategic Plan and some ways it can be strengthened.

First, I would like to point out that Somerset County has been a long-term supporter of state planning. We recognize the benefits to New Jersey that a workable and effective planning framework for economic growth, quality communities and environmental preservation can have.

In all of our planning work, including Cross Acceptance, Wastewater Management and the County’s Master Planning, we always use a bottom-up process, engaging our municipalities, businesses and residents.

We participated in the stakeholder meetings leading up to the release of the Final Draft State Strategic Plan, and appreciate the dialogue that has occurred between county planners statewide and OPA staff.

Somerset is the first County in the State to apply the Priority Investment Area Framework envisioned in the Draft State Plan. We developed infrastructure asset mapping tools and criteria, and by working with our municipalities, identified over 20 Priority Growth Investment Areas.

Our goal is to define a comprehensive Priority Investment Area Framework for the County, obtain written support from our municipalities, adopt it as part of the County Master Plan, and submit it to the State for designation.

We applaud the Governor and Lt. Governor for their leadership and support for revamping the State Planning Process, as well as the OPA and the State Planning Commission for making it happen.
We support the overall shift from a top-down directive placed on local governments to one that emphasizes the horizontal alignment of state agencies with the State plan's goals. Some additional policies in the Plan that we support are:

- Relocating the OPA to the Department of State, so it has stronger visibility and increased authority;

- Aligning OPA with the New Jersey Business Action Center so it can succeed in "enhancing opportunities for the attraction and growth of industries of statewide importance";

- Emphasizing the importance of building upon the state's infrastructure and locational assets and "prioritizing redevelopment, the re-use and remediation of existing sites and structures"; and

- Recognizing that the Plan must first and foremost, guide state policy and investment decisions – and that jurisdiction over local and regional land use policies must remain in the hands of the State's municipalities and counties.

We believe the Plan can be enhanced in several areas.

1) First, most of the details about the Plan's implementation will be worked out in the State Agency Strategic Plans. In order to assure transparency, the guidelines that define the content of the State Agency Plans should be included in the State Strategic Plan. And, State Agency Plans must be subject to public review and comment. These plans will fail if what they call for is not do-able.

2) We support the development of the "Scorecard System" to replace the unwieldy Plan Endorsement Process. However, work on the Scorecard happen after the Priority Investment Area Framework is established and State Agency Plans are completed.

The Scorecard cannot be applied effectively until the Priority Investment Area Framework is in place and State Agency alignment with the State Plan has been achieved.
3) The Priority Investment Area Framework will succeed only if it is derived through an open process that directly involves counties, municipalities and the public.

4) Finally, the OPA should develop targets and measures that are used to inform the public about the status of the Priority Investment Framework and each of the State Agency Strategic Plans.

We are grateful for this opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to working with you to implementing the new State Strategic Plan. In order to keep the momentum going, we encourage the State to build the necessary partnerships, particularly with Counties and municipalities throughout the State, and to empower Counties to advance the Plan’s mission.
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

At the last one of these meetings, in Newark, several people noted that the word "equity", which is used in various places in this Plan, is ambiguous, meaning either "fairness" or "economic value." These two meanings represent opposite agendas for the plan, and so the ambiguity is both perverse and pernicious: a word which is interpreted in one sense during acceptance might be interpreted with the antagonistic sense during implementation and execution, and that second interpretation might well be upheld.

For the sake of the integrity of this Plan, I urge the commission in the strongest possible terms to remove the word "equity" wherever it appears in the Plan, and to replace each instance with an unambiguous synonym. In addition, I urge you to explain why the word "equity" was removed and replaced, either in a glossary or in some other front or back matter.

Mark Terrible
Aberdeen, New Jersey
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolland Member</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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Draft Final State Strategic Plan Public Hearing
Monday, February 27, 2012, 6:00 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone and E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey R Gonya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph E. Doyle</td>
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The fifth public hearing convened on February 28, 2012, in Long Branch, Monmouth County, hosted by Monmouth University. The purpose of the public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

**Resident:** Wants more than six meetings. Environmental groups too well represented. Doesn’t like social justice. The Plan will take away power from local government.

**Resident:** Wants the low income housing program eliminated.

**Resident:** Doesn’t want NJ to turn into Europe. Does not want housing projects here.

**Resident:** Some things good in the SSP. Wants to see people’s comments on the Plan posted on the internet. Wants more than six meetings. Doesn’t like the word “sustainable.” Thinks the Plan is related to Agenda 21. Went on to read numerous passages and statements about Agenda 21.

**Advocacy:** Applauds the Administration for the SSP. Believes in preservation of natural resources. Wants to expand Priority Growth Areas to include centers, all sewer service areas, transit hubs, Brownfields and Areas in Need of Redevelopment. Wants affordable housing added to the Plan.

**Resident:** Feels the SSP won’t protect water recharge areas. Also discussed a local development in her town that she has a problem with. Economic development is fine, but need to protect the environment, especially drinking water.

**Resident:** Spoke about walkable communities. When he grew up in Brooklyn, women had to make several trips to the supermarket if they didn’t drive. Spoke extensively about local issues. Wants parking problems solved. Left written comments.

**Advocacy:** Likes a lot about the Plan. Wants housing close to employment. Need opportunities to grow in urban, suburban and rural areas too.

**Advocacy:** Likes parts of the Plan. Need transparency. Want to have more green industries. Needs more specificity as to how to protect the environment. The SSP must adhere to the State Planning Act. Suggestion: define the criteria better.

**Resident:** Wants large lot construction encouraged to preserve land. More money should be put into the infrastructure of low growth areas. The Plan doesn’t have enough discussion of protection of critical natural resources. Thinks the Plan lacks input from municipalities. Did not like DEP’s extending the SSA in Holmdel. The 2% cap is the best thing to ever happen to NJ.

**Elected official/government:** Thinks the SSP is a vast improvement over the old Plan. Wants the county planning boards to play a major role implementing the Plan. Provided written comments.

**Resident:** Believes that State planning should have been stopped in the 1940’s. The SSP is too concentrated on environmental protection. Government has been taken over by radical environmentalists. Wants decisions about planning to be made by locals, not Trenton. SSP will lead to eminent domain abuse. Does not like the legislature. Thinks solar energy doesn’t pay. Thinks the Plan will lead to conditions similar to Europe during the plague.
Advocacy: The Plan needs to do more for environmental protection and to especially protect drinking water. Will promote urban sprawl.
Advocacy: Supports the SSP and regional planning. Wants walkable communities, economic growth, and environmental protection. Submitted written comments.
Resident: The government should not tell the people what to do. Public education is not working. Believes that they know what we need because we are people.
Advocacy: Supports State planning. The SSP is a plan to plan. Likes the guiding principles and goals. Needs to better balance economic growth with environmental protection. Needs more input from the municipalities and counties. Plan should not be adopted in its present form. Need to address the property tax issue. Suggestion: Plan should mention affordable housing.
Resident: Plan is ambiguous and short on specifics. Seems to be a vehicle for centralized planning. NJ cities are in bad shape because of centralized planning. The SSP degrades private property rights.
Advocacy: Wants the Plan to incorporate how the arts can help economic development. Supports the SSP. Submitted written comments.
Resident: The Plan in the past was used to stop things. Need sensible planning, not obstruction. Shouldn’t impose on people where to live.
Resident: America has to follow the Constitution. The Plan will control us and we don’t want to be controlled. Taxes are too high in NJ.
Advocacy: The SSP will hurt the environment in favor of developers. Submitted written comments.
Resident: Does not want to be pushed in to an urban hub. Doesn’t like what’s going on in the school system and doesn’t want to be told what to do. Suggestion: public should vote on Plan.
Resident: This is an Agenda 21 Plan. The SSP uses the same words as Agenda 21. The SSP is too short.
Resident: Worried about global warming. This plan should take into account climate change.
Resident: Wants people to join the Tea Party. People don’t have property rights anymore. Government doesn’t do anything right. Wants more meetings.
Resident: Doesn’t know much about the Plan. Wants to know how the Plan will affect property rights. Doesn’t trust government and doesn’t want to be told what to do with their property.
Resident: Wants to know who the stakeholders were. Why did they get 15 meetings and the public only six? City housing projects are a disaster. The Plan is Agenda 21.
Resident: Wants to know who votes on the Plan and what happens if everyone in the room disagrees with the Plan. Wants to know who wrote the Plan. Willing to give up their lives this.
Resident: Doesn’t believe that the Plan won’t cost taxpayers any more money. Thinks it will lead to eminent domain abuse. SCC is inept.
2/28/2012  To: NJ State Planning Commission
From: C. Anthony Cooper, Ph.D.

Subject: Comments at Public Hearing
Monmouth University, Bey Hall

Comment 1:
Under this Draft Plan's Goal 3, "Preservation and Enhancement of Critical State Resources", I believe additional attention should be paid to NJ's existing low growth areas which are currently built to capacity with a mix of large-lot residential development and preserved open space:

First, text should be added under the Draft Plan's Goal 3 to the effect that use of large-lot residential development (sometimes with clustering provisions) has effectively preserved NJ's critical resources at little cost to the State's taxpayers, and this should be encouraged to continue.

Second, while existing text on the Draft Plan's page 33 properly discourages high-cost infrastructure extensions in preservation-oriented, low growth areas, some additional text seems needed to clarify that State investment is appropriate for major infrastructure repairs in these areas, as for example, when dealing with a bridge failure. In other words, a preservation-oriented, low-growth area should not be allowed to degenerate into a depressed area because of inadequate funds for major infrastructure repairs.

Comment 2:
This Draft Plan is currently missing any specific treatment about protecting environmentally critical areas, which are identified in the State Planning Act as "wetlands, flood plains, stream corridors, aquifer recharge areas, steep slopes, areas of unique flora and fauna, and areas with scenic, historic, cultural or recreational value." I believe the Draft Plan's Goal 3 should at least cite the need to generate suitable objectives for protecting these environmentally critical areas.

Comment 3:
This Draft Plan appears to lack any inputs municipalities. Indeed, I understand that the criteria to be used in identifying areas for economic growth and areas for preservation/protection were released on February 10 - just 3 days before the first Public Hearing on this "Draft Final State Strategic Plan: NJ's State Development & Redevelopment Plan". Municipalities generally cannot react that fast.

Thank you.
Unraveling the "Sustainability" Paradox

The word "sustainability" flashes images of fresh air, clean water and revitalized resources. Yet, Americans are discovering it also means lost property rights and value, reduced mobility and the surrender of family land. Because of "sustainable development":

- Mike Sackett faces $100s of thousands in EPA fines for building his dream home on his own land.
- Planners in Carver County, MA force citizens to accept solar farms few want.
- In Dade County, Florida, the local government is forcing 1500 homeowners from their property.
- In King County, WA, 17,000 residents filed court complaints attempting to win back lost property rights.

Here is why a good idea like sustainability has such destructive outcomes:

Locally, most see sustainable development (SD) as a reasonable way to protect the environment. Globally, SD is much different. It is a social, political and economic action plan that forces boilerplate solutions for real or perceived environmental crises on willing and unwilling participants.

Most citizens and public officials are not aware their local sustainable plan derives from the coercive global one. Here is how it happened:

- The term Sustainable Development came from a 1987 UN report called "Our Common Future" which concluded that developed nations, such as the US, were responsible for global warming and poverty, which in turn created an unsustainable planet. The solution was to limit property ownership and growth in the US, and transfer consumer wealth to developing nations. (Read, "Our Common Future" - Amazon)
- The 1992 UN Rio Earth Summit in Brazil codified the report, created an action plan called Agenda 21, and was signed onto by 178 nations including the US. (Search: "UN Agenda 21 Rio," "Rio Declaration")
- A 1993 executive order bypassed Congress to create the President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) whose stated purpose was to "implement UN Agenda 21 in the US" via regulatory agencies. (Search: 60 12852, State Dept. submission to the 5th Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, April 1997)
- In 1998, J. Gary Lawrence, an advisor to the PCSD, recommended the term Agenda 21 and UN references be dropped to more easily implement SD in the US. Agencies and planners changed their terminology to Smart Growth and other environmentally friendly terms. (Search: "The Future of Local Agenda 21 in the New Millennium" p.5)
- By 2001, Sustainable Development/Smart Growth was part of the regulatory makeup of every federal agency and signed onto by the US Conference of Mayors, The National Governor's Association, and several Leagues of Municipalities. It is now in your hometown. (Search: your town, state, and sustainable development)
- In 2002, HUD and other federal agencies funded the American Planning Association's, Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook 2 to incorporate Agenda 21 principles. This is now the standard planning apparatus throughout US communities. (Search for guidebook by name)

Now you know the problem. For solutions read, "The Sustainability Dilemma."

