



*State of New Jersey*  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION  
PO Box 820  
TRENTON NJ 08625-0820

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
*Governor*

GERRY SCHARFENBERGER, PH.D.  
*Director*

KIM GUADAGNO  
*Lieutenant Governor*

**New Jersey State Planning Commission  
Minutes of the Meeting Held on November 13, 2012  
State House Annex  
Committee Room 4  
125 West State Street, Trenton, New Jersey**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair McKenna called the November 13, 2012 meeting of the New Jersey State Planning Commission (SPC) to order at 10:15 a.m.

**OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT**

Deputy Attorney General Don Palombi announced that notice of the date, time and place of the meeting had been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present**

Kenneth Albert, Public Member  
John Eskilson, Public Member  
Roberta Lang, Designee for Douglas Fisher, Secretary, Department of Agriculture  
Michele Brown, Chief Executive Officer, NJ Economic Development Authority (arrived at 9:34 am)  
Dominick Fiorilli, Designee for Lt. Governor Kim Guadagno, Department of State  
Shing-Fu Hsueh, Mayor, West Windsor, Public Member  
Joyce Paul, Designee for Richard Constable, Commissioner, Department of Community Affairs  
Marc Larkins, Chief Executive Officer, Schools Development Authority  
Thomas Michnewicz, Public Member  
Andy Swords, Designee for James Simpson, Commissioner, Department of Transportation  
Edward McKenna, Chairman, Public Member

**Members Not Present**

Bob Martin, Commissioner, Department of Environmental Protection

**Others Present**

(See Attachment A)

## **PLEDGE OF ALLGIANCE**

Chair McKenna asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair McKenna asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the October 17, 2012 meeting. Commissioner Eskilson made the motion and it was seconded by Commissioner Michnewicz. There were no discussions, comments or changes. Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote: Ayes: (11) Ken Albert, Michele Brown, John Eskilson, Roberta Lang, Dominick Fiorilli, Joyce Paul, Shing-Fu Hsueh, Marc Larkins, Thomas Michnewicz, Andy Swords, Ed McKenna. Nays: (0). Abstentions (0). The minutes were approved.

## **CHAIR'S COMMENTS**

Chair McKenna asked for a motion to go into Executive Session in order to receive legal advice from the SPC's attorney. Commissioner Michnewicz made the motion and it was seconded by Commissioner Eskilson. Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote: Ayes: (11) Ken Albert, Michele Brown, John Eskilson, Roberta Lang, Dominick Fiorilli, Joyce Paul, Shing-Fu Hsueh, Marc Larkins, Thomas Michnewicz, Andy Swords, Ed McKenna. Nays: (0). Abstentions (0).

The SPC went into Executive Session at 10:18 a.m.

At 10:36 a.m. Chair McKenna reconvened the public meeting at which time he addressed the audience that the SPC had conferred with counsel on a legal issue and that Director Scharfenberger was going to read a prepared statement.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Scharfenberger read the following prepared statement:

"OPA would like to first acknowledge the thousands of families, businesses, organizations and governments that have been impacted by Hurricane Sandy. Our hearts go out to all those affected.

During these times, it is difficult to see past the immediate needs of our State. That said, as we get back to business, we still have important matters to attend to. One of those matters is the State Strategic Plan. Although some have had the opportunity to review the Final State Plan released by OPA last Friday morning, we presume that many have not. Those that have reviewed this newest version of the plan feel that it incorporates recommendations made by the public during the public comment period, creating a better plan. Some organizations are making specific recommendations that may also strengthen the final document.

As such, OPA is recommending postponing adoption today. OPA did its best to assist the SPC to meet this deadline, but mother nature had other ideas. This will allow for ample opportunity for those that wish to review and comment on the final version to be acted on the SPC to do so.

