

OPA Item No. 1

General Topic:

Economic

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

2. Comprehensive Planning, Policy 1 Planning Resources

Participating municipalities in the growth corridor all stressed the need for financial and technical support for their urban revitalization efforts.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

1.Planning Resources

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

2. Comprehensive Planning, Policy 1 Planning Resources, Page 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) provides technical assistance and funding at all levels of government for capacity-based planning. OSG recommends the communities in Salem County's growth corridor participate in the Plan Endorsement process. OSG intends to propose a comprehensive update to the Plan Endorsement process and the attendant guidelines. The new proposed Plan Endorsement process will be a comprehensive and constructive engagement between municipalities and interested state agencies that will yield better planning results and access to real benefits as a consequence of endorsement.



OPA Item No. 2

General Topic:

Economic

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

3. Public Investment Priorities, Policy 4 Priority for Planning Resources and Policy 5 Secondary Considerations

The proposed role for the State is to support the notion that redevelopment should be emphasized equally in older suburbs and rural areas as it is presently in larger cities and urban areas. These communities have not had the opportunity to participate in the State's Urban Enterprise Zone and Urban Coordinating Council Programs which have provided critical seed money for redevelopment planning and projects. Similarly, most of these communities are not eligible for critical environmental and infrastructure funds available through the NJ Redevelopment Authority. Thus, policy changes at the state level are recommended to support regional planning efforts.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

4. Priority for Planning Resources

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

3. Public Investment Priorities, Policy 4 Priority for Planning Resources, Policy 5 Secondary Considerations, Page 119

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) will insert language into the new State Plan to recognize redevelopment strategies and design for urban, suburban and rural areas of the state. OSG welcomes suggestions from Salem County.

While redevelopment is a preferred method of achieving sustainable growth in the state, it cannot take place without regard for the location of the proposed development or constraints on development that may exist. A rural location may not always be appropriate for growth, even though it may be taking place through redevelopment. Redevelopment projects, especially in rural areas where support infrastructure often does not exist, must be evaluated for their impacts on overall planning considerations in the location they are proposed in.



OPA Item No. 3

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

4. Infrastructure Investments, Policy 13 Expeditious Regulatory Review Within Centers and Areas with Endorsed Plans

Municipalities need technical and financial assistance to develop the infrastructure