For more info: www.didyknowonline.com
www.americanpolicy.org/issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone and E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dement</td>
<td>400 Cedar Ave.</td>
<td>732-571-3526 <a href="mailto:pdement@monmouth.edu">pdement@monmouth.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted and Nancy Petersen</td>
<td>200 Cedar Ave.</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID FISHER</td>
<td>200 Cedar Ave.</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Bieringer</td>
<td>1 Ruby St., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Goldsmithe</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Brenner</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Behrend, NJTAPA</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cunningham</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. McNally</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jaworski</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Vandenberg</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ceva</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Fowler-Bickert</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Goldsmith</td>
<td>102 Fieldcrest Ave., Edison, NJ</td>
<td>732-245-4001 <a href="mailto:david@kbov.com">david@kbov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Ahrens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter H. Lumpris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Reinhardt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Meehan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Meehan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Rourke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dockwey, N.J.</td>
<td>336 Bond St, Red Bank, N.J.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CDDockwey@AGAPE.COM">CDDockwey@AGAPE.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gatto, N.J.</td>
<td>1415 W. High St, N.J.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bgatto@Gmail.com">bgatto@Gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Isler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith A. Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Hanlon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Pinzolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Mazzei/A</td>
<td>FREDONIA, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Blake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin Neuringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Neuringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Vandenkeren</td>
<td>611 Industrial Way Westfield</td>
<td>732-380-7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Dilovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Brenner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Moeke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona Couzens</td>
<td>ASBURY PARK PRESS</td>
<td>732-557-5928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Mayzak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Castellano</td>
<td>VALLICE, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Herman</td>
<td></td>
<td>unlisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Scharfenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Scharfenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gleitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bongard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Stocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Gatto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hill Jr BSG</td>
<td></td>
<td>611 Industrial Way, Eatontown, <a href="mailto:al@birdsell.com">al@birdsell.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDiamo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Medley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil Kossler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Lexie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. On Cugen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hillsg Sira Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Etreckson BSG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Chavan BSCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Albert SRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Touhin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen McGurk Borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Zoppo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house, Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Mathis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ferraro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Daniele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe M. Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Phone and E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Antonucci, greater Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>732-358-5200 x 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mikhail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sixth public hearing convened on March 1, 2012 in Bordentown Township, hosted by the Rutgers University Ecoplex. The purpose of public hearing was to receive public comment on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan.

Public Comment was received and is summarized below following a presentation from OPA staff on the Draft Final State Strategic Plan. The attendees list is attached as well written public comments that were submitted at the hearing.

**Resident:** Critical of Plan; Goals in the plan are flawed; disagrees with redevelopment of urban areas and downtowns; Plan is Agenda 21; Suggestion: define institutional change

**Advocacy:** Support direction and intent of SSP; Plan has the potential to be a national example of State supported economic opportunity; plan promotes public/private partnerships, quality of life, will help in State’s economic comeback; benefits of the Plan will be alignment of government, supports job creation, economic growth; promotes efficient use of State resources, repurposes existing State resources; industry cluster approach is positive; Suggestion: Plan needs to support all business - small, mid and large size

**Resident:** SSP doesn’t address road congestion/capacity; Plan is a subversion of personal property rights and is Agenda 21; Suggestion: Plan should encourage the expansion of the road networks throughout the State

**Resident:** Supportive of Plan; encouraged by the Plan calling for cooperation between State agencies

**Resident:** Plan is a positive step

**Resident:** Critical of Plan/critical of government in general

**Resident:** Generally supportive of Plan; Suggestion: Priority Growth Areas need more definition

**Resident:** SSP step in right direction; Plan needs to recognize budget constraint

**Resident:** Plan is an assault on civil liberty and property rights; process lacks transparency

**Resident:** Concerned with property taxes and development

**Resident:** Supportive of SSP; felt the State needed to direct resources to those transit oriented designed areas where tremendous opportunity to accommodate growth, especially for the millennials

**Resident:** Plan is Agenda 21 and threatens personal property rights; Plan takes away local control; the State has too many plans already - local, County, water, sewer, etc. Suggestion: Define Return on Investment

**Resident:** Generally supportive of SSP; feels SSP is good planning and that leads to good choices for jobs and housing; it will foster essential redevelopment; Plan doesn’t protect environment enough; Suggestion: Plan should not promote new sewer service areas

**Advocacy:** SSP is not based on science or capacity analysis; economic growth trumps environmental protection; cluster concept vague; criteria needs to be defined; concern that all Areas in Need of Redevelopment will be Priority Growth Areas and become a target for eminent domain action

**Advocacy:** Plan lacks capacity analysis; not enough environmental protection; SSP has no mechanism to take lands out of Priority Growth Areas; Suggestion: Plan needs
to identify how to resolve conflict between economic growth and protecting the environment

**Advocacy:** Supportive of SSP; alignment of State policies, investments and rules a positive outcome of Plan; Suggestion: Priority Growth Areas need more refinement

**Resident:** Plan is good for the State; wants the SSP to preserve as much land as possible but realizes the need to offer the opportunity of jobs, properly priced housing and an assortment of transportation options

**Resident:** SSP doesn’t address the impacts on the educational system or crime; considers the Plan to be social engineering; Suggestion: start over with more public input into creating the Plan

**Resident:** Feels Plan in on the right tract; doesn’t go far enough in protecting water quality

**Advocacy:** Endorses SSP; it fosters local/County and State cooperation; process has been transparent; Plan is a guidance document; the State Department’s functional plans are critical to the Plan’s success

**Resident:** Lack of regard for taxpayers; no Return on Investment (ROI) analysis; no transparency with Plan development; Suggestion: State needs to do ROI’s on investments prior to spending the money

**Resident:** Plan doesn’t support the current opportunities for middle class minorities to access housing in the suburbs

**Resident:** No trust in government

**Advocacy:** Plan not strong enough in protecting water resources; acknowledges resource planning needs to be done on a regional/state level; Suggestion: Keep the map; wait until there is more detail with criteria

**Advocacy:** SSP is an opportunity to protect natural resources and is long overdue; Plan lacks detail; doesn’t address environmental protection; need better defined criteria; landscape project in necessary in the Plan

**Resident:** Supportive of SSP; process is sound; promotes economic development; plan is supply oriented, not a land use plan

**Resident:** Opposed; no public input on the Plan; only held 6 meetings. Suggestion: hold more meetings

**Resident:** Indiscernible, bad audio

**Resident:** Plan is Agenda 21, it will increase taxes

**Resident:** Agency cooperation is positive; doesn’t trust government; no transparency with Plan; it’s a land grab; Suggestion: hold a meeting in every County
New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce
Comments Regarding the
State Strategic Plan for Development and Redevelopment

Rutgers University EcoComplex, Bordentown

March 1, 2012

Michael Egenton – Senior Vice President, Government Relations

By way of background, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce ("State Chamber") is recognized as the independent voice of business in New Jersey. With a broad based membership ranging from the Fortune 500 companies to small proprietorships, representing every corner of the state and every industry, our members provide jobs for over a million people in New Jersey. We continue to work towards promoting a vibrant business environment and economic prosperity through vision, expertise and innovative solutions.

As a long-time champion for creating a prosperous business environment, we support and commend the new direction and vision contained in the State Strategic Plan. This revised Plan has great potential as it positions New Jersey as a national example of public-private partnerships that will enhance our economic opportunities as well as our quality of life.

The State Chamber views the State Strategic Plan’s emphasis on economic prosperity, resource efficiency and realignment of government not only as strengths of the document, but also as necessities for catalyzing the New Jersey comeback.

Central to this plan is the issue of job creation and economic growth, two key concerns of our association. Unlike previous state planning processes, this plan seeks to expand New Jersey’s business community by using incentives to attract and retain industries that will employ the state’s present and ever-growing talented workforce. We support the plan’s goal of making New Jersey a state where businesses desire to locate through improving physical infrastructure to transport goods and services and creating healthy communities to house employees. We believe that investing in infrastructure and housing not only makes our state more attractive to employers, but also creates needed jobs in the short-term.

The plan strategically approaches its goals by efficiently allocating and using state resources. The State Chamber appreciates that the plan advocates for development and redevelopment in the context of what the state can afford, what is cost effective and what will create future investment. Instead of calling for new sources of revenue, the plan repurposes existing funding mechanisms to encourage both economic growth and resource preservation. The plan also seeks to make the best use of New Jersey’s assets by situating development within infrastructure rich areas and by juxtaposing the state’s higher education facilities with its business community to foster targeted job creation. To support these strategic visions, the New Jersey State Chamber of
Commerce is working closely with Plan Smart New Jersey to evaluate how best the state can use existing assets and infrastructure to support industry growth.

The plan realizes the need for an aligned, committed and strong coalition composed of municipal, county, and state officials along with private business, non-profits and regional authorities. The State Chamber favors streamlined government and finds this a vital component of the plan. Uncoordinated and isolated government processes often result in undue burden on the business community and prevents investment. By promoting effective communication and collaboration between government and non-government organizations, the plan cuts red tape and allow businesses to flourish. We believe an aligned government will safeguard the progress made by the Christie/Guadango Administration and perpetuate the “New Jersey Comeback”.

While the plan’s strengths outweigh its weaknesses, the State Chamber does see some areas of improvement. First, the State Chamber supports the growth of industry clusters, but we hope that the plan proves inclusive of all types of businesses, large and small, because many smaller companies are vital to supporting the state’s larger clusters.

Secondly, we believe that the plan has tremendous potential to encourage innovative policy making that advances economic development, preservation, education and quality of life in New Jersey. We would like to see the Commission provide specific ideas and tools regarding fiscal, tax, and housing policy, that it will encourage to execute the goals of the plan. Previous policies like Grow New Jersey and the Urban Transit Hub Tax Credit provide models for new economic growth policies. In addition, recent initiatives like the New Jersey Residential Foreclosure Transformation Act along with the Governor’s proposals for capital improvement in transportation, increased aid to schools and higher-education institutions, and an urban scholarship program are policies that the State Strategic Plan could endorse.

Overall, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce finds the State Strategic Plan refreshing and promising. It seeks to improve the state’s physical infrastructure and protect its quality of life resources while at the same time it encourages smart growth so that current and future residents will be proud to live and work in New Jersey.

As you move forward in this process, we want to offer the active participation and involvement of our organization, particularly as policy ideas are developed that seek to improve the economic development climate of New Jersey.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views and recommendations.
Good evening. My name is Carlos Rodrigues and I am Director of Land Use and Regulatory Affairs for the New Jersey Builders Association.

On behalf of the NJBA, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft State Strategic Plan.

1. We are delighted that the Administration has chosen to breathe new life into the state planning process with the release of this Draft Strategic Plan. The state planning process has been adrift for many years and we believe it is very important to put it back on track. We recognize that there are no easy or simple solutions and we appreciate the Administration’s willingness to take this on.

We are particularly pleased with the Strategic Plan’s emphasis on aligning state agency programs and policies. The development community has struggled for many years with conflicting and contradictory requirements and regulations from feuding state agencies. These have substantially increased the cost of housing and hampered our ability to provide new housing at affordable prices.

We believe that in order to make NJ more competitive with respect to other states, we need to provide housing, at prices our residents can afford, close to where they work. The Strategic Plan can help make this happen.

2. With this in mind, we would like to suggest ways for improving the proposed framework for prioritizing state resources. Priority Growth Investment Areas should include all lands currently mapped as Planning Areas 1 and 2, along with all lands within existing (or planned) sewer service areas. All designated Centers (including lapsed Centers and Coastal Centers) should be included, along with lands targeted under existing state programs, such as the Transit Village program, Urban Hub Tax Credit program, Brownfields Development areas, and others, as well as lands targeted locally under the redevelopment statute or as affordable housing sites.

It is important to note that existing environmental regulations remain in place, and would continue to be enforced within these designated areas. As such, there is no danger that inclusion in a priority Growth Investment Area would result in environmental degradation.

3. The “limited growth” category should be limited to lands not in existing (or planned) sewer service areas and not targeted as Priority Conservation Areas.
4. The Strategic Plan should also provide greater definition of what is meant by "growth" in the Priority Growth Investment Areas. The Strategic Plan should not encourage sprawl, and new large-lot single-family development or corporate office parks in areas where no infrastructure exists to support such uses. Instead, the Strategic Plan should encourage more efficient use of land — an increasingly scarce resource. The state should not encourage additional employment growth in regions with severe housing deficits, but rather seek to encourage a greater balance between housing and employment, and between different types of housing, including rental and workforce housing.

5. Finally, we would point out that the 1985 State Planning Act was clearly intended by the New Jersey Legislature to provide a statewide planning framework to facilitate implementation of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act. The current Draft Strategic Plan does not address the constitutional issue of affordable housing. We believe that this can be overcome by providing further definition to the Priority Growth Investment Areas, as previously suggested, in ways that create tangible opportunities for the housing industry to build a wide variety of housing types in appropriate locations and at appropriate densities.

The New Jersey Builders Association will submit formal written comments on the Draft State Strategic Plan to the State Planning Commission in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

I wish to consider the confluence between four of the elements that drive this Plan. This consideration leads me to the conclusion that the goals of the planning process have a severe deficiency.

The first element is redevelopment, identified in numerous places throughout the Plan. The second is the assertion by the National Association of Realtors, on page seventeen, that Americans favor “walkable” and “mixed use” neighborhoods: in essence, urban and downtown areas. The third is the desire to “institutionalize change” (page 20). The fourth is economic growth, the very first strategic goal stated (page 20).