Another reason for this recommendation is that the SSP's goals, if adopted as proposed, could be a framework for the coastal region to recover and rebuild. All the answers won't be in the final document but the framework for the next steps would be in place. OPA will be reviewing the objectives and strategies of all four goals and may recommend specific further additions or amendments with long term coastal recovery

in mind. OPA will be making an extra effort to reach out and seek input from stakeholders directly impacted by recent events."

Director Scharfenberger also noted that the SPC had filed its notice regarding the Permit Extension Act.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Chair McKenna thanked those who actually had the opportunity to review the plan that was released last Friday and had submitted comments. He also note that the SPC has taken very seriously the comments concerning the abbreviated timeframe within which the public had the opportunity to review the Plan, which played a large part in the SPC's decision to table adoption of the Plan. He explained that the SPC would welcome public comments. It was requested that comments be limited to five minutes and comments should specifically address concerns in connection with the changes to the Plan. Chair McKenna asked for motion to table the Resolution to adopt the State Plan. The motion was made by Commissioner Eskilson and seconded by Commissioner Michnewicz. Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote: Ayes: (11) Ken Albert, Michele Brown, John Eskilson, Roberta Lang, Dominick Fiorilli, Joyce Paul, Shing-Fu Hsueh, Marc Larkins, Thomas Michnewicz, Andy Swords, Ed McKenna. Nays: (0). Abstentions (0).

Chair McKenna noted that there was not yet a specific date for final action on the Plan and that when such date was available the public would be notified and the information would be posted on the website. He expressed his appreciation for the public taking time to come to the meeting. Chair McKenna opened the floor to public comment.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Jeff Tittel, Director New Jersey Sierra Club thanked the SPC for not taking action today on the SSP and indicated that he would follow-up with written comments. Mr. Tittel expressed concern that the conditions in New Jersey have changed since the initial draft of the SSP was released. He noted that in light of the recent weather events the SPC and state government should take pause on how we move forward with the recovery. He noted that the status quo would not work with respect to the recovery and the SSP was the status quo. Mr. Tittel explained that he was concerned that some of the areas that were impacted by Hurricane Sandy were being identified in the current version of the SSP as Strategic Investment Areas and Growth Areas. He noted that these areas need to be rebuilt in a better smarter way and not prioritized areas for growth. He further noted that the protections that were in the 2001 Plan for the barrier island, for 5b do not exist anymore under the new criteria with many of the areas now identified as Strategic Investment Areas and Growth Areas. He also noted that when the areas are rebuilt the infrastructure needs to be done in a sustainable way ensuring that it would not be damaged with the next storm. Mr. Tittel noted his concerns with the SSP with respect for the Highlands and being identified as Priority Growth Investment Areas. He explained that the SSP creates a conflict with the Highlands Plan because it gives towns a free pass if they don't come in for conformance thereby allowing PA1's, centers or redevelopments areas to become a Priority Growth Investment Area. He noted that many of the areas were now identified as environmentally sensitive and many of them listed in the Highlands Plan as Conservation and Preservation Areas, which creates a conflict. Another concern noted was with Table 2 indicating that planning areas and former sewer service areas the area become an Alternative Growth Area when many of the maps are outdated. Mr. Tittel also noted his concern with respect to the Highlands Act and the State Planning Act which exempts the Highlands Preserve Area from the State Planning Act and the State Plan. However, the change in the language in the Alternative Investment section of the SSP indicates that if a town is in the Highlands Preservation Area and is a redevelopment area or an Existing Community Zone with planned or existing infrastructure the area now becomes an Alternative Growth Area; thereby promoting growth instead of accommodating growth as outlined by the Highlands Act. Next, Mr. Tittel expressed his concern that Pineland's towns were now designated as growth areas and the

Pineland's villages as Alternative Growth Areas even though the Pinelands Act is exempt from the State Plan. Lastly, he noted that the SSP in its current form violates the Highlands Act, the Pinelands Act and the State Planning Act and major corrections need to be made.

