



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION
P.O. Box 820
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0820

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

THOMAS K. WRIGHT
Chairman

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
LT. GOVERNOR

DONNA A. RENDEIRO
Executive Director/Secretary

**New Jersey State Planning Commission
Minutes of the Meeting Held on February 1, 2023
Zoom Video Conference**

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair McKenna called the February 1, 2023 video conference of the New Jersey State Planning Commission (SPC) to order at 9:34 a.m.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

It was 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

Nick Angarone, Designee for Shawn LaTourette, Commissioner, Department of Environmental Protection
Danielle Esser, Director of Governance, NJ Economic Development Authority
Douglas Fisher, Secretary, Department of Agriculture
Frank Gaffney, Designee for President Fiordaliso, Board of Public Utilities
Bruce Harris, Municipal member
Keith Henderson, Designee for Lt. Governor Sheila Oliver, Commissioner, Department of Community Affairs
Edward J. McKenna, Vice Chair, Public Member
County Commissioner Director Shanel Robinson, County Member
Stephen Santola, Public Member
Andy Swords, Designee for Diane Gutierrez-Scaccetti, Commissioner, Department of Transportation
Elizabeth Terenik, Public Member (arrived 9:44 a.m.)
Melanie Willoughby, Designee for Tahesha Way, Secretary of State, Department of State

Others Present through Video conference

See Attachment A

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chair McKenna asked for a motion to approve the minutes of January 4, 2023. Commissioner Robinson made the motion, and Commissioner Esser seconded it. With no further discussion or questions, Vice Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote: Ayes: (10) Danielle Esser, Secretary Fisher, Andy Swords, Bruce Harris, Nick Angarone, Keith Henderson, Shanel Robinson, Melanie Willoughby, Stephen Santola, Vice Chair McKenna. Nays: (0). Abstains: (1) Frank Gaffney. The January 4, 2023 minutes were approved.

CHAIR'S COMMENTS

Vice Chair McKenna said that since the chairman is not with us today, we will pass over the chairman's comments and referred to Director Rendeiro for the Director's report.

Before the report, Director Rendeiro referred to Mayor Fanucci of the City of Vineland for comments due to his restricted schedule.

Mayor Fanucci said thanked the Director and Vice Chairman McKenna. He appreciates everyone's time today. I thank you for the invitation to be at this meeting as well. I just wanted to make reference to the planning commission and what a positive experience we had. Working through all this with everyone on the team. We have worked with so many people here throughout the county and the state on this. We are just very appreciative of that. I wanted to relay that positive feedback.

Vice Chair McKenna thank you the Mayor. In reading the report that was prepared in anticipation of today's meeting. You have really done a great job down there, very progressive, and we applaud you and ask you to continue your great leadership because you are definitely headed in the right direction.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Office received a letter from Mayor Myhre from Stafford Township thanking us for the letter of support for Stafford's successful application for DEP's Natural Climate Solutions Grant Program. The grant will enable Stafford to make environmental and resilience improvements for the community.

Since the January 4 SPC meeting:

Florence's and Edgewater Park's PIA and mapping have been approved by DEP and OPA and locally at the staff level. It is anticipated that both municipalities will be presenting to their governing bodies on February 8 and 7, respectively. It is anticipated that they will be presented to the PIC on February 15. If endorsed, they will be the eighth and ninth Burlington County municipalities of the 12 that are part of the regional endorsement process.

OPA and DEP are largely in agreement with mapping on Burlington City and Burlington Township. We will be forwarding to DEP the final map for confirmation. OPA and DEP are in agreement regarding the mapping for Bound Brook. We await a response from the municipality. We received DEP's Opportunities and Constraints report for Little Egg Harbor.