Redevelopment works towards the goal of economy by putting unused things to work. It also works to the goal of cleanliness by not allowing existing developed areas to become artificial wasteland. While it must be remembered that one person’s blighted area is another’s blue collar neighborhood or business location, my concern is the way that this dovetails with the Realtors’ assertion that urban and downtown communities are the most desired (and thus the most saleable). This happy coincidence makes these two goals mutually reinforcing, since most areas suitable for “redevelopment” are urban and downtown areas. Such goals, thus reinforced, tend to become more firmly established.

The term “institutionalize change” is not sufficiently defined. When it says “The State of NJ will ensure that progress made is institutionalized in a way that can transcend time without perpetual recasting,” does it mean that this Plan will effectively become eternal, making changes that cannot be undone if they are found to be wrong? Or does it mean that it will provide stable a framework that can accommodate change without having to start all over? What happens when one generation’s “progress” becomes the next generation’s disastrous mistake? Or when the “progress” is revealed to be the expression of a fad? Must we start all over again for the next Plan, and the next one after that?

The assertion that walkable and mixed-use neighborhoods are the most desirable is a statement gleaned from the actual preferences of people over a period of time. Not long before, the most saleable homes were in suburban areas. How long will it be before preferences change again? Will it be a year? Will it be five years? Will it occur as soon as the economy experiences another major change? We do not know, and if the Realtors or the State Planning Commission have foresight, they have not told us.

To “institutionalize” this change of preference without institutionalizing the process of review and adaption to future change of markets could lead the State of New Jersey to effectively shut down the housing market when preferences change, and to stop the influx of skilled people upon which economic growth, the Plan’s first goal, will sooner or later depend.

If this Plan is to be more than one step in long, lurching progression of Plans, it should separate decision processes from the inputs that lead to the decisions, just as a Constitution separates the law-making process from the laws made. That way, when one input (such as real estate market preferences) changes, the Plan can be re-executed on the new inputs. And when the process must be tweaked, for
greater transparency or greater responsibility, it will not be necessary to reinterpret every input at the same time.

Mark Terrible
Aberdeen, New Jersey
Members of the New Jersey State Planning Commission, New Jersey Residents in Attendance, and Members of the Press,

The goals of the Strategic Plan include providing a workable plan, streamlining the processes faced by developers, and making the process more transparent. The first goal is the subject of open discussion. There seems to be agreement that it may indeed streamline the process of approval or rejection. The third goal has two aspects: the process created by the Plan and the process of creating the Plan. I wish to address that second aspect of transparency.

The previous State Strategic Plan was approved through a cross-acceptance process that included a public hearing in each of New Jersey's twenty-one counties. That process is described on a web page found, as of this writing, at http://www.nj.gov/state/planning/plan-cross-acceptance.html.

By contrast, the Plan now being considered for adoption has been seen at only six public hearings. Three of them have been in halls so full that not everyone who wanted to attend could be seated. (This is written/revised before the last hearing was held.) These hearings are at night, starting at six p.m., making it difficult for working people to arrive on time. Some may have to leave work early, and some may be afraid to do so in the current insecure climate. Others may have to use vacation time, personal days, or sick time in order to attend.

Government transparency, or the lack thereof, is a major concern today in the public and political arena. By limiting the public hearings to six, the process used to create this plan flies in the face of this major concern. The questions thus raised should be answered and the shadow thus cast should be lifted before this Plan is presented for final approval. Provising additional public hearings to have one in each county is an essential step towards answering the questions and lifting the shadow.

Mark Terribile
Aberdeen, New Jersey
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Abstract:

New Jersey has the opportunity to become one of the most healthy, prosperous, sustainable states in the United States. It has the land, resources and basic infrastructure. It only takes political will to make this happen.

Using basic GIS analysis of the land use, there is more than enough available land, if properly developed, within a five minute walk from existing and proposed train/transit stations to meet the vast majority of the residential and commercial growth in the State of New Jersey for the foreseeable future. Expanding beyond that basic 162 acres (five minute walks) around train and transit stations to a 12 minute walk or a 10 minute bike ride provides development and rehabilitation opportunities for growth beyond all growth projections. Implementation at the appropriate scale and amenities within these growth target areas will improve health, reduce carbon footprint, improve the quality of life, reduce unemployment, provide extraordinary economic development opportunities and make living in those communities that implement this concept more affordable, safe and pleasant. It is a strategic option for cities with existing or proposed transit.

This pattern of development will complement the existing “locked in,” pattern of sprawled land uses with total auto and parking dependency, knowing that it will over time, become even more unsustainable and expensive in the future. The new generation of millennials who become the majority demographic by 2016 already understand the benefits of a more urban, walking and transit dependant future. It is their future.
"Plan for maximum land development benefits by coupling high-speed rail station investments with policies that encourage land development around station areas that are primarily located in urban area. In general, well-connected stations in center-city locations offer the greatest potential for urban revitalization."(1)

(1) From the America 2050 and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

Introduction

Transit Dependant Development (TDD) means that land use and transit depend on one another. It means that residents and businesses can exist without reliance on a car or immediate access to parking. TDD puts the focus on walking, bicycling, on promoting a healthier life style and higher quality urban design. It also has economic advantages. In a forthcoming paper entitled, The Walkability Premium in Commercial Real Estate Investments, Pivo and Fisher state "the benefits of greater walkability were capitalized into higher office, retail and apartment values."

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is now a policy within current urban planning dogma. Unfortunately it is considered more as an option, with vague metrics, dimensions and standards. TOD encourages places to become more walkable around existing and proposed transit stations. On the other hand, Transit Dependant Development demands, walkability, bicycle use, multi transit modes and high intensity of mixed and multiple use buildings and civic spaces within reasonable walking distances. It has specific metrics for implementation.
Transit Dependant Development uses the concept of Transects, applied to locations with major transit stops and train stations. It is particularly applicable in New Jersey which has the nation’s largest statewide public transportation system (source NJ Transit). It is also applicable to any other city or region that has now or is proposing high speed rail, enhanced rail, light rail or narrow gage streetcars, or BRT public transit. Transit Dependant Development has two, three and four dimensional metrics. It provides a basic framework for new buildings and public spaces, infrastructure, future transit networks and public and private investments. It generates the opportunity to generate very livable, sustainable urban habitation. With proper urban design standards, great places of memorable character with high quality of urban life can occur. This is fundamental to the regeneration of faltering cities and towns, that became auto and parking dependant. It is this change in this dependency which provides the greatest opportunity and provides the greatest challenge.

Focusing investment into transit dependant urban areas, designing exciting interesting places to live, work and play is far more cost effective and energy efficient. We can experience this in the cities that have already implemented more transit dependency. We know that we cannot promote the pattern of development that encourages energy consumption and pollution, traffic, noise and accidents and the diminishing respect for the pedestrian.

The obscene and wasteful amount of land for parking, particularly in urban areas provide land banks for new urban development. We know that the auto/parking dependant land use pattern has generated huge profits for a few, particularly the surface parking lot owners and operators, with long term costs to consumers and society beyond measure.

(2) Transects are more simple division of land uses into 7 basic categories as opposed to the multiple “zones” typical of most local zoning ordinances. The land use Transects divide land into T-1 – Environmentally sensitive lands – rivers, wetlands, flood planes etc. T-2 – Agricultural lands to be reserved until all other land is built out; T-3 – standards suburban sprawl, T-4 – General urban areas, T-5 – Areas around the cores of cities or towns. T-6 – The cores of cities, towns and villages and SD – a special district.
True costs to society and the environment have not been calculated. Unfortunately, this land use pattern of sprawl and the deurbanization of cities and towns with its auto and parking dependency, over the last three generations has left few mobility options for the vast majority of people. But where these options still exist (cities and towns with existing train stations, light rail or BRT) they must be capitalized upon. Transit dependency is not a new land use pattern. It was functional and operational in the past. It is the emerging vision for the evolving future, using the best of a more humane urban design combining new technology propelled by global, financial and environmental urgency. Combine this with a new generation that is beginning to understand that the future planning will not be the same as the past. That a new economic and social reality must emerge.

**Researching for Sustainable Future**

Since the first Urban Design Studio [UDS] at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey was taught in 1973, to provide a physical planning course to provide accreditation to the Master's Degree Program in City and Regional Planning, it has been dedicated to the research, graphic and communication of three and four dimensional urban forms that positively impacts the quality of life and future sustainability of cities and towns. It has now an impressive list of professionals who have graduated after taking the three course Urban Design sequence. This article emerged after another of these studios focused on the task of developing and testing a conceptual Urban Design framework and landholding analysis on cities in New Jersey that were served by heavy and/or light rail transit. This research studio was conducted in 2009 by a team of 6 graduate students. Focused on New Jersey, with its existing and potential expandable transit network and stations, the resulting recommendations could be applied to the regeneration of cities with current and potential train/transit stations across the United States. The land use goal is higher mixed buildings with walking distances from the station combined with an emphasis on pedestrianism and the de-emphasis on parking.
The purpose was to develop and test a Unified Theory of Urban Design for Transit Dependant Development that would generate a simple, basic two dimensional diagram - a fundamental framework of function, use and intensity, along with a series of Urban Design Standards for urban character, form, massing along with development program metrics. This combination of diagram, metrics and standards could be applied to any city with, or proposing a train or major transit stop/terminal. The diagram had to be simple, with basic metrics and provide infinite flexibility when applied to a specific town with its unique geography, street network, natural features and community visual preferences. The architecture and design vocabulary within the diagram can be determined for each city or town on an individual basis. The specific application of the urban design diagram and standards along with the specific architectural design vocabulary should be generated through a public participation process, thereby insuring optimum public input and the public support of the final form of the land use, street types, parking and public spaces, parks and plazas.

The studio began by researching earlier studies of Transit Oriented Development, the concept of the American Mega Regions with high speed rail connecting major nodes, being promoted by American 2050 of the Regional Plan Association, the Smart Code and the Transects as being promoted by the Congress for the New Urbanism. The studio was a spin-off of initial analysis and recommendations generated from a public participation process/workshops commissioned by Union County, New Jersey to probe the visual, spatial and technical standards for development around train stations in small towns with train stations. Called Transit for Small Towns, 2005, the report summarized the process and recommendations. This report was prepared by A Nelessen Associates with Berger Associates. See the diagram Three Transit Sheds 2005.

What would transit dependant regenerated cities that incorporated this urban design diagram look and feel like? Much in-depth Urban Design Observational Research was completed in cities nationally and internationally that already had a reputation for walkability, livability, sustainability and transit dependency. Much of this observational research was completed prior to the studio, and captured on hundreds of hours of video.
and slide images. Most of this observational research was in Europe, some in Asia and South America. The film and images from the streets and public domain in these cities presented a most compelling and logical, humane and environmentally green vision for the future. The cities where the observational research was conducted provided the “idea models” for which United States cities must start planning if they are to become more sustainable, healthy and efficient in the future. After an internal visioning session using these films and images, a “this could make American cities great” attitude was generated. With the current problems financially and ecologically, globally and locally, it is clear that our costly, polluting sprawl model of urban growth will end when the financial and ecological problems become more manifest to more people. Compact well designed, pedestrian, bicycle transit based cities provide one potentially compelling opportunity to get it right in the future and will particularly appeal to the newer generations, particularly the Millennials (in 2011 are 8 to 29 years old) who will be the prime decision makers about the form of cities in the future because most will live in cities for pleasure and survival. Visual Preference Surveys (3) with this cohort clearly indicate a desire for an alternative future.

(3) Survey results from recent Visual Preference Surveys can be seen on http://www.vid8b328 )

The focus cities for the observational research included Zurich, Switzerland [considered the city with the highest quality of life]; Oslo Norway; Vancouver, Canada; Portland, Oregon; Curitiba, Brazil; Freiberg, Germany; Copenhagen, Denmark; Gent and Brussels, Belgium along with pedestrian and bicycle priority streets in Manhattan and foremost Amsterdam, Holland, the poster child of this type of rational, green development at the national, city and town scales. Holland is one of the most advanced countries on the planet. It has achieved a strategic balance between the pedestrian, transit, bike, the car and parking; between urbanism and farm/food production lands. The observational research of the Dutch and Belgian cities, filmed during winter and summer proved invaluable and informative. Cities had more pedestrian activity in the winter contrary to the belief that pedestrianism is a fair weather exercise! Another city was Oslo, Norway, a wonderful case study unto itself.
There was much to be learned and experienced from these videos. These cities represent the current evolution of urbanism and humanism, green technology and planning, education and culture, transit and bicycle orientation while balancing urban life, pedestrian prioritization and the private automobile. A summary of observational research that focuses on Oslo is currently on YouTube titled: Planning and Designing Healthy Sustainable Future by Tony Nelessen.

In the United States there are excellent examples of cities that have been historically planned and implemented to achieve a high level of sustainability or appeal. Unfortunately many of these cities have lost their train stations and had their transit replaced by arterials and parking lots. Some cities may still have transit but with urban design so negative that it lacks appeal. Portland, Oregon is probably close to a holistic transit dependant city, with high quality urban design that capitalized on its walkable grid, waterfront and well scaled architecture, integrated green and a bicycle network. The early Visual Preference Surveys conducted there set the tone for expanding transit dependency.