Bill Wolfe, Director of NJ Peer (Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility) thanked the SPC for stepping back from adopting the SSP in light of current events. Mr. Wolfe commented that he felt the SSP should not be used as a "framework" document for dealing with the coastal recovery from Hurricane Sandy. He explained that the SSP was an economic development strategy document and not a land use planning document, which abandoned the State Planning Act's framework, which was a land use plan. He noted that the coast shows that economic development cannot occur without the support of natural systems and without the support of functioning infrastructure and unless there was a fundamental change in the framework from an economic development strategy back to an integrated land use development/redevelopment plan the SPC can't move forward. Mr. Wolfe spoke specifically to water and sewer infrastructure knocked out due to the hurricane. He referenced the Delaware Bayshore Adaptation Study adopted in 2010 and DEP's March 2012 Community Vulnerability Assessment for the shore region which makes specific recommendations on land use, infrastructure noting neither were engaged in this planning document. In closing, Mr. Wolfe commented that the State should think about establishing a coastal commission dedicated to the restoring the current commotion that seem to be breaking out at the municipal government level with respect to social services, and to come up with a consensus plan on how to redevelop those damaged areas. He also noted that global warming policies were not addressed in the SSP.

Elliot Rugga, Senior Policy Analyst for the NJ Highlands Coalition thanked the SPC for acknowledging and referencing in final draft SSP the good planning that has been in the New Jersey Highlands. He commented that referencing the Land Use Capability Zones in determining the Priority Investment Areas was a very good step in the right direction. Mr. Rugga noted his disappointment that there was acknowledgement that the SSP was an optional plan and the Planning Area of the Highlands conformance is always optional and that the SSP was more stridently behind the planning area in using the tools of the State to help municipalities make decisions on whether or not to participate. Lastly, he felt that there was a missed opportunity with one of the tools that hinges on the Highlands Regional Master Plan being successful was the identification of receiving areas for Transfer Development Rights for Highlands Transfer Development Credits and in the identification or requirement for criteria for assigning Priority Investment Areas encouraging municipalities thought the State to become receiving areas.

David Sharp, Waretown, New Jersey, commented that his main concern about the Plan was the top down nature, its lack of transparency and that it sounds like central planning. He further noted his concern regarding the number of hearings that were held. He further noted that many citizens studied the plan very carefully and that some even met with the Lt. Governor and Director Scharfenberger but have had no assurance that their concerns were transmitted to the Governor. He also spoke of his lack of success in getting time with the Governor to discuss their concerns. In his opinion, Mr. Sharp feels the SSP is the flesh of Agenda 21.

Lucy Vandenberg, Executive Director of PlanSmart New Jersey, thanked the SPC for delaying the adoption of the SSP and allowing for additional public input given the circumstances of the last few weeks. She noted that PlanSmart was very enthusiastic about the State Plan and hoped that its adoption would be done expeditiously in the course of 2012. Ms. Vandenberg commented that in the wake of Hurricane Sandy the State's leadership in regional planning, infrastructure investment and economic growth is more vital than ever and that there should be a leadership role for the State Planning Commission to play in assessing preparedness for the future. She also commented that PlanSmart is supportive of the economic goals in the SSP, the industry cluster approach and hoped that implementation of those concepts could begin even before the SSP was adopted. Ms. Vandenberg commented on the importance of the preservation side of the SSP and the need to have a long-term source of stable funding for open space preservation, historic preservation and farm land

preservation.