Letters reminding the 57 municipalities of their upcoming March expirations have been sent. The letters were sent in three groups. The first are those with whom we have not had any meaningful contact, then those that are in the municipal self-assessment stages, then those that are on the "homestretch" of endorsement. The text in the letters for each group will reflect their status. Because of the reminder letter sent, the Office received responses from Netcong, Haledon, Flemington, and Metuchen. Netcong wants to restart, Haledon and Flemington would like further information, and Metuchen is not interested, as they do not see the benefit.

The Office met with Burlington Township, Florence, and Burlington County for a briefing in preparation for a meeting on January 19 with Senior Management at DOT to discuss concerns with their road network. This effort is being done as part of the Burlington County Regional Endorsement effort. The Office then met with senior management at DOT regarding the Burlington Township road network issues. While DOT has agreed to participate in general terms regarding an effort to meet with municipalities early and proactively to enhance communications with local government, the Office sent DOT documentation so that they can determine whether to consider meeting again with Burlington County. The request is being made due to the increased truck traffic due to the significant warehouse development along the 130 corridor. The alternative would be to allow the road infrastructure and safety of residents could be at risk, given the future truck traffic projections. We await DOT's response.

Please recall that as part of the Plan Endorsement process, staff facilitated a meeting among NJ Transit and representatives from Dover Township. The main topic for discussion was Dover's interest in jumpstarting renewed discussions/negotiations with NJ TRANSIT, regarding several surface commuter lots, maintenance/storage yard, and the state of disrepair of the historic train station. The second meeting was postponed from January 27 to February 6 at the Township's request. This meeting will be on-site and will include NJ Transit, OPA, the Highlands, and Township officials. NJ Transit seems amenable to participating in the discussions to move the project forward.

The first workshop for the second cohort of municipalities in FEMA's Resilience Accelerator was held in Millville. Participating municipalities mapped their community assets and began discussing programs and projects that could assist in protecting those assets. The next (and final) workshop is being scheduled for early to mid-March to finalize plans for implementation. In the meantime, their "homework" includes identifying a local project team and preparing to come to the next workshop with plans to which the State agencies and FEMA can respond.

A follow-up meeting was held with the municipalities participating in FEMA's Resilience Accelerator Riverine Cohort. The municipalities reported on the progress of the projects that were identified in the workshops held last year. There was a good mix of quick, short-term projects and longer-term, major projects. The steering committee will focus on how we continue the state-local relationship once FEMA exits the program.

A nice example of what Melanie has done connecting the business advocates with the planning advocates, discussions continue between Atlantic City, the Business Advocates, and OPA regarding Atlantic City warehouse redevelopment opportunities. The project involves about a dozen underutilized/vacant properties within Atlantic City. Staff provided resources and information that will prove useful in furthering the project.

DEP's first IAC meeting on Climate Resilience of 2023. Each agency has been asked to identify programmatic, policy, and funding actions that may contribute to the Extreme Heat Plan, including initiatives that may already be underway. The Office will also provide input for the IAC "Agencies at a Glance" document that includes an update on a description of the Department of State. The next IAC meeting is scheduled for February 14.

The Office is participating in an SJTPO technical study that will focus on economic activity, circulation/traffic flow, waterfront development initiatives, and trails/greenway potential along the Maurice River in Commercial and Maurice River Township. The Office was asked to assist with their outreach to the municipalities regarding the study, (done over the summer/fall of 2022 that coincides with PE Visioning sessions), scoping it, and reviewing proposals.

The Office recommended Berkeley Township to EDA for their Brownfields Redevelopment Incentive Program. The Township has a major brownfield project that has stalled due to a lack of funding for cleaning up the site. We are working on setting up an informational webinar between EDA and the Township.