There are extraordinary small scaled projects examples in the United States at the downtown or neighborhood level that promote walking and transit/land use dependency like areas of downtown Denver and now Manhattan, Brooklyn and Philadelphia, or sections of Hoboken. In the US we plan and implement incrementally and much of that is “value and traffic engineered” or has very poor quality urban design, streetscape and related public spaces. It is all auto/parking dependent. If developer investment is not seen as generating a guaranteed savings or immediate profit, because it is their money, why do it?

Much of today’s urbanism seems to be designed for the corporate market and not for the long term good of people or community or sustainability or long term enhancement. It is rare to discover a continuous urban experience at a large scale that contains all the characteristics of sustainability, energy efficiency, affordability, convenience and urban delight.

Walking, bicycling, transit orientation balanced with trucks and cars are the mobility fundamentals to the most sustainable and attractive cities. Intensity of land use,
from the highest to the lowest as it transitions through the three transit transects is the second key to future sustainability. All cities and towns have available land and are not now or will ever be "built out" thereby providing the opportunity to retrofit for transit, bicycles and mixed use at appropriate contextual scale.

The entire concept inherent in a transit dependent city – a new urban design theory, generated many questions. Can we reinvigorate walking and transit, bicycles, pedestrian priority and mixed use intensity in our urban centers that are car and parking dependent? How does this diagram overlay and is retrofitted onto an existing city with transit and an array of potential developable lands and buildings? How intense and at what scale does new infill and redevelopment have to be to make places attractive, pedestrian oriented and affordable? At what time and scale of development will cities allow cars to be removed from streets to be converted to pedestrian priority? How do we overcome the desire for parking proximity? How do we retrofit cities to implement this diagram and urban design standards in the United States given our car oriented, parking dependent, non-walking culture and a past history of pedestrian priority (downtown pedestrian mall) failures? Can businesses exist in a downtown without immediate adjacent parking? What happens if a major county or state road transverses the study area? Can the state and federal government become involved in planning and designing critical sustainable elements of sustainable green infrastructure, like sewer, water, communications technology, upgrades to stations, streetcar lines and remote parking.

Parking and access to parking became a key concern. Many existing cities and towns with an active train or major transit stops are heavily dependent on surface parking or parking decks. Most are located next to or immediately adjacent to the station occupying some of the most valuable land in the most unattractive building with awful pedestrian realms and perceptions. Other stations have little or no development of any reasonable scale or intensity around them. Some are park and ride facilities because they serve a suburban auto based population. Opportunities abound in any of these cities to apply the framework diagram and begin the process of planning the transit dependent development of the future. The scale, location and intensity of existing parking lots and
structures will be the greatest impediment to implementation. Fundamentally it must be remembered that enhanced pedestrianism is the hallmark of a sustainable city.

Cities that have embraced transit by default also have to embrace pedestrianism because the user needs to walk to the station. The more people walk, the greater their sensitivity to place and those features that make walking a pleasant and safe experience. Walking five to fifteen minutes is possible, but beyond that, a holistic sustainable system must incorporate convenient secondary transit modes. By extending mobility beyond the ten minute walk, by use of bus rapid transit, on-demand transit and narrow gage street cars, the center of the city with a train station will develop an entire new vitality. We only need to research other cities that have great secondary connections from airports to generate positive examples of secondary transport that works.

**URBAN FRAMEWORK DIAGRAM [UFD]**

After reviewing the observational and best practices research, building and street form concepts and much discussion, the Urban Design Studio spent several weeks developing and refining an urban design framework diagram that could be superimposed over existing train or transit stations/stops and cities with a range of development opportunities. This Urban Framework Diagram joins other classic diagrams that have used the development radiating out in circles from an urban center. The resulting diagram uses a new combination on the traditional circular diagram similar to the Garden City diagram of Ebenezer Howard or the Future City diagram of Victor Gruen. Each contained a focus areas, transportation and mobility network and green spaces. The urban framework diagram prepared by the Rutgers Studio uses three concentric circles that contain mobility and development “sheds.”

**See Figure 1 Conceptual Diagram** which illustrates the primary and secondary walking sheds as well as the tertiary shed divided into multiple potential traditional neighborhoods with their five minute walk from the center of each neighborhood.
The three transit transects of the framework diagram can be understood as the primary, secondary and tertiary service areas. The first two walking distance metrics are universally accepted in the transit business. The first is the traditional five to six minute walk from its centroid [See Figure 2 - TT6]; the second is a six to twelve minute walk out from the centroid [See Figure 3 - TT5]. A minute of walking time was calculated at 250 feet. Where TT6 and TT5 are walkable, the TT4 with its multiple neighborhoods that support the center requires supplemental transit modes to connect each of their neighborhood centers to each other and from each neighborhood center to the main city center and the more regional transit stop. T4 has a radius of two to two and one half miles, a 42 to 45 minute walk or 15 minute bike ride.[See Figure 4 - TT4] The maximum that people will walk may be up to 20 minutes. Clearly, not only is the bicycle critical but will also depend of a range of transit options beyond the bicycle. Bus rapid transit and narrow gage streetcars are the least expensive but would only connect more intensely developed neighborhoods and more remote parking storage areas to the main transit/train station. All the other neighborhoods would require a supplemental form of transit like on-demand transit. This technology seems like the only logical choice supplemented with taxi.

The Conceptual Diagram can be overlaid with its center on any station over any city or town with any combination of streets and natural areas. The essence of this urban framework diagram is that it is infinitely adaptable to any location, natural conditions, street and highway structure provided that the circles are translated into isobars and the dimensional characteristics of the three transit transects are retained. Figure 5 illustrates the Conceptual Diagram infilled with color with the arrange representing the possible neighborhoods with their centers. Figure 6 called the "Reality Model" illustrates how the conceptual diagram can be modified for natural conditions and major roadways which act as edges to neighborhoods.

The Urban Framework Diagram incorporates four of the seven transects as developed by the Congress for the New Urbanism along with the principles of Smart Growth and many of the standards contained within the Smart Code in lieu of the chaos, inefficiencies and non-sustainability of existing zoning regulations. The transects, as they
are used by the Congress for the New Urbanism, are massing and use designations, devoid of defined area until applied to existing land uses or used as a model for urban redevelopment. The Transsects ranged from a Transect Six, T6 to a Transect One, T1, and a Special District. T6 is characterized by the highest density, intensity of activities and mixed-use, decreasing to lower density and intensity in the T5, lower in the T4, transitioning into suburban lots and land uses in the T3, land to be reserved in the T2. The T 1 [areas to be preserved and restored] The designation includes land that is to be preserved for its unique ecological characteristics. A transect based on existing intensity of land uses can be reinforced by various mobility options and vice versa. When applied as a more dimensional “control” for the dependency of land use with specific mobility options an extraordinary range of opportunities emerges.

The Urban Design Research Studio expanded on this concept of Transsects by superimposing the three most urban transects, T6, T5, T4, as radii onto an actual city site with a major transit or multi-modal station as the center point of the radius. Three concentric “rings” of development were recommended

In the Transit Dependant Diagram, T6 is characterized by the highest density, intensity of activities and mixed-use, decreasing to lower density and intensity in the T5, lower in the T4, transitioning into suburban lots and land uses in the T3. The T 1 designation was also used. The designation includes land that is to be preserved for its unique ecological characteristics including flood plains, wetlands, potential high water along with existing parks and green acres lands within urban areas. Much of the T1 area will have to be restored to a new ecological balance incorporating environmental best practices for runoff and wet ponds. T1, “Lands to be Preserved,” could intersect every transect within the radius diagram. It could provide continuous green connections from the periphery to the center connecting parking and open spaces with streets and plazas.

A special district transect is an optional use. Special Districts could be hospital complexes, industrial sites, warehouse and distribution, universities, etc., those places that need specific land use and access.
Exhibit One: The Transect

The urban design framework diagram incorporated a more specific set of definitions which took into consideration not only the location of the major train station/transit stop, but also walking distances, potential bicycle paths, higher intensity of mixed and multiple use development and parking locations. The new planning term that evolved was the Transit Transect or TT using the same numerical enumerations as provided by the Congress for the New Urbanism. The beauty of this diagram is that it provides a rational cost effective model for development with clear rules for all as opposed to the current politically based, and corruption generating rationalization of land use, parking and traffic engineering on an incremental project by project basis.

Each transit transect has a strong emphasis on sustainability through walkability, appropriate mixed-use high density, incorporation of green, infill and rehabilitation. As you can imagine, this diagram superimposed with its center on the station, has the potential to generate a wide range of design scenarios and form patterns based on where the station is located in relationship to the city core, the natural features, existing important buildings, street configuration etc. Depending on location, the edges of the transect could overlap municipal boundaries.

Critical to the diagram is the ability to incorporate multi modes beyond pedestrians. Bicycles and bike lanes have only recently become a hot topic and transportation planning application in the United States. It is well established in Europe and Asia. More cities are incorporating bicycles as a major form of personal mobility. Bicycles for transport are the most sustainable next to walking. They are nearly pollution free and are healthy exercise. Bicycle travel was calculated at 10 mph. It also assumes that designated bike lanes/access continues through all three Transit Transects starting at the major station, continuing on into the T3 suburban area. Provision of safe, stress free bicycles lanes in the three major transit transects is critical to make the entire set of transects work to its optimum advantage and highest level of sustainability. To make bicycles work within the three transit transects, on-street parking must be sacrificed on
many streets unless they are wide enough for parking or have such little traffic or could be redesigned as a slow speed one way.

The initial urban design research included the TT6, TT5 and TT4, but focused on the TT6 because it has potentially the more intense development in the smallest area. The center city/town core TT6 is supported by (TT5) of less development intensity that surrounds and reinforces the core. The TT 5 is pedestrian/bike and car balanced while the TT4 is more oriented towards the car and bike with the pedestrian. Of course the T-3 is suburban and almost entirely car oriented. As the distance from the train station increases, sustainability also decreases because there is typically greater energy usage, pollution and lower intensity of mixed uses.

The TT6, the city center, has to be the highest mixed use density (FAR). The most pedestrian oriented and least car/parking oriented. Major public facilities and plazas should be located in TT6. Ideally, many pedestrian priority streets are located in TT6 area. Parking of all types, on-street, surface, podium, decks and underground, should be seriously discouraged in this transit transect. Keep the car, traffic, pollution, noise and accidents out! Personal vehicles for handicapped, taxis, limos or vans for delivery is restricted, except with a special parking permit for specific and limited locations or for specific and time limited delivery areas.

To accommodate the transition to transit dependent development, a phased plan for implementation and deployment of parking must be developed in time with the implementation of other transit, mobility and parking options for those that still must commute to and from the city center. What has worked best in other cities is a timed phase out of parking by providing transit options, zip cars combined with off-site parking at low costs.

TT5 is still high mixed-use density, but with a greater emphasis on housing. It has a high priority on pedestrianism, bicycles and local green spaces. Parking should also be restricted in this Transit Transect. If parking is to be allowed, it should be in mixed use
parking structures on the edge of the transect or into the lower TT4 transect near a major roadway, arterial or highway. Parking can be up to a 5 to 8 minute walk away when there is a great, safe walking experience.

The TT4 area is by far the largest extending out approximately 2/1/2 miles. This area should be been divided into multiple traditional neighborhoods that have the same five minute walking radius to their respective centers. There could be 75 to over 100 distinctive neighborhoods with the recommended distance dimension within the TT4 area. The most adjustment to the diagram will happen in the TT4 with its multiple traditional neighborhoods whose location is based on existing streets, natural features, historic boundaries and social ties. These smaller circles of neighborhood development can easily be adjusted for major highways, arterials and natural features.

Linking the center of these neighborhoods to the center city core with transit, bicycles and cars is critical for the entire structure to work and function holistically. We know that bicycle has great potential for access to the core from any neighborhood within the TT4 provided that there are bike lanes. Light or narrow gage transit, bus or bus rapid transit can only serve the prerequisite five minute walk to the transit stop therefore these transit modes must be centered on the most intensely developed neighborhoods and mixed use parking areas. How are the remainder of the neighborhoods connected to the city center? This will require a new type of on-demand transit that only connects the centers of each of the neighborhoods to the centers of each of the other neighborhoods and to the city center. Each traditional neighborhood should be redesigned to have a transit/on-demand stop a maximum of 5 minute walk from it’s edge to it’s center. Other choices include taxi, smart cars or the use of personal vehicles. There should be an emphasis on small, electric cars, smart cars and corner cars. If there is a holistic mobility network, of walking, bicycles, on-demand transit, combined for some neighborhoods with light or narrow gage transit, the need for a car should be significantly reduced or eliminated. Vehicles miles traveled will be significantly reduced and quality of life and the environment will improve.
Within the three transit transects, there must be a jobs-to-housing balance, using a minimum of 1 job to 1 housing unit. For every new and existing housing unit within the three transit transects, there need to be 180 to 300 square feet of job generating space as a general rule. Many of these jobs can be distributed throughout the three transit transects, but should be focused in the TT6 and TT5. The TT4 is the ideal location for more home occupations and businesses with few employees. In addition there must be a housing-to-retail balance of 10 square feet for each existing and new residence within the three transit transects. Here again the larger scale retail/commercial uses should be located in TT6 and TT5 with smaller retail uses focused in the center of the multiple neighborhoods of the TT4. Further there should be an open space (parks and recreation) balance based on land use and the potential development program. The provisions of parks, well landscaped streets and plazas must be a top priority to attract and retain people living and working in cities. Parks must be located so they become part of the everyday experience in each of the transit transects. Local neighborhood parks should be located within a three minute walk of all residents.