Chris Sturm, New Jersey Future thanked the SPC for the opportunity to provide more thoughtful comments on the SSP. Mr. Sturm noted that everyone recognizes the need to rebuild the coast more resilient so the both people and property is protected. She explained that the SSP can provide that framework as the guiding principles for growth and development decisions in addition to an overarching framework for rules such as CAFRA that govern development decisions on the coast. She also noted that the idea of integrating information on flooding and flood prone areas into the Investment Area Criteria should be considered. She also suggested that the revised SSP should call for bringing best practices to local governments with respect to rebuilding in a resilient way. Ms. Sturm noted that the comments that New Jersey Future submitted on Monday included sign-on by a handful of colleague organizations as well as the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions, Regional Plan Association, Candy Ashmun and Jim Gilbert. She summarized that the group recognized positive changes in the final draft SSP over the previous draft. There was an improved balance between economic growth and natural resource protection. The group also recognized need for improvement. The SSP should acknowledge how to advance housing that is close to jobs. Lastly, she noted that the mapping system was exciting and complex and that New Jersey Future had some ideas on the matter and looks forward to working with the SPC.

Al Frech, New Jersey resident commented that it would be help to everyone if the changes to the SSP were easily identifiable and that it would be nice to know if any of the opposing comments were incorporated into the SSP. Mr. Frech referred to an article, "Growing Cities Sustainably", published in the May 2012 Journal of American Planning Association, refuting many of the unfounded claims for smart growth. He felt it gives reason for planners and the SPC to reconsider some of the aspects of SSP that include the micro management of taxpayers' housing and land use choices as well as costs. Mr. Frech also noted his concern with public private partnerships and whether the government should be involved in picking winners and losers as suggested in the SSP. Lastly, he thanked the SPC for not voting on the SSP today and allowing the people more time to absorb the changes.

Mike Pisauro representing the New Jersey Environmental Lobby thanked the SPC for postponing the adoption of the SSP. He noted that he did not believe that the SSP had gotten any better from the initial draft and that the SPC should take this opportunity to evaluate the SSP in light of Hurricane Sandy. He noted that the coast needs to be rebuilt without putting people in harm's way and the SSP does nothing to elevate that concern. Mr. Pisauro specifically commented on Goal 2.1 which talks about bringing growth areas and regulations in line. He noted that he read the goal to mean that regulations would be lesser, would not be enforced, would be different in growth areas then they would be in others. The SSP puts growth areas along the coast. He further noted that 84% of our waters were not clean enough to meet recreational uses because of the way the State has developed and that that SSP will only help make it worse. The SSP growth areas, don't take into consideration the carrying capacity of the water supply, the Waste Water Management Plans on how the areas can sustain growth. He questioned why the SSP would reward municipalities, within the Highlands, who have not come into conformance. He feels that being designated a Priority Growth Investment Area whether a town is in conformance or not goes completely against the Regional Master Plan and the Highlands Act. Lastly, he noted that the SSP needs to help protect people and protect resources and that he hoped the SPC would take this opportunity to revise SSP to do that.

Mirah Becker, President of the New Jersey County Planners Association commented that the Association applauds the SSP. They feel that it is much improved and concisely written. She noted that they like how the vision was articulated outlining how the different entities could tap into the resources at the State Level without being overwhelmed and that thoughtful planning could be done at the county level, taking the municipalities concerns into account so that the best county regional plans could be achieved. She noted that for her, the process was refreshingly open and honest and represented a positive and constructive energy under Director Scharfenberger and Deputy Director Kennedy's approachable style of leaders. She thanked them for attending the County Planners

Association's monthly meetings over the last two years. She noted that the Association was happy to see the idea of a site evaluator incorporated into the SSP and feels that it was important to get away from static geographic maps and have resources available such as the site evaluator. Lastly, she noted that the Association looks forward to working on developing the criteria for the four different investment areas and to ensure that the best county plans grow out of the vision in the new SSP.

Faith Ochoroso, Middlesex County, Oldwick NJ, thanked the SPC for working hard on the document but felt the entire document should be put on a shelf until there was a proposed budget to show how the SSP would be paid for because in these bad economic times she can't see where the money was going to come from other than the taxpayers. She also noted that government should not be in the position of picking winners and losers. She feels that the SSP is social planning and that it hasn't work in 70 years and was not going to work now. She noted that if the SPC wasn't aware of Agenda 21 they should find out. She also noted that it was suspicious when there is an American Planning Association feeding information to every state how to create sustainability. She noted her concern with so many people being on board about climate change.