The eighth, ninth, and tenth warehouse presentations were hosted by the League of Municipalities (86 attendees), the County Planners Association (approximately 30 attendees), and the League of Conservation Voters (275 attendees). Franklin Township in Somerset County is in the process of changing its Master Plan to incorporate the guidance. One more is scheduled for February 8 hosted by the New Jersey Society of Municipal Engineers. Because of the warehouse presentation to the New Jersey League of Conservation Voters, njherald.com published a story about the webinar. The article can be found at <https://www.njherald.com/story/news/state/2023/01/25/nj-surge-in-warehouse-complexes-group-urges-early-action/69835691007/>

Staff participated in a meeting with the warehouse mapping project team. Mapping protocols, a rough timeline, and counties to pilot were discussed. We believe that Somerset and Burlington Counties are good pilots. It is anticipated that a beta map will be available within three months and a presentable one (for one or two counties) will be available for the NJ Redevelopment Forum in June.

We have agreed to work with OIT to participate in their upcoming upgrade of the LiDAR system. This upgrade will assist the Commission when updating the State Plan Policy Map.

Three bills in the committee relate to warehouse development; two are directly related to the SPC warehouse guidance. A4950 requires the State Planning Commission to develop a model ordinance (among other things) and S3356 requires a municipal re-examination to be consistent with the guidance. A third, A4475, requires County Planning Board approval for warehouse applications, utilizing an impact assessment that includes all of the factors included in the guidance.

Staff attended and the Executive Director spoke at Rutgers Climate Change Resilience Training. Nick and other state agency partners were there and the most productive session was when State agency representatives spoke on programs and participated in a question-and-answer session.

Commissioner Harris said that I was pleased to be able to observe the seminar that Donna and Matt held with the League of Municipalities on warehouse guidance. It was clear from the Q&A and discussion that the attendees found it very beneficial. So congratulations.

Director Rendeiro thanked Commissioner Harris and said that we do get some good feedback from all audiences; we have had these presentations to a number of a variety of audiences. Really, the only difference is whether it should be legislated or not.

Commissioner Santola circled back to the comment about Metuchen not being interested. He has done work there. It is a very progressive and thoughtful town. Given that we are always trying to increase the number of municipalities that participate, for them to just rather come back and say, we do not see the advantages, maybe we drill down a little bit into that. See how they got to that analysis, what might we be able to change a little or a lot to entice them only because I know the players there. It seems odd to me that they would sort of come back so negatively.

Director Rendeiro said that we talked a little bit about when we talked about the annual report. How do we want to drill down into those things? I think it is partly because they are built out. Barry was the one that was talking with them.

Barry Ableman said that would not call it negative, He would just say that the benefits were not worth the cost of going through the process. They just did not see the benefit for them as they are pretty much built out and they did not see the need to go through plan endorsement to achieve their planning goals.

Commissioner Santola said that when I say negative, I do not mean to suggest they do not think the State Plan is a good idea or that others should not participate. I meant more for their purposes. We did not align. I am just interested and I think whenever and I have made this point before whenever a town was in and decided to leave, or does not want to participate it is worth a little bit of follow-up to see what we can be improving, that would increase participation or cause towns to not drop out of the process.

Vice Chair McKenna said that he knows that municipality very well, and the players just like you do. They acquired that theater, and they have done nothing with it. I would think we would be an ideal partner with them as far as working with them as far as how to redevelop that. I think they paid 3 million plus dollars for it and they should be acquiring that corner. I have not seen any action there. It may be worth just pursuing a little bit further. Particularly because I know residents in the town that just question, why did we ever buy it to begin with? We are not doing anything with it.

Director Rendeiro said that we would continue to follow up with them. It is in line with what some of the plans are for 2023. When we get to that section, which should be next, on the Annual Report, I will talk a little bit about that.

NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTION 2023-02 – Approval of Annual Report

Director Rendeiro said that we have been talking about the annual report for the last couple of months. The 2022 accomplishments are self-explanatory, I took the edits that I had received, and incorporated them into this final draft. It does identify many good things that we did. It also identifies some of the things that we did not get a chance to get as far along as I would like to. Therefore, we did incorporate those items into the 2023 goals.