Within most cities the current urban land uses are completely out of balance thereby requiring extensive commuting and parking. As the economic times become tougher, with the price of energy increasing, a decreasing amount is being spent on other sectors of the consumer economy. Sooner or later a new enlightenment should occur that could lead to changes in land use and mobility. Today a lot of emphasis is being placed on the emerging electric car and the ability to recharge them. Having a small electric car for long distance trips out of the transit commuting range seems probable. The concern is were will they be parked in TT6 and TT5.

With in the three primary transects, this balance must be achieved the sooner in the development process the better, typically by providing more attractive and affordable housing and great safe streetscapes and green spaces. Being able to get to and from work, school, shopping and recreation without the use of a car will reduce pollution, accidents, unsightly parking, significantly reduce the vehicles miles traveled, reduce cost to user and allow the valuable land that heretofore has been used for parking, to be
repurposed and designed for other uses. The more intense the development, the more activity, the less expensive to maintain and energize and the more taxes can be generated. The greater the diversity of users and activities the more interesting and engaging is the living experience. Remember those that are more concerned about their privacy, their large lot and yard and can afford the cost and impacts will still have a huge array of choices as more and more suburban housing becomes available.

The three concentric circles, must be converted into isobars when specific pedestrian, bicycle or transit routes are plotted over a specific network of streets, highways, railroad overpasses and natural features. This is best done by a walk-out from the station at different times of the day and year to understand the actual location experience. Nothing beats direct observation. A good urban designer in conjunction with a good new urbanism transportation engineer is needed to determine that which can be changed to make the walking bicycling experience more pleasant and effective. GIS can also be used with the correct metrics but must be field checked.

How much potential development area is available when these transit transects are applied? First we calculated the gross total amount of land in each of the Transit Transects. The general gross area was determined for each using a circle as a surrogate for the actual movement isobar.

TT6: 6 minutes = 1,500 foot walk or 162 acres
TT5: 12 minutes = 3,000 foot walk or 648 acres - 162 acres[T1] = 486 acres
TT4: 2 ½ mile = 13,200 foot walk or 12,560 acres - 648[T2] = 11,912 acres

To determine the “holding capacity” of each of the transects, we used a combination of aerial photography, primarily using Google Earth, along with “in-field” investigation of the vacant land, parking lots and single story building in bad shape. Field analysis was completed at the three potential city locations, Asbury Park, Rahway and Elizabeth. For the remainder of the 251 stations, we generated “utilization factors” based on the visual and GIS data to provide an estimate of the potential land holding capacity.
The studio focused on two cities to prepare a detailed land use analysis and susceptibility to change maps for TT6. A series of sketch urban design plans, using the Urban Design Framework diagram were developed overlaying the existing street network, building, natural areas, empty lots, and land and buildings considered highly susceptible to change using GIS and Sketch-Up over Google maps and AutoCAD.

**URBAN DESIGN STANDARDS and PROCESS**

Before a more specific massing and development program could be developed, there was much discussion regarding the "urban design standards" that should be applied to provide focus, integrity and integrate the new infill with the existing context, while meeting the goals of sustainability, energy efficiency, pollution and accident reduction, affordability, convenience and urban delight. The principles of Smart Growth and the Smart Code were reviewed as were classic urban design texts.

After much discussion, ten urban design standards that in part incorporated a process were developed and incorporated into the preparation of the urban design plans:

1. In a transit dependant development, the train station is the critical center point. Redesigning, rehabilitating and rebuilding major train stations in city centers to modern engineering and design standards making them more attractive, comfortable and user friendly is critical. This assumes that improvements to tracks, rolling stock, computer scheduling, switching and energy are co-requisites. Designing stations and major stops to be multi modal, provide parking for bicycles and ease of drop off and pick up by transit modes, jitneys and taxis is basic. This is one of the infrastructure improvements that is critical. Also using available transit owned land around and above stations for the highest intensity is only logical for high intensity mixed use. This is a critical infrastructure improvement. Using a process of District Improvement Bonuses (DIB) at intensities above a certain standard could significantly offset costs.
2. A land and building use analysis must be completed using field work, in field community workshops, synthesized in GIS. Determine the amount of existing retail, offices, service and residential in all three transit transects. Inventory, all vacant, partially vacant, underutilized, tax delinquent, undervalued property (low improvement to land ratio) and inappropriately used land (e.g. surface parking, storage) and buildings within each of the three transit transects starting from major trains station or transit station continuing out through the TT4.

Inventory and map the status and capacity of existing sewer, water and other infrastructure including streets, electric transmission, gas, cable, fiber optics etc. Prepare a demographic, housing, and economic profile for all areas within the three transit transects.

If possible declare the as much of the area occupied by the three transects "an area in need of redevelopment" or "an area in need of rehabilitation." The easiest to implement is the declaration of the area as being in need of rehabilitation. This designation does not have the power of condemnation but provides the opportunity of rezone or recode the entire area using a form based-smart code, the framework diagram and the ten urban design standards and processes. Do not default to a large number of small more focused "area" designations. Either way, it is highly recommended that the three transit transect areas be declare, by a non binding resolution of the municipal planning board and the city council, a "critical area for future sustainability."

3. Apply the Urban Framework Diagram and modify it for local conditions, walking distances, major natural features, highways, existing neighborhoods, potential neighborhood centers etc.

4. Once the land and building analysis is complete and the diagram applied, prepare a sketch three dimensional urban design plan to redevelop and infill all of the
determined “available” land based on #2 above using AutoCad, Google Earth and Sketch up. Design for the highest floor area ratio, the tallest buildings the highest residential densities for a diversity of population with the most intensive city center mixed use in the TT6 graduating out to lower intensity through the TT5 area and into the TT4 area. For TT6 use a minimum FAR of 3. For the TT5 a minimum of 1.5 and for the TT4 a minimum of .5. Dependent upon intensities and development program, these FAR’s can be significantly increased provided that the building heights respect the human scale in the proportion of the streets and spaces. Active pedestrian edges should be kept to a four to six story height and then stepped back when building multi stories above the base.

Clearly scale has an important emotional and physical impact on people testified to by the responses from hundreds of Visual Preference Surveys and more locally that Hoboken with its 3 to 12 story scale, punctuated by the occasionally 20 to 30 story building is considered the most comfortable scale street to be on and is one of the fastest growing cities in New Jersey.

5. Refocus most new retail, commercial, social and cultural facilities again in the downtown TT6, providing space, logical dimensions, distances and destination anchors. The basic design rules for retail are well documented. Provide space to promote cultural activities and events in the downtown rebuilding the vitality of the center city. Promote a center city Business Improvement District. Determine the size of the retail and commercial facilities based on population both existing and proposed.

Master Plans and zoning will have to be amended in most locations to accommodate Transit Dependant Development. No additional retail or commercial facilities should be allowed except in the TT6, with less in TT5 and only located in the neighborhood centers in TT4. Those that are “grand fathered” in any of the transects can stay unless the building is vacated for over 6 months.
Short term incentive opportunities should be provided for transfer of development rights for retail and commercial from existing strip commercial and office parks to the downtown transects. Allow no new retail or commercial expansion in the T3 and T2 Transects. Use regional or state wide planning mechanisms or inter governmental agreements when transects overlap municipal boundaries.

Provide a high jobs to housing balance (as close as 1 job to 1 housing unit as possible). For each new or existing unit, with in the three transit transects, as a rule of thumb, provide 180 to 300 square feet per job. For each existing and new person provide a minimum of 10 square feet of retail space.

6. For urban areas to be successful, we must integrate nature/green into each of the transects both summer and winter. Design parks, plazas, greenways, river walks, waterfronts, green buildings, green roofs, as part of the everyday experience. Create a green continuous experience by extending green through street plantings and furniture. Design a "green experience as part of the everyday walking experience, close to residential and accessible from offices and work places.

7. Maximize walkability and pedestrianism within the TT6 and TT5 transects using pedestrian priority streets and plazas, wide sidewalks and quality streetscapes. Pedestrian streets must be lined on both sides with retail or commercial and maintain proper height to width proportions of the streets to make them comfortable and imageable. Pedestrian streets should be hierarchical, with primary and secondary pedestrian streets. Pedestrian streets are dedicated to the walking pedestrian. Bikes on these streets must be pushed. Reduce the interference of taxis and on-demand jitneys accessing and exiting the two primary transects to the low pedestrian priority street.
8. Incorporate multi-modal transit including bicycles, narrow gage and light rail, bus rapid transit, buses, taxi and on-demand jitney services that connect the neighborhoods in the TT4 area and remote parking to the downtown civic center TT6 and TT5 and the train station. Only light/narrow gage rail, taxis, buses, service vehicles and bicycles should be allowed inside the TT6 and possibly TT5 areas. Design transit modes to increase accessibility, promote walking, reduce parking, accidents and pollution. Bus rapid transit, narrow gage street cars, bike lanes, on-demand transit, and zip cars must be integrated with the pedestrian movement to eliminate conflict.

Light rail, BRT, or narrow gage street cars should be incorporated into the overall plan connecting the highest density outer (TT4) neighborhoods, remote parking structures and other local destinations. Those neighborhoods within the TT5 and TT4 Transects that cannot be served by light or narrow gage or conventional bus service need to be served by an on-demand jitney service. If a car is required, the smart car, zip car or corner car rental should be applied provided that it is parked out the pedestrian realm.

The urban design of the streets, public spaces and buildings in all three transit transects must be so desirable and positive in its scale and character, use and facilities, that people who live there could find most of what they wanted or needed within a walk, a short internal transit or bicycle ride. Assuming you arrive at the major central train station from another Transit Dependant Development, a short walk puts you in the center of the activity and intensity. If you need to get to a more remote location within the TTD a short wait should provide transit access. Or, you could rent a bike. Ideally each TT and neighborhood would have characteristics and facilities, spaces and places that make it unique and walkable.

9. Because buildings are the primary users of energy, incorporate and integrate green building architecture into plans for infill and rehabilitation is critical. Design for
appropriate orientation, incorporating sustainable building practices, materials, day lighting, recycling, green roofs etc.

New redevelopment must reduce our carbon footprint. The more global issues of climate change being generated from the increase in atmospheric carbon from 280ppm to 386 parts per million this year and increasing each year is setting off alarm bells. It is estimated that we have a planning window of 22 years at the current rate before the concentration will reach the critical 450 part per million. This requires that we must do more than current tokenism to reduce carbon emissions. The United States only has a small percentage of the planetary population but generates the second largest amount of pollution.

Reduction in our carbon footprint can best be implemented through changes in land use, less dependence on the automobiles and the energy that is required to maintain our transport systems, the incorporation of renewable energy, the infilling of the urban fabric with energy efficient buildings, and the design of great urban environments where people want to live, work, play, walk and bicycle.

10. Parking will be important as long as there are vehicles and people have to use vehicles to get to their destination and at the destination they need to leave their cars for a short or long period of time. Creating high density mixes uses places where people can live, work and play in walking proximity and have access to mass transit and bike lanes is primary. Where vehicles park is the key. Our recommendation is that no parking be provided for new infill within the TT6 and TT5. All required parking should be removed beyond the TT5 and require people to walk thereby enhancing the pedestrian realm. Land is too valuable within these areas to be used for parking. The studio rejected the idea that in order to sell a housing unit with in a well designed TT6 or TT5 parking for each unit is required within the buildings. When this exists there is no personal interaction with the pedestrian realm. If density is high enough, the streetscape compelling, with alternative forms of transit, remote parking is the trade off for a more pedestrian
character of place. It is vehicular circulation within the primary transit transects that is the most inhumane and with its noise, speed and inconvenience and danger to the pedestrian. To enhance the pedestrian realm most on-street parking should be removed and replace with wider sidewalks and bike lanes except for delivery and pick up locations and those pre-permitted parking locations. Any Urban Design Plan must plan for a hierarchy of mixed use parking facilities outside TT6 and TT5 to include local, neighborhood, district and regional parking.

Locate all new parking for the TT6 and TT5 on the periphery of the TT5 adjacent to and accessible by major streets/arterials. Locate new more remote parking areas within an optimum walking distance of 10 minutes or if located at a further distances, connect by transit and/or bikes. Use all existing surface lots within the TT6 and TT5 for development. If possible remove or reuse older parking structures for offices or retail, manufacturing or service/storage uses, urban farming, hydroponics and roof top renewable energy. Do not locate car or truck parking for the train station within TT6 or TT5. Close-in parking increases the anxiety level when combined with traffic, accidents and the need to rush. Slowing down and a short walk are good for your emotional and physical health.

Local parking in TT6 and TT5 is reserved for a limited number of cars, handicap drop off areas, package delivery, designated taxi stops and limo parking. These must be included in the plan. All of the above require a local permit for parking. Certain streets, particularly pedestrian oriented street can have no parking and no vehicular service except for emergency and after hours delivery, cleanup and garbage/recycling pick up.

Neighborhood parking within TT4 is primarily for residential uses but also some commercial, service and retail must be contained within a mixed use structure or be located within a optimum 5 minute walking distance from designated locations. This can be embedded or under building parking. Ideally
this parking is encased by liner buildings a minimum of three sides with retail or commercial on the ground level.