Mark Terible, Aberdeen thanked the SPC for postponing the adoption and allowing for additional time to allow the matter of storms to be considered. He spoke of science not being settled and that science in most cases was not science. He also noted that he was in full favor of measures to harden infrastructure against storms, of research to study the effect of wind and wave on the coast line. He spoke of global warming and climate change and that the climate was always changing. He noted that a difference along that coast now is that many of the homes are no longer vacation bungalows but they are permanent homes and that the effect of storms is a much greater factor that should be considered. He also feels that the question of what is and is not science should be addressed.

Michele Calome, Bergen County commented that a concern for many citizens center on the significant potential for property rights abuse and the State's over reach and infringement upon personal property rights. She noted that the language in the SSP means that unelected government bureaucrats and appointees coordinate with government, select private business, NJ politicians and will invest tax dollars to fund projects they want, not projects the citizens want for their communities. The SSP will take the citizens hard earned money away from the suburban and rural communities and give it to sustainable communities in urban areas using taxation, zoning laws and eminent domain to move people into sustainable communities. She noted that mandating new rails and transport should follow migration and transport should not hope that migration follows. She noted that this was not planning it was forced communities and that communities follow industry. She requested that the SSP be rewritten with property rights and freedom of choice prevailing. Lastly, she noted that a public hearing should have been held in every single county and it was not and that the SSP was controlling and oppressive.

Kevin Kerocl a Montgomery Township resident commented that he was concerned with the SSP. He noted that the SSP seems to intrude in the local government tradition of home rule. The money used will force communities to accept development of urban areas and will lock up land through open space and smart growth policies. He lives in a suburban area by choice over time more and more burden will be placed on the property owner through government regulations and money transfer from suburban areas to urban areas. He commented that sustainable development practices will eventually force urban area people to move over to suburban areas. Suburban residents should see a benefit from the SSP equally as the urban residents. He also noted that the shore area should be looked and included in the SSP in light of Hurricane Sandy. Lastly, he noted that he was not in favor of the passage of the SSP. He thanked the SPC for postponing the vote.

Sandy Batty, Executive Director, Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions and Chair of the Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment commented that she would be commenting on behalf of both organizations. She noted that both organizations had already submitted written comments. She noted that the State was facing a new reality with the respect to Hurricane Sandy

and its destruction and that the SPC should take this opportunity to relook at the SSP. She recommended that the SPC should recommend a coastal commission to develop the policies for development along the coast to deal with sea level rise. There should be some mention of flooding in the State Plan and sea level rise because those were the new realities. She noted that the disaster also pointed out the need for affordable housing because there are so many displaced people and no place for them to go because of the dearth of affordable housing. She explained that the State Planning Act anticipated that the plan would give guidance to the Council on Affordable Housing or at least the Fair Housing Act to show where affordable housing growth was going to happen and thus affordable housing take place. She noted that she appreciated that in response to their comments that the SSP now had a reference to affordable housing and Strategy 2.7. However, it was really talking about the municipalities and there needs to be guidance as well for State agencies. She also noted that they were happy that environmental protection was now included as well as preservation in response to their comments. However, there needs to be more on how environmental protections would be ensured within the SSP. In addition, a link to the sewer service areas and the waste water management planning that is happening right now, should be explicit in the SSP. She noted that Strategy 2.1 was poorly worded and did not provide the necessary guidance. Lastly, she noted that they would like to see more of the criteria in the SSP rather than in the rules because the SSP would give the criteria stature and gives the ability to refer to the SSP and from ANJEC's point of view give guidance to the municipal environmental commissions on how the plan directs the local commissions in their towns.