For the 2023 goals, which I think are the more important things to talk about a little bit. We discussed this at the PIC; we also discussed it a little bit at the last SPC meeting. A lot of what we are doing is sort of a continuation of what we have been doing. Once the 74 municipalities expire, I am anticipating that the number of municipalities that we will be working with will be reduced to approximately 40. That will free up planner time to start working a lot more on some policy ideas that are in here. The categories are:

- We want to continue the effort to endorse communities – Obviously, we still need to have the Plan Endorsement process, and I think it is important to do that because the only way to ensure consistency with the State Plan is to continue that process.
- To develop and update State Planning Commission policies. The first four that we will look at as a result of some of these conversations as well as our recommendations are the equitable provision of affordable housing, promoting economic sustainability through land use practices, reconciling resiliency project priorities among state agencies, and developing age-friendly policies. Clearly, there is a laundry list of other items we could tackle, but if we can get to those four, those are the really big ones that I think are really important for us to take a look at. Developing a State Planning Commission policy that we could recommend and that this board can have some serious input on is important. The equitable provision of affordable housing, I think is critical because we want affordable housing, but we want to make sure it is put in the right place where it is not vulnerable.

We want to make sure we can provide economic sustainability because sustainability is not only for climate change, but it is also making sure that we have an economy that can withstand many economic cycles. We believe that there is a land use implication in all of that.

Reconciling resiliency project priorities among agencies. I think that's important and that is part of what we're doing on the DEP's Interagency Council where I am chairing the funding committee so that conversation will continue to happen.

Age-friendly policies are a big effort on the part of the Department of Health because of an executive order from the Governor that requires DOH to develop a blueprint for becoming an age-friendly state.

I think those are important. Certainly, we would tackle more if there were time, but if we can get to those four, I will be very happy.

- To continue the interagency coordination is important. We are statutorily mandated to do that.
- To update state planning rules and guidelines. We did have a pause on the rules; we are now actively working with the Governor's Office. Once that concludes, we can then update the guidelines.
- We also want to continue it with other planning partners.
- We want to continue to advance technical assistance and capacity to counties and municipalities. This is where I think the change is coming in and to go to Commissioner Santola's point. One of the things that came up in both of the meetings is how we customize the Plan Endorsement process. How do we work with municipalities based on the characteristics of that municipality? For example, do we change the requirements for PE for an already built-out community, making it somewhat less cumbersome, versus a community that has a lot of development pressure? How do we categorize municipalities? Do we differentiate between North Jersey and South Jersey because a PA1 in North Jersey is very different from a PA1 in South Jersey? How do we customize what we do so we can better provide technical assistance that we can provide, and the Plan Endorsement process to better align with what their needs are? That is important. I think that is kind of the next step in what we are doing. We have started to update our website, and it is dated, it is old, it has a lot of old information on there. So how do we make that more useful for municipalities to provide a one-stop shop that has best practices that has good documents? We have started to work on that. We have a little bit of work to do on that yet. How do we provide better and more targeted technical assistance to those municipalities? That relates to continuing the PE process.

Those are some of the things that we would like to accomplish in 2023. I can answer any questions or we can go to the resolution that accepts the Annual Report.

Vice Chair McKenna noted to the Commission that Commissioner Terenik joined the meeting.

Vice Chair McKenna said that if there were any movement to go ahead with addressing the State Plan, which of course would be nirvana for us if that happens, would we have the capacity to deal with that, as well as all the things in our annual report?

Director Rendeiro responded that yes, and she neglected to mention that there is a reference that says all of these policies and all of these initiatives will coalesce around when we are able to update the Plan. I am consciously saying when as opposed to if because we are having a number of conversations with the Governor's Office, it is likely we will be able to update the plan. I do not have the go-ahead to flip the switch. In the interim though, we are working on a number of prep efforts. I have been interviewing both one additional planner as well as what I am calling a project manager that can help with all of the administrative work to make sure that we follow the rules that are in place and the statute that's in place. Those interviews are being held now. Probably by the next meeting.