District parking is primarily for office and day time parking outside the TT5 with vehicular access from a major street or arterial. Connection to parking structures on the edge of the TT5 can be a pleasant and interesting 10 to 12 minute walk or by transit/bus or possibly by bike.

Regional Parking is located in very large efficient parking structures located on the edge of a freeway, major highways, arterial or boulevard well out from TT6, TT5 or TT4 although it could be on the outside edge of TT4. There should be limited retail and services on the ground level. Access to and from regional parking is by transit or bike. Regional parking should have the cheapest parking rates. Parking in Transit Dependant Development is considered infrastructure and as such should be eligible for federal funding. Financing for these structures should be a joint venture between the municipality parking authority and the development community who will not have to provide on site parking and deal with the disruption that auto traffic generates.

Almost all traffic engineers focus on function, capacity and safety of the driver of the automobile. But, given that we kill between 95 and 115 people per day in the United States in fatal crashes, should we not look to reduction in the need to use the auto as opposed to better seat belts and crash tests? The number of fatal crashes is slowly decreasing but add up to 35,000 to 42,000 per year. Some days it can reach over 350 people killed. A huge number of people are injured.

These 10 Urban Design standards were considered the minimum that must be applied to achieve the level of sustainability that is required in the future and come reasonably close to the vision that was generated through the Observations Research. The next step in the process was to determine the potential
development program that incorporated these standards. Optimism grew as the 10 standards were discussed and agreed on.

The odds are slowly stacking up for walkability, transit and healthy humanism by the presence of obesity, pollution, climate change, and unsustainable land use patterns. There is a growing acceptance and media coverage of sustainability, climate change and cost of energy, and the financial crisis. Unfortunately it is still a minority view and most people are locked into the present pattern of auto convenience and dispersion. Currently there is no major crisis that has precipitated the need for change, although history clearly indicates that we are following a trajectory of change. (*Generations* by Strauss and Howe)

**DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

How much future growth, development, infill, redevelopment and rehabilitation could be accommodated in these areas using the Urban Design Framework diagram while incorporating the ten design standards? To calculate a gross land holding capacity, we first started by superimposing the urban design framework, using GIS, centered over the 215 existing train stations/transit stops in New Jersey. See *Exhibit 1: 251 Train Stations*

In a later study the same transects were superimposed over the 32,685 bus stops. Incidentally, there is so much development potential around the train and transit stations alone that using bus stops would only be used where no other transit modality exists or to act as a feeder system to the larger nodes. See *Exhibit 2, Train and Bus*

In developing the gross calculations of future capacity, we had to take into consideration that a hierarchy of stations exists with a wide a range of available, vacant and underutilized land and political aptitude towards sustainability. Some municipalities with existing stations will never accept
any type of development at this time, others will accept limited development. Some with land resources might not see the need. Other cities are in such political chaos, or politically dysfunctionality that no decision can ever be made without significant changes in the governmental structure. Others may be locked into their existing zoning which is inappropriate for future sustainability particularly if that zoning is "Desperation Zoning." This type of zoning will allow any use including low density, low FAR and high parking ratio suburban type development like drug stores, fast food, big boxes and gas stations and suburban parking around train stations. Finally there is currently (2011) little market for any type of development. Therefore physical planning is in hiatus. Planning for infrastructure improvement like transit dependant development should be considered a federal requirement. The purpose here is to test the concept and generate form and a potential holding capacity for future planning and design.

In the development of our gross calculations for the entire 251 existing stations in New Jersey, we created factors for these conditions. In the analysis of the more specific urban design plans that were generated, we far exceeded our preliminary estimates. The gross numbers we calculated are very low relative to what is possible with high quality urban design.

Our field work and GIS/Google Earth investigations suggested that in the TT6, approximately 6% to 20% of the land not including streets, was either vacant, i.e. cleared of buildings, abandoned one story buildings, surface parking lots or buildings for lease or sale. If occupied a building was marginally used on the ground floor. Some cities had significantly more than 20% of the land available, some less. This was simplified to a mean of 12% of total land area for our initial gross calculations. For the TT5 and TT4 area we estimated that approximately a very conservative 10% of the land area, not including streets and parks could be developed or developed at a higher intensity. TT5 and TT4 would be infilled at a much lower FAR to respond to
the existing context.

Applying that factor (12%) to the 162 acres of the TT6, we estimated that we could design 19.4 acres of new development. We then applied a FAR of 3.0 – [using the 4 over 1 mixed use design module] which is a very cost effective building type- determined a preliminary minimum development program of approximately 2,535,000 square feet within the TT-6, the most walkable mixed use transect. This 2,530,000 ft.² can be used for housing, retail, commercial and civic uses. It does not include spaces for the needed and necessary open spaces plazas and parks nor does it include area for parking. If buildings increase in height, beyond the FAR of 3, extra land would be available for the needed and necessary parks and open spaces.

Visual Preference Survey from a broad sample of participants suggests that the “ideal” height ranges between 6 and 7 stories with a base course of height complementing the existing scale of stories with the opportunity to go higher, up to 20 stories with appropriate setbacks. The desired proportions of the street to building wall is 1:1 to 1.2. 1:3 is ok if it is extensively landscaped with street trees.

How much development opportunity would be available if we used all three of the transit transects at a predetermined FAR using the mean land availability factor? The research design studio assumed that the floor area ratio would be an average of 3.0 in the TT-6 area, to a lower FAR of 1.5 in the TT5, and an even lower FAR of .5 in the TT-4 area. Using a combination of lower floor area rations and the increased land availability because of area of the transit transects, TT4 had the most available land using the above low FAR.

The following are the general calculations for holding for each TT. These floor area ratios are very low and are purposeful to develop numbers that are doable and very
conservative.
TT 6 – 162 Acres with a 12% availability factor using a FAR of 3.0 = 2,540,000 sq ft
TT 5 – 468 Acres with a 10% availability factor using a FAR of 1.5 = 3,058,000 sq ft.
TT4 - 11,912 Acres with a 10% availability factor using a FAR of .5 = 25,944,000 sq ft.
*All of these numbers will vary with land use analysis at each location, but are reasonable for the purpose of developing this urban design theory.

In total, using the three transects as applied to only one station and one major city could generate up to the unbelievable amount of 31,500,000 square feet of building area.

If all this potential over the three transit transits were applied to the 251 stations, and to be conservative, reducing the land availability factor even further i.e, 6% of TT6, 8% of TT5, and 7% of TT4) over 5.8 billion ft² of developable space could be built!

MORE CONSERVATIVE NUMBERS
There are multiple disparities between stations in terms of available land and underutilized buildings. The 12% land availability and FAR's within the TT6's, could not be applied unilaterally to all stations. Using only the TT6 at the FAR of 3 a total of 638,000,000 square feet of building could hypothetically be built around the 251 existing stations. Even if half of that amount of land was used, or only one half of the stations were to be built in this form (some towns will object to any development) 319,000,000 sq ft, an enormous amount of square footage could still be built around stations. To arrive at a specific number for each station area a detailed land and buildings use analysis would have to be done around all existing and proposed stations incorporating all supporting data that is current available.
If the projected square footage of 318,000,000 within one half of all the TT-6’s was simply divided into 1000 ft.\(^2\) increments, i.e., one urban apartment at 1000 ft.\(^2\), balanced with retail, job generating square footage, service facilities, civic and culture uses, which would add an estimated additional 1,200 square foot, a person in the future consumes 2,200 sq ft of floor space for home, retail, jobs, civic uses, etc. The plan could accommodate more than 145,000 new housing units and 173,770 million square feet of employment space.-jobs - retail - civic uses. This is a very conservative figure given the low FAR’s. Remember this is just within the TT6 areas on only one half of the stations.

In 2009, the estimated population of New Jersey from the US Census was 8,707,739. In 2000 the population was 8,414,378 generating an increase of 293,361 in 9 years. At an estimated 2.68 persons per household, a total of 109,000 housing units would be needed at some time assuming that these people stay in New Jersey. This generates a crude household need of about 12,000 units per year. Assuming the very low minimum potential reflected in the FAR and number of stations areas, suggests that 145,000 housing units and their parallel non residential requirements could be developed within one half of the TT-6’s alone! The seasonal adjusted average rate for housing starts in New Jersey according to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress was 9,680, well under the low 12,000 possible units per year. It is unclear in this constrained “wait and see” economy how much growth will actually happen. A rough estimate is that this time line could be extended out to 20 years or more. (Assuming that no other housing was built or occupied elsewhere, that existing vacant houses were to remain vacant or the 5.8 percent of all mortgages are in foreclosure are not reoccupied which is an unlikely scenario)

Can you imagine what this would be like with these great walkable and bicycle urban city centers, with continuous green space extending into the cities, great walkable streets with multi modal transit working at optimum capacity, mixed use buildings, large light filled apartments, parks, plazas, cafes, with people everywhere? All the Visual Preference Surveys that have been completed over the past 20 years
clearly illustrate what this could be like and that the people who participated in the
survey would like to have and experience.

There is plenty of new development capacity, when considering all the transects,
to build an enormous number of great housing units and civic space with walking
distances of train stations. These areas could consume the market for the next 50 to 60
years.

Currently, there is little market pressure for development or redevelopment as this
article is being written, except for those municipalities that have a reasonable
proximity to the Manhattan market, and have incorporated some but not necessarily
all of the ten urban design standards.

We know it is possible, but will the market, local state and federal politics
controlled by the car and parking oriented baby boomers allow it to happen?
Certainly some cities are moving in this direction, New Brunswick being one, Jersey
City another. For others, it is going to be a hard sell as we continue the “wait and see
attitude” and enjoy the auto dependant, sprawl, anti city pattern we have come to
know. The more interesting question is, could there be a market in the future for a
new normal, an urban, green integrated, transit and walking oriented life style as a
choice for some of the future market if we designed it properly? Perhaps not for most
of the baby boomers who created the sprawl and are the most car dependant, but
perhaps for the new generations who more clearly understand that their survival and
future life style depend on a new urban pattern that is carbon free and could seriously
reduce carbon emissions and green house gases. This will provide an even greater
pressure for long term sustainable plans that would link multiple transit transects in
New Jersey.
Testing the Concept

To test the concept, and prepare a gross development program, the urban design research group studio focused only on TT6, in two cities, Elizabeth and Asbury Park, New Jersey, one larger and one smaller city served by rail transit. The project was hypothetical and not sanctioned by the city of application or any transit agency. For each of these cities, field trips revealed existing conditions and notated land and buildings what appeared to be vacant or under utilized. A Land Utilization and Susceptibility to Change map was completed after field visits and before the urban design concept was applied. The methodology for the plan was to first designate the areas within TT6, locating the boundary not in the center of the street but at least one building deep or in the block center thereby capturing the building on both sides of the street. Starting first with the areas designated as the most susceptible for development, a preliminary urban design plan, massing, phasing and resulting development program was developed integrating the existing buildings and natural features and respecting the urban design guidelines. The urban design program required the designers to meet the base minimum number for the TT6 transect. If desired, and if it created a higher quality urban design, the base program could be exceeded which it was in all the specific urban design plans. The plans were created in a combination of two-dimensional AutoCAD and three-dimensional Sketchup. Using these programs the massing could be analyzed from any perspective thereby assuring the scale and proportions of the spaces and places designed, which also made quantity analysis easy.

When the final concept plan for the TT6 zone in Elizabeth was completed, over 37 million square feet of building area and over 2 million square feet of parks and open space emerged. This was 15 times the earlier gross estimate.

The Elizabeth development program broken down as follows:

- 27.75 million sq ft residential
- 7.5 million sq. ft. of retail and office
- 2.25 million sq. ft. of civic space
2.15 million sq. ft of Parks and Open Space

Just using the residential square footage, at the 2,200 sq. ft. (combining residential and non residential uses) a total of 12,600 units could be built in the Elizabeth TT-6 area alone or one year of focused growth for all of New Jersey. The following diagram represent the conceptual urban design massing models that illustrate the application. See Exhibit 3: Elizabeth Development and Massing Diagram.

Once the gross potential development square footage was calculated, the next task was to prepare a preliminary urban design plan consisting of street form, block structure, open space/plazas, general building massing and development program for Elizabeth and Asbury Park to test the concept. When the preliminary urban design plans were completed, each application of the theory exceeded the minimum expected development program while adding much additional green spaces, plazas and public areas.

The urban design theory assumed little or no new parking be built with in the TT6 (UD Standard #10) and where possible moved the existing surface parking and most of the on-street parking where bike lanes or pedestrian priority streets were required to a mixed-use parking structure in one of the lower transects preferable in TT5 (a five minute walk or to the TT6 and 10 minute walk) where land was less valuable and there was greater access to a major arterial, highway and transit stop.

The issue of parking - where to locate the parking, size of lots or decks, ratios (number per square foot or unit) was the subject of much discussion and debate. Most current urban zoning codes requiring significant amounts of parking to be either in the buildings, under the buildings, in a podium or immediately adjacent in a parking structure. For most train stations, it is typically located immediately adjacent. The current planning philosophy is to increase the amount of parking
so suburbanites, those that do no live in the city, will have better access to the train station. It is simply too expensive and time consuming for many who use the train and work in Manhattan or other high density locations to stand in traffic or pay for parking and maintenance. So if we want people to use the train station, the logic goes, we must provide parking.