Andrew Daniele Monmouth County resident noted that he was a lifelong resident of New Jersey and grew up in the sixties and seventies. He feels that the environment is cleaner, the water is cleaner and the air is cleaner now than it was for him growing up. He feels that the environmental argument is being used for other reasons that have to do with controlling the population. He commented that the Garden State Values want to promote and support convenient walking distance to homes, support walking, biking and public transportation; he doesn't feel this should be the purpose of government or to protect equity. He noted that the plan if implemented by county and local governments affect responsible development potential of private property and is determined to disproportionately affect the equity of other citizens. Lastly, he did not agree with the policy recommendation from the Governor's Institute (page 5, first bullet) "create a vision and shared guiding principles for economic development to create places that attract and retain people, industry, and investments." He feels government does not have the right to retain people.

Barbara Petrousiano from Hardwick noted her concern with the coast line being growth areas and what would have happened if there were windmills placed of the shore line.

Ray Rinaldi, taxpayer and citizen of the State of New Jersey feels that he was being railroaded. Government is getting too big, too centralized and is now going to tell the citizens how to live, where to live and how to do it. He feels the SSP is social engineering and it will benefit some people and questioned how many members of the board it would benefit either personally or their companies. He noted that there needs to be transparency.

David Pringle, Campaign Director, New Jersey Environmental Federation, State Chapter of Clean Water Action, a national group, commented that he had been prepared to be very critical due to the lack of notice for the meeting and time for the public to review the draft SSP or have the opportunity to testify. He commented that he appreciated that SPC was not voting today, that the SPC was going out of the way to seek additional comment moving forward, especially with the focus around the ramifications of Sandy. Mr. Pringle commented that it would be helpful if the SPC wanted meaningful public input to at least summarize in print before the end of the public comment the changes that were made from the draft final to the final plan. He noted that there have been some improvements around the tone and language and recognition that environmental protection and the preservation of natural resources is or as more important than just land preservation and that you cannot have economic growth in the long term without those and appropriate quality of life. He noted his concern that the

actions of the administration do not measure up to the positive changes in the tone of the SSP with respect to the Water Quality Management Planning Rules, Permit Extension Act, DEP Waiver rule and commitments made on environmental justice, category one, Garden State Preservation Trust, Energy Master Plan, Global Warming Response Act, Water Supply Master Plan, and Barnegat Bay all very much related to the substance of what should be in the SSP. He noted that he would like the administration and the State to rethink a lot of the bad development decisions of the past as result of the Hurricane Sandy. He further noted his concern with the waiver rules in terms of DEP telling towns they could do whatever they want with public infrastructure in light of Sandy. He noted that the rebuilding should be done better than what was done in the past. Lastly, he noted that the SSP was not about communism or Agenda 21. There needs to be reasonable regulation that is the plan is about and the plan needs go a lot further down that road.

Rosaro Herrero, commented that she come to this country in 1962 escaping from a totalitarian state. She noted that she came to this country knowing that she could live where she wanted and is a law abiding naturalized citizen. Little by little she is seeing centralized government she feels the SPC is being hijacked and can obtain the same goals without manipulating people. She commented that the UN has no business being the parent manipulates with sustainability and the bottom line was that individual pride was being taken away. She asked the SPC to rethink what it was doing because they were being manipulated and being hijacked for a means to an end that the whole country for generations would pay for it.

Richard Gibbons, a business owner in Monroe Township, Middlesex County commented that the SSP in terms of preserving the pristine areas has good ideas. But in terms of an economic strategy the plan was a disaster. He noted that government does not create economic prosperity because if it did we wouldn't be in a position we were in today in the State of New Jersey. He commented that the reason that there have been these problems is decades of government taxation and regulation. He suggested the US Constitution be incorporated in the SSP.