I should be able to have some announcements there. I have been given a go-ahead to do some of those background activities. I have been having discussions with Rutgers on developing the Infrastructure Needs Assessment. We are doing a lot of the background work, so once we get permission to proceed to go do it, we can hit the ground running.

Vice Chair McKenna asked the commission for questions or comments on the annual report.

Keith Henderson, Designee for Lt. Governor Sheila Oliver, Commissioner, Department of Community Affairs said that he really likes the direction that things are going. Maybe this is a little bit too much in the weeds for this level of conversation. I would like to see, perhaps a focus on the interagency relationships and the technical assistance relationships, whereby we could create some sort of a statewide standard methodology to be incorporated into build-out analyses because I think there are many different issues that are tied to that. If we have people using different datasets and different approaches that is going to create inconsistencies in the underlying baseline for some of our data analysis.

Director Rendeiro said that we have had an initial discussion with Rutgers and our other state agency partners in developing a standard build-out analysis. Those discussions have begun and will continue. I agree with you, this should be a standard that everyone uses for a build-out analysis. We are in the very early stages of that discussion but that is part of the effort.

Commissioner Santola said that one thing that jumped out that he thought was interesting was the idea of the fully built out versus the not fully built out. As someone who lives in a fully built-out town and who does a lot of work there. They have many planning challenges that could use technical assistance. I do not know if that should ever be a reason for somebody to not want to participate. You can make arguments. In certain instances, it is even more important that municipalities that have large tracts of dedicated open space, they bought farm rights, they have limited and sort of self-directed, they're planning versus towns like Metuchen that are subject now to older buildings, older neighborhoods and how do they handle that.

Director Rendeiro said that that is a good point because I really think we should prioritize Plan Endorsed communities. If you are not involved in the process, I would not turn you away if you ask for assistance. A lot has to do with the resources. If we have the resources, we can certainly help anybody that asks. As part of the benefits for Plan Endorsed communities, then they should be prioritized in terms of that assistance. If we can start to customize what that assistance looks like, based on what their on-the-ground circumstances are there, maybe that can help in terms of the workload and what has to be done in each area. That is definitely something that will be part of that discussion on how to customize.

Commissioner Esser said that she and the Director had discussed the Annual Report previously, and she shared that she thought it was very good. The only thing that she would like to emphasize, which I know you're working on is always trying to have templates and examples that we can make available, whether it's through the Office of Planning Advocacy or our partners like ANJEC or Sustainable Jersey. Everything that is in here is so comprehensive, and really addresses all the work that has been done. So thank you very much for that. Commissioner Esser had one question. She remembers there used to be a business map where folks could check in to see, what their planning area is and what state benefits or resources were available based on their location. Is that still active?

Director Rendeiro said that she believes it is still active. The only reason she hesitates is she is not sure how updated it is. The Director agreed to look at that. In addition, related to the Commissioner's suggestion on templates, we are also thinking about putting them on the updated website. Commissioner Esser said that might be something that as we are ramping back up again, it might be something worth looking at, even though it is a heavy lift and may take many resources.

Andy Swords, Designee for Diane Gutierrez-Scaccetti, Commissioner, Department of Transportation said that I just want to add his thanks for a very thorough report. He agrees with you on the importance of interagency

coordination in recognizing that we do not always see everything exactly in the same way. That is even more reason to continue the coordination so I definitely support that. In addition, thank you for the groundwork that is being laid for eventually getting the State Plan restarted. Thank you for that as well.

With no further discussion or questions, Vice Chair McKenna asked for a motion to approve Resolution 2023-02. The motion was made by Bruce Harris and seconded by Shanel Robinson. Vice Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote. Ayes: (12) Danielle Esser, Frank Gaffney, Secretary Fisher, Andy Swords, Bruce Harris, Nick Angarone, Keith Henderson, Shanel Robinson, Elizabeth Terenik, Melanie Willoughby, Stephen Santola, Vice Chair McKenna. Nays: (0). Abstains: (0). The Resolution 2023-02 was approved.