Locating parking in the city center is anti-urban and anti-pedestrian and anti-livability. It might be considered a necessary evil but it is the curse of good urbanism. The more pedestrian a city the more likable and livable. Pedestrian presence is the primary energy in a city. Moving cars into the city center and then storing them, immediately adjacent to the train station or within the TT6, or parking them on city center streets or worse in on grade parking lots creates noise, pollution, accidents and desgregates the humanism and positive visual and spatial quality of place. It impacts negatively the desire and the actuality of a more pedestrian oriented center city, pedestrian oriented streets and the provision of dedicated bicycle lanes. How we deal with parking will be one of the most difficult transitions to this unified urban design pattern because drivers expect parking to be close, cheap or free. The trade off has to be initially much higher prices to park close, reducing in cost in proportion to distance. People are very adaptable if given proper incentives. Given a choice of a well designed and accessible, mixed use parking structure with a great walking experience, or, if further out, an immediately accessible short transit ride into a pedestrian center people will walk. They will complain at first but then adapt and realize the distinct advantages to their health and positive sense of place. Removing parking, after thinking that the salvation of the city was more parking in close proximity, has been around now for so many years and is incorporated into so many centers, that not providing it may seems like a development killer. Many city centers will have great difficulty to become more pedestrian and sustainable because there are already peppered with parking structures and lots. Convenience has become normative and expected much like the remote control for a TV.
For politicians and early generation planners not to consider the lack of parking a development killer, will require that it be replaced with pedestrian places of extraordinary merit and market value. Those few places in the country that have tried it, like the Santa Monica Mall, Burlington, Vermont, Boulder, Colorado are very successful as has been most large suburban malls for so many years, that required people get out of their car and walk. Suburbanites who drive into the city will try to park as close to their destination as they can. The suburbanites mentality has tempered the planning of most cities therefore these cities that succumbed to this type of planning have lost their unique city identity. The key to the urban design of the sustainable city is to provide the opportunity to live and work without the car and for those that must drive in provide convenient and adequacy parking combined with a great short walk or transit ride. A walkable city core is the key to sustainable urban design.

Jan Guel’s multi year policy to remove small amounts of parking each year now for twenty years, has made Copenhagen one of the great pedestrian, bicycle cities of the world.

Our observational research of other cities like Zurich, Switzerland, Curitiba, Brazil, Friberg, Germany, Oslo, Norway; Gent or Brugges, Belgium and many other cities in South America and Asia have revealed many pedestrian priority streets combined with the provision of little or no parking in the most used pedestrian places, typically in the center of the city. Parking is provided in non-center city locations, including neighborhood parking within a two to three minute walk, local parking within a five to 10 minute walk, or remote parking using a secondary transportation mode like a streetcar up to ten to 15 minutes away. The more remote, the cheaper and the better access to high capacity roadways and transit. By not having to provide parking, over the long term significantly reduces building costs and the environmental impacts and human costs within the TT6 and TT5. As the density increase and with the provision of secondary means of transport beyond the private automobile, people use their car
less. In some cities like Hoboken, new parking structures for some residential project are well under capacity as people opt not to purchase or rent a parking space thereby reducing their personal costs. Remote parking with a great walk can be done and has been done.

Is There a Market?

If applied, can these cities and towns attract a market? Applying the framework and standards in just two towns reveals that the holding capacity development numbers are excessive for the market need and certainly excessive for the rather low FAR development program. This means that fewer cities with major transit, done well, could capitalize the future market in New Jersey. The plan provides a market opportunity for those who wish to live a more affordable, quality life style. To really make it attractive, all the ten urban design standards would have to be applied. That city which incorporates all the standards will be the most successful.

I suspect that households without children will be the most attracted although we are seeing many baby strollers in some of our more successful urban areas like Hoboken or other cities with large immigrant populations. If there are children in the city than quality schools are critical. But for most childless households, quality schools will not be an issue. Safety, accessibility, affordability, walkability and delight will be critical. How fast we grow and how many suburbanite transfers to livable cities will in part be dependant on the quality of the urban experience.

It is clear that the vast majority of the wealth in this country is held by a very small percentage of the population. This group which controls media, real estate and finances, can and will live anywhere they want. Exciting cities, and large rural estates, penthouses and Hampton beach houses. Travel by private jet, helicopter and limo. The world is currently their oyster. Why would they change what they have and how to the keep and expand the money they have make from
the status quo? Many in the lower 95% of the population would love to live the life of the rich and famous. It is an illusion and a fantasy for most. Perhaps it is a motivation. But, what about the vast majority of the population who will have to live on lesser means? What do they deserve? Can we plan and design great good places for them? Certainly!

My guess is that it will be an uphill climb at first to create this ideal place until a holistic first phase with all the criteria can be actually experienced or produced in virtual reality generated from a future visioning process generated from many people's minds. Like most successful places, success follows success, implementation follows programming. Just as soon as the market and banks can look through the rear view mirror of time and see local demonstrated success is when real progress will come. Some city, some enlightened developer will inevitably take the chance realizing the upside. Local governments must encourage and support transit dependant development giving developers the opportunity and the motivation, but it must be holistically designed, not compromises particularly on parking. Once it is successful it will be copied similar to the evolution that happened when the one sided strip mall morphed into life quality centers that were walkable and in some emulated the traditional main street. Some even removed the parking on the pedestrian streets completely. Every Visual preference Survey and Vision Translation workshop that I have conducted reinforces this concept. The market is there, the place is not.

**Implementation**

Every transit/train station has a real opportunity to grow and become a positive contributor to future sustainability. The larger the station in terms of use, the more multi modes the more intensive the FAR's within the Transit Transects. Many plans for proper development around train stations have been rejected. West Windsor and Hamilton are but a few examples. Sustainability has not yet a commonly held goal. Maintaining traffic flow and convenient adequate parking
for their low density, auto dependent constituency is currently the only criteria that seems to apply particularly in ex-urban townships.

The studies and plans that have been completed for places like Hoboken, Journal Square, Monmouth Junction have revealed much land development potential. As an example, the Hoboken station has multi-modes and heavy usage with important key underutilized parcels available within walking distance, as has the Newark Station. The Asbury Park is a smaller town, also has significant vacant land. Elizabeth has large amounts of vacant and underutilized land and deteriorating, partially used buildings to which this Transit Transect could easily apply. The list could go on and on. So why has this not happened before in most cities in the United States? We could start with the car, asphalt, baby boomer program mentality. This is serious enough of a hurdle. Some think that future generations will look back on the excess of the 50's to 2010's as the most destructive, unplanned period in American history.

In discussion with the contemporary practicing planners, many feel that the European, South American, Scandinavian or Asian examples used in the observational research will have difficulty applying in the United States because the American culture, politics and expectations are different – essentially we have become programmed on sprawl, problematic cities, cheap energy, auto dependence, easy available inexpensive or free parking, convenience, and the pressures of a consumer mentality. While the baby boomers are in power, the future is maintaining the status quo which they created. This might even be extended to the Generation Xers. The politics of approval are based on this mentality. Americans want easy access and convenience according to them. Currently, cars, highways, arterials and parking are more important than transit and walking and certainly bicycles. Removing parking for bicycle lanes in cities is nearly impossible, according to most planners and traffic engineers. Higher density as seen from a suburban mentality of land use is too low to be effective
and to generate the type of urban vitality that is necessary to have a successful urban place.

Currently few cities are planning for the future. Planning academics seem to be focused on creating metrics of the present. Physical planning is a low priority for most cities that do no understand the imperative of sustainability. Physical planning requires money, public and private commitment and most important vision. Most cities are not planning for the future, because they are so hung up on maintaining the present which constrains them like an airline passenger with too much baggage. Can we learn to get along with less and have more? Will developers and cities understand the long term benefits over short term gains? If cities continue to do little will it be too late?

The baby boomers currently have their vision of what land use is and should become. Saving open space and maintaining free car flow seems to be top priority for them. We have not learned the lessons from history nor have we as a culture fully realized the huge looming problems that will confront us in the next 10 to 50 years. It is still perceived to be cheaper and easier to continue to expand into the rural areas, retrofit a few old shopping centers or add new streetscape to the center of the city than to tackle the holy grail of sustainability, energy efficiency, pollution and accident reduction, affordability, convenience and urban delight. It is clearly easier to accommodate the cars flowing through the center of our cities and forgo pedestrian priority in city centers than it is to modify our plans and codes, and even more to implement the alternative even though it may be healthier for people, sustainable for the planet and create more value in the center cities. The baby boomers who control, cannot see over the dashboard of their cars.

If Transit Dependant Development is considered as too visionary, radical, simplistic or unattainable at this time, it means that we must redouble the effort to
promote and educate, believing that transit based development is a rational and logical plan for the future at least for those cities with active mass transit.

I believe that it will be the new generation, conditioned on continued crisis, high unemployment and lack of wealth that will spirit the change. It will not be the baby boomers and perhaps not even the GenXers, but perhaps the Millennial Generation (1982-2003) who will be in power in 15 to 30 years from now. It is their vision of the future that might be the most important given that they are more inclusive, optimistic and tech savvy. I just hope that this will be understood soon enough before it is too late to catch up because in 15 to 25 years from now we will reach the critical 450 ppm of carbon in the atmosphere, the peak of oil and the major disruption to the oceans and two billion more people on the planet the perfect expansion of the current financial crisis scenario. Unless there is a global pandemic or a global war that would limit population, we need to start planning now.

This paper outlines a concept/framework for the perfect sustainable, transit based city center and surrounding transit transects located on very small percentage of land area for a large number of people. This framework cannot be done without the acceptance and the need for a physical manifestation of what this vision could and should look like in many locations. It argues for the creation of a vision plan. To accomplish this would require a public participation process that would generate a consensus vision. It argues for a unified theory that has great flexibility and therefore has the opportunity for multiple applications. It is only with the use of a unified diagram, and the three and four dimensional variations that could be created from this diagram, that real, phased, options for the future could be created. Within the area of diagrammatic superimposition many people could participate in the creation of a vision using the community participation techniques of visual preference surveys and vision translation workshops.
A public relations and advertising campaign would have to be generated that would have a real buy-in. A transit based vision of the future must be able to be seen and experienced even if virtually at first. We must generate the feeling of place that people will think, “I really love this place and would love to live and work here.” This transit dependant plan of place would have to be presented first in a video form or I Max movie or a 3D movie or multiple You Tube movies. If enough people participated in the creation of some type of a transit dependant plan, perhaps in a few years as the constraints and economics of sprawl development become more apparent, this vision will move from virtual to real, small at first then growing as the new normal become more apparent.

The institutional barriers of redevelopment in New Jersey particularly after the Gallathin and Mulberry Street decisions have left many urban redevelopment places in even more advanced state of deterioration. The extraordinarily untapped potential of land with walking distances to train stations which has the greatest probability for sustainability because it’s location and proximity to employment, will have to be utilized at some point in the future to achieve even a modicum of sustainability for small percentage of the population. If it cannot be developed under the redevelopment statutes, either the redeveloped criteria and process will have to be modified or zoning has to be put in place and very explicit urban design site plans are going to have to be designed and engineered within this complex geometry of ownership and underutilized land. With an overall framework diagram institutionalized through zoning, and infilled with public participation, has the potential to create an initial vision of what is acceptable and not acceptable.

For transit dependant development to happen in reality, higher intensity and density cities with great public spaces and transit, there will have to be public investments in urban infrastructure like sewer water, energy production, train station improvements, reactivating old rights of way with new train or street car service, narrow gage transit on existing streets, on demand transit, bicycle lanes
and pedestrian networks, along with parks, plazas and public parking all of which are in the public domain. There will always be the overarching question who pays for the public spaces, the needed infrastructure improvement, the provisions of the community benefit agreement. Public infrastructure is of particular concern. In almost all urban areas there is the fundamental problem of aging infrastructure. Much of the urban infrastructure has undergone delayed maintenance for many years and now to repair or modify, or, in most site plans, to add new and expand the capability of infrastructure continues to be more and more expensive. Federal Infrastructure Improvement funds are desperately needed. The capital improvements that are required and in essence should be budgeted capital improvements plans for each municipality and should probably be financed through federal money and mechanisms like a TIF. Incentivizing developers with tax credits short term abatements and building bonuses will certainly be required.

It is going to be the density and intensity, that will be of greatest concern to the development community who not only has to finance it, but also has to make a profit building and occupying it. There has to be a semi transparent cost analysis which clearly lays out the costs, the land purchase, the relocation, the demolition, the infrastructure improvement, the design development and engineering, the construction, marketing, the continued maintenance and the operating costs and the expected profit. But there will also have to be Community Benefit Agreements [CBA] that the developers and investors will have to absorb include job training, affordable housing, construction of parks and plazas, the commitment to local hiring, provision of space for neighborhood education and child care which will have to be incorporated into the development plan and costs.