John Cummins, Atlantic Highlands addressed some of the needs for development in NJ. He noted that taxation in New Jersey is extremely high and government is large with much expenditure being paid for out of the people's pockets thereby limiting the ability of the people to develop. The people are unable to build, grow, unable to hire because when they have disposable income it is ripped from their pockets for other people to decide how to spend it. The citizens of NJ have been for many years promised lower property taxes. He noted that the people need something honest from the State, smaller government and less expenses so that the people can develop. He respectfully asked that work be done to reduce government, reduce the regulation and allow people to do what they do best, to be creative, to solve problems, to live and to grow. He noted that the current plan right now comes from the UN and that there does not need to be more government oversight.

Chair McKenna concluded the public comment portion of the meeting.

Chair McKenna reported to the SPC members that he had recently attended an international symposium in Dublin, Ireland where he was asked to speak with representatives of the Netherlands, France, Denmark, Germany, UK, and Ireland and that some of the subjects talked about included global warming and climate change. He noted that in light of Hurricane Sandy the issues discussed at this international forum made him think about where our nation is going and what we are doing correctly or incorrectly in this country. He didn't ask for agreement or disagreement but was just stating that it was very interesting to attend an international forum with people from all around the world taking these issues very seriously.

## **COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

There were no Commissioner reports at this time.



## ADJOURMENT

With no further comments from the SPC or the public, Chair McKenna asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Commissioner Eskilson and seconded by Commissioner Paul. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Gerry Scharfenberger, Ph.D.  
Secretary, State Planning Commission

Dated: November 19, 2012

## NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2012TIME: 10:00 AMLOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 4, STATE HOUSE ANNEX,  
TRENTON, NJ

NAME	AFFILIATION
BARBARA WALSH	Coalition for Affordable Housing & Env. <sup>the</sup>
DAVID I SHARA	PUTTING AMERICA FIRST
TED RITTER	NJTPA
Bill Wolfe	NJ PEER
Lanette Kratina	Somerset County Planning Board
Matthew Mulet	NJ Chamber of Commerce
Bob Bzik	Somerset County Planning Board
Lisa Cintron	NJ Chamber of Commerce
Chris Sturm	New Jersey Future.
Jeff tittel	SI-ELLACLS
Mike Pisano	New Jersey Environmental Lobby
Jennifer Coffey	Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Assn.
Wilma Frey	New Jersey Conservation Foundation
Jim Hess	Trenton, NJ

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2012

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 4, STATE HOUSE ANNEX,  
TRENTON, NJ

NAME	AFFILIATION
AL FRECH	NJ RTP
DAVID HAJSAK	SELF
M. Valence	Citizen for Position Change
R. Rinaldi	Citizen for Position Change
Rich Lubbers	Middlesex County Tea Party
Beck Kercado	Middlesex County Citizen
Jason Simms	Ocean County Planning Dept.
Andrew Daniele	self
Anthony Soriano	Monmouth County Dept Planning & Development
Lucy Vandenberg	PlanSmart NJ
George Moker	—
Carol Moker	—
Sandy Batty	ANJEC & CAHE
Rosent Herens	Top Payer - ultimate funder of SDP

# NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2012

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 4, STATE HOUSE ANNEX,  
TRENTON, NJ

NAME	AFFILIATION
Susan M. Weber	NJest
Joe Michalski	state citizen
Gene Fyfe	Highlands Council
MARGARET NOODSIRICH	HIGHLANDS COUNCIL
ROBERT BOYD	CITIZEN
John Cummins	Atlantic Highlands, Monmouth County
Kevin Kerach	citizen
Michael Cerra	NJLMA
Carol Hloka	Taxpayer & Homeowner
King PENNA	TAX PAYER
Christine Dwyer	home <del>has</del> owner in suburbs
Danielle Coxer	NJHMA
Mark Beel	MCDP
Elliott Raga	NJ Highlands Coalition

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2012

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 4, STATE HOUSE ANNEX,  
TRENTON, NJ

NAME	AFFILIATION
Daniel Pringle	NJ Env'l. Fed.
Linda Bocanea	Monmouth Co. Planning
Jim Lewis	NJDOT