RESOLUTION 2023-03 – Endorsement of the City of Vineland

Director Rendeiro said that we have spent a lot of time and discussion on Vineland. We believe at OPA that the recommendation you are about to see is a good balance. There are two areas and one kind of overall comment that we do not agree with the DEP on. At the PIC, it was decided that we would develop a fact sheet that was sent to the Commissioners earlier this week. I am proposing that Meghan will give her normal endorsement presentation, talk a little bit about the map as we are proposing it, go through the PIA, and then talk in detail about the differences that we have and ask Nick to comment or say what he needs to say, and then open it up for discussion. I have to say that we have done a lot of work with DEP, we have done a lot of mapping work with DEP and I think both groups have been able to compromise 99% of the time. I want to thank Nick because he actually has been a good partner in doing this, but there are going to be times when sometimes we do not agree. All we can do as staff is present to you the facts, and then open it up for discussion and allow folks to say what they need to say. We believe we can move forward with this.

Secretary Fisher asked when the City of Vineland would speak. I think it would be appropriate for them to be able to at least make their case for it before we make our comments.

Vice Chair McKenna and Director Rendeiro agreed with Secretary Fisher.

Director Rendeiro referred the presentation to Meghan Wren.

Meghan Wren proceeded to present the City of Vineland.

This presentation can be found at:

<https://nj.gov/state/planning/assets/docs/meeting-materials/spc/materials/2023-0201/spc-material-Recommendation-Report-SPC-Vineland-1-26-23.pdf>

Kathie Hicks Supervising Planner from the City of Vineland said that Meghan has done such a phenomenal job with her summary. I really have little to add. Maybe just a bit of elaboration on all the negotiations with Meghan. She asked that we focus on what was most important to Vineland and for us, that Route 55 corridor was the big issue and that is where we concentrated on our requests for map changes. Just so everyone understands. If you are not familiar with Vineland and Cumberland County, there is only one limited-access highway in Cumberland County. It is like the aorta that is what brings development to Cumberland. The rest of the county has very poor access. Particularly industrial development along that corridor is very important. That Garden Road interchange was targeted for industrial. We have Industrial Park North and Industrial Park South. There is a private airport industrial park. We have sewer along Garden Road the whole way up to Delsea and north on Delsea all with the intent of encouraging economic development. Any loss of acreage there is an issue for us. We were endeavoring to retain as much as we could. We had always agreed even prior to this exercise. Anyone wishing to expand the service area, we advise they have to do the habitat suitability studies and some have, particularly one in the north end of our old industrial park, Industrial Park North. The Lampe property is probably the most critical to us. That was not in the sewer service area, even though it was PA2. We always acknowledged that habitat suitability studies would have to

be done on it. Beyond that, we objected to carving acreage off that tract. We are appreciative that you have come up with a compromise position on the mapping.

Nick Angarone, Designee for Shawn LaTourette, Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection said that on the two specific stream corridor parcels where we have disagreements. We do not feel that environmentally sensitive areas, particularly in stream corridors should be incentivized for additional growth and development. We do feel that the Department agreed to multiple middle ground for both locations. We continue to disagree with specific recommendations in the recommendation report.

Secretary Fisher asked what the compromise is. Are we going to allow them to use some of this wetland?

Director Rendeiro responded that the compromise is to add more to the stream corridor in exchange for carving out a bit of the two pieces of the two parcels so that they can at least target that for development. Meghan Wren showed the parcels on the map and further explained the compromise.