Because development costs are so opaque in the minds of most community objectors, (aka corruption and overruns) the revenues generated from projects, phased over time are even more difficult for most people to understand. What density and intensity of use is required to offset the costs the profit and
continued maintenance and operating fees? If this was more transparent it is my belief that there would be greater room for negotiation to get projects built. The more intense the development, typically meaning more floors than the community would like to see, must be offset by payment into District Improvement Bonuses or Community Benefit Agreements when a base contextual number of floors is exceeded.

Rather than one or more large developments, ideally many small developers should be allowed to participate. Unified theory of urban design applied to zoning would allow many small and large developers to participate because the plan is clear, not negotiated.

There is no question in my mind that we can pay for this, we just need to divert the money from the war provoking, war production loop into sustainable city building. If we stay at war, and public money continues to be spent on wars, provoked because we are at war alienating the younger generations who then “threaten our security” we are on an endless loop of destruction and fear. Money is needed for infrastructure and it is needed soon. The most logical source is the trillions spent each year on wars diverting it into secure, livable, high density, mixed-use cities.

Summary

The goal of Urban Design is to promote a vision for the future. If we as a state and country are to evolve to a higher level of sustainability, we must have a real vision of for the future of cities particularly those with trains and connected transit. This vision must incorporate a unified theory of urban design, providing an alternative within the context of past programming not a compromise. We must strive for transit dependent communities, not transit oriented communities.
The paper sets forth a simple structural framework diagram and 10 urban design standards which can easily be superimpose on any existing city with a train station or light rail transit, underutilized lands, surface parking, continued deterioration.

Facilitation would be enhanced if there was enlightened leadership and a positive public consensus vision for the future. Ignorance, fear and government dysfunctionality or a suburban planning mentality or a “that’s the way we’ve done it in the past” mentality will be the condemning factors for the unsustainable city in the future. Partial application will engender only partial sustainability.

Just because we have become a nation of sprawl and dysfunctional cities does not necessarily mean that continuing this pattern is appropriate for the future or even that policies of the past should continue in to the future despite short term approvals and quick fix solutions which are easier. There are too many looming problems from the disappearing middle class, energy costs, depleted and expensive resources, climate change, traffic jams, changes in values, demographic changes, obesity, poor education attainment and crime. Still many view this as paradise and therefore why change?

The United States has a small percentage of the worlds population. With the country, New Jersey is considered the more dense and has an extraordinary existing network of operating rail lines and many more that could be reactivated. As a country and state, we cannot continue to consume and pollute at the current extraordinarily high rate. There must be serious reductions not just token reductions because in tight economic conditions with high gas prices people drive less there is a commensurate small reduction in pollution. If we do not begin to plan for change, it will be too late to catch up as the problems intensify.

Imagine if walkable cities, towns and neighborhoods in high density metropolitan regions strung like pearls along a transit lines connected to larger
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regional and national cities. This is the ideal urban design model. Most recently, May of 2011, the Federal government announced that the North East Corridor will receive the bulk of the high speed train improvement fund for track, signaling and rolling stock improvements. A good percentage of this track is in New Jersey. This is good news for New Jersey and the region and those stations that will be stops on the new improved line. There is also a proposal to sell the line to a private group that could implement change more rapidly. Either way, it is good news for any of the station as they will be able to provide connections to the new high speed stations. Station improvement must be accompanied with a rational planning and development diagram.

It is the hope that this and a more sustainable future may generate new thinking including pressure and incentives to more intensely develop the transit transects that we currently have, and reorganize train schedules to serve these nodes in a more flexible timely manner generating more movement between these as employment nodes and places of unique cultural identity in New Jersey. The new unified theory using the Transit Transects could create the image of a more sustainable New Jersey particularly if this is combined with the growth or renewal energy resources and more local (in New Jersey) food production.

I hope this essay provides you with some things to think about as a future with limited resources and environmental constraints becomes more real. It is time to start planning for a possible future where many could have extraordinary, healthy places to live, work, play and move.

Additional Resources

For a visual presentation of this essay view YouTube Video Planning for New Jersey's Future The Transit Transects - Part 1 and Part 2 2009©. This presentation represents a vision of policies and plan that would make New Jersey one of the most healthy, green and sustainable states in the country by capitalizing
on our existing resources and our previous planning for preserving lands and focusing on urban centers.

(4) Log on to YouTube, type in "Tony Nelessen" make selection.
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Ocean County: Submitted written comments (attached)

Resident: Gov’t created problem and won’t solve it. It is going to end up in the court and contort it. We don’t want any plan.

Resident: Plan should be scrapped and use a free market approach to spur development.

Resident: I am from Sparta and lives in a plan community that was created by private people. In Newark large buildings were built and then imploded. Cancer alley is not smart growth. Supreme Court decided there should be affordable housing in every community. Government can’t provide the jobs. Renewal energy is the most expensive type of energy. He feels that bike paths and biking to work are similar to Maoist China. The most important thing is protecting private property rights. The governor should tear up the plan start over.

Resident: No comments from the six hearings can be found on the website. The plan is identical to Agenda 21.

Resident: Wants to have a face to face meeting with Governor Christie to explain why this plan is Agenda 21.

Issue with ceding time to another speaker

Farm Bureau: Appreciate the efforts of Gerry, Dan and OPA. They have been involved in all of the State Plans. It is important that the plan recognizes the investment of farms and protecting private property rights. Towns don’t always want a successful farm in their town, because of too much traffic. They will have more comment at a later date.

Resident: Do the will of the people and listen to them. I want what is best for the people. We have had it with government. Environmental protection is taking away our rights.

Resident: High property taxes, permits. We are paying, paying and paying. We don’t need government telling us what to do.

Resident: When I hearing environmental protection agency, I get nervous. When I hear government partnering, I know there is trouble. It is absurd when we are told that local governments don’t have to follow the plan. It is we the people, not Christie the government.

Resident: We don’t need this plan.

Resident: OPA used be called Office of Smart Growth. The same lobbyists are at the State Planning Commission meetings asking for our money. It is plans like this that take away the wealth of the middle class. The plan calls for regional plans. How do we know what these word mean, like “vibrant regions.” The process is wrong. It is based on stakeholders who are divvying up our money. None of our freeholders, council members or elected officials were at these stakeholder meetings. The Sierra Club was there. Does anyone want pollution? How many of you are afraid that your property rights will be taken away. Nobody wants that. We are good stewards of our property. It is based on the 2000 census, not on the 2010. The plan if adopted will introduce regionalization redistribution of wealth and socialization of our state. Once it is done, we won’t be able to reclaim them.

Resident: Plan sounds like a communist agenda for New Jersey.

Resident: Where are the people who are going to vote on this plan?. (Interruption from State Planning Commission designees.) It is about Agenda 21. Sustainability, Complete Street are all part of the. Has the governor read the binder that I provided and connect the dots to Agenda 21? I tried to meet with the governor before he
signs this plan. Terms that are part of Agenda 21 are part of this plan. Even the former name of the office, was the Office of Smart Growth.

**Resident:** Government is comprised of men. He names freeholder who was legal counsel, mayor and councilman who bought a property and sold it at a much high price. Government can’t take your property for private redevelopment. Watch out for this plan. You don’t want to end up like Camden, NJ with the highest crime rate.

**Resident:** Elected officials always want grant money. Safe Street and Sustainable Jersey are part of our community and there is no stopping it. Tell the governor to stop this plan.

**Resident:** Start this process over. Cited an APA article that sustainable growth did not result a positive outcomes. An analysis should be done first to make sure that the same negative results do not happen here after implementation.

**Resident:** There needs to be transparency and need to see what has already been said. My gut feeling is that plan is not necessary. If the governor wants more businesses to come to the state that regulation need to be curtailed.

**Resident:** Sustainability should be removed and all of the Agenda 21 nomenclature should be removed. If Governor Christie has been successful bring in new businesses, why do we need this plan? We need an environment to encourage them: lower taxes, safety, good transportation, lower regulations.

**Advocacy Group:** Their group was created by public and private individuals who wanted make sure that the state would grow in a positive way for businesses. And provide more opportunities to participate. They appreciate the governor’s leadership in moving the SSP forward. She is a working mom that wants her kids to return to New Jersey if they want and appreciates the efforts to make the streets safe enough for her high school son to ride his bike to school. Cares about private property rights. Doesn’t see any connection with the State Plan and Agenda 21.
**Director Scharfenberger:** Answered question prior to public comments. Reminded people of a five (5) minute limit for comments and that there will be no ceding of time from one person to another.

**Resident:** Taxes go up. Read from an article entitled “Suffering in Suburbia.” ([http://issuu.com/ekcanoy/docs/type3-book](http://issuu.com/ekcanoy/docs/type3-book)) The article talks about how sprawl fosters poor health. She then ties the State Strategic Plan (SSP) to Agenda 21. She asked that the plan be revised to protect the rights of the taxpaying New Jersey Citizens.

**Resident and representative from Hudson County:** Already made comments and reiterated that is critical to build and maintain infrastructure throughout the state. Garden State Values should be adopted. He is supportive of the SSP and its economic growth message. Taxes should go to support the entire State of New Jersey.

**Advocacy Group:** We should talk about what needs to be fixed in the plan and no Agenda 21. The plan and its goals are vague and lead to conflicts with other state programs. It might suggest growth along a highway corridor, but there may be environmental resources like wells within close proximity that might be contaminated if growth is pursued. The plan should move the state forward while balancing the need to protect the environment. No money should be used to support eminent domain. We need to see the revised plan. The plan needs to be based on science and capacity for growth. There are sewerage plants in places like Jersey City where growth is encouraged, but there is sewerage overflow. Where and what are the priorities? They should not based on fuzzy math. We support a good plan and this is not it.

**Resident:** Using satire he pretended to have a crystal ball that showed that sustainable New Jersey will end in lawsuits that will force state and local governments to follow their rulings of the court. If there are large projects, they should be addressed on a case by case basis, not based on this plan. Projects that cross municipal and county lines can be worked out by those entities. We don’t need another level of bureaucracy. The crystal ball sees special interests seeking to get their way.

**Resident and Advocacy Group:** Supports and are encouraged by the plan. It is critical that the SSP be adopted.

**Resident:** Why do we want to create another government entity that seeks to usurp the private property rights of citizens? There should be a punitive cost if government seeks to take private property. The plan talks about priority growth areas, but there is no map. He sarcastically offered that there is a steering committee, so we shouldn’t worry. He tied SSP to Agenda 21 and that the plan will create institutional change.

**Resident:** Smart growth and sustainability will increase costs. Compact development reduces quality of life and increases crime. The plan doesn’t increase bus lines or encourage economic development in suburban areas. It will make some land owners rich at the expense of the tax payer. The plan will also foster the redistribution of wealth from suburban areas to urban areas. The plan should be reconsidered.

**Resident:** We need to talk to the governor about this, because the process with executive orders doesn’t seem to allow or show any change. Why can’t we see the revised version? The governor is not hearing us.
Resident: We don’t need a plan. There are environmental laws already in place. There are too many bureaucrats that are preventing individuals. The redistribution of wealth has never worked. You should get rid of the plan.

Local government representative: We need a plan. He cited changes that occurred in Jersey City over the years. The economy was based on ports, railroads and factories. The economy was depressed in 60s. The investments in mass transit have successfully recreated the local economy. Communities with train stations will benefit in the future, because they will be able to continue to grow with more people relying on mass transit. The SSP needs to make mass transit a priority. If the train line could be extended from New York City into New Jersey, the economy would grow.

Advocacy group: Submitted comments already. We have seen government misuse public resources and agency infighting and are tired of it. We support the plan, because it tries to address these issues.

Resident: We have been left out of the planning process. Protection of private property rights is critical. We need fewer regulations and laws that seek to take away the freedom to recreate private sector jobs. The plan oversteps executive order 78. The plan tries to do too much and not what the people wants. She cited Growing Cities Sustainably, a study that says compact development lacks conclusive evidence of environmental and economic benefits.

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2012.666731#preview

The plan may do the opposite of what it purports to do.

Resident: The plan should be scrapped, because it is creating another level of bureaucracy, costs cronyism and doesn’t protect property rights or put resources into rural areas. Pages 4 and 27 advocate getting rid of cars. Page 34 talks about Transfer of development rights (TDR) and encourages effective density transfer. By statute we have to update the plan, but the same statute says that we were supposed to do it years ago. Perhaps we should update the statute instead.

Resident: Lower taxes and give freedom from regulations and you will see development.

Resident: We have run out industries and the cost of entry due to permits and regulations is high. The state seems to want to create a new plan, because it is overdue. If you want to save money, get eliminate of county government. Private property is why the US economy has been successful. Decisions should be made at the local level of government. She is worried about strings attached to federal grants. The state plan is guessing what businesses want. The added bureaucracy can lead to cronyism and mismanagement. We need three hearings in each county.

Resident: There is a mistrust of the system that is not revealing the revised SSP until right before it is adopted. The plan redirects tax payer money to urban areas and for more mass transit. The language of the plan is exact wording of Agenda 21. He asked again that the governor meet with representatives prior to adopting the SSP. The state needs to get out of the way of the people.

Resident: The state needs a blue print and state agencies need to work together. Planning at the state level is critical.

Director Scharfenberger: Thanked everyone and reminded everyone that there is a 30 day comment period that encourages people to submit written comments. Someone asked if the comments were recorded. Director Scharfenberger responded that he and Dan review the comments.