Secretary Fisher said that he just want to make a couple of statements. He is hoping that the compromise that the staff is suggesting can come to fruition because he totally understands the environmental sensitivities. Cumberland County is the poorest county in the state of New Jersey, the industrial park is and I can tell you this because I lived in Cumberland (not anymore; I live in Gloucester), but I have been the Freeholder Director for several years. This area is densely populated with industrial regions and warehousing and the like. They very much tried to consolidate it and put it in there. That is really the engine that drives much in the county. As was mentioned, 55 is the only major highway that comes in and out. The farmland in the City of Vineland as Meghan said they have tried to isolate that area as well, is just as rich in terms of its value as the ecological value and being the word sort of clashing of sort of public policy in a way. The tightness of both, the tight range that these activities take place, is very well thought out in Vineland, as you said, they have been very progressive, and trying to do a lot of their planning, you know, going over and above. I am hopeful that the Committee is going to see it that way. Because we do not take lightly DEP concerns, we certainly understand what the DEP says. They want to maximize every opportunity for that waterway, and it is in many areas pristine. Cumberland County is, as I said, the poorest county, but it is also one of the most richly endowed ecologically in the State. It is really blessed with a lot of that, but this particular zone is their lifeline that they are trying to expand and to maximize as you can see, all that red is industrialized. I just wanted to make that comment, because what DEP is saying is understandable. If they could have every inch of it, I would love to have them at it. You know, I sponsored horseshoe crab legislation; I have done all that stuff. I seriously hope that we can give them the opportunity to expand without really infringing upon what is that waterway. Thank you.

Nick Angarone said that he thinks that when we zoom out and kind of look at the entire township in particular, that area in the southern half of the town that is within the center and is designated as PA1. When you take that big picture, you see that there is a strong urban center in Vineland and that is great. It is the way that it should be. It is good planning. It 100% aligns with the goals of the State Plan. However, we extend the center and PA1 pretty far south, where in my opinion, if you again, zoom out and look at the land use there, it is largely rural agricultural use with development tightly along road corridors and in my opinion is inappropriate for designation as PA1 and a Center. I will note that it is not an environmentally sensitive resource issue other than a kind of watershed-based protection, but I do believe that it's not appropriate for those designations.

With no further discussion or questions, Vice Chair McKenna asked for a motion to approve Resolution 2023-03. The motion was made by Secretary Fisher and seconded by Danielle Esser. Vice Chair McKenna asked for a roll call vote. Ayes: (11) Danielle Esser, Frank Gaffney, Secretary Fisher, Andy Swords, Bruce Harris, Keith Henderson, Shanel Robinson, Elizabeth Terenik, Melanie Willoughby, Stephen Santola, Vice Chair McKenna. Nays: (1) Nick Angarone. Abstains: (0). The Resolution 2023-03 was approved.

Commissioner Esser said that she just wanted to add that when you look at the changes to planning areas, the PA1, PA2, and PA4 are actually shrinking because of this. While the PA5 and 4B are increasing significantly. So it is

compounding that with the other comments that were made by other commissioners. I think that from my perspective, the compromises are fair.

Vice Chair McKenna said that he totally agreed with Danielle. When you look at what they are losing, as far as PA development areas that are moving up to PA4, I understand the arguments that Nick makes on behalf of DEP. I have great respect for Nick. I think he is a super member of our group, but I think in this one, we did the right thing.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments from the Committee or the public, Vice Chair McKenna asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Melanie Willoughby and seconded by Stephen Santola. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Donna Rendeiro, Secretary
State Planning Commission
Dated: March 1, 2023

ATTACHMENT A
NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION ATTENDEES
DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2023 TIME: 9:34 AM

Steven Gleeson - DAG
Mark Villinger – Planner, Ocean County
Susan Weber – NJDOT
Anthony Soriano – Morris County
Anthony Fanucci – Mayor, City of Vineland
Kathie Khicks – Planner, City of Vineland
Tom Stanuikynas - Burlington County Bridge Commission
Matt Baumgardner – NJDEP
Ruth Foster – NJDEP
Brian Jackson – NJDOT
Hailey Anilonis
Rosie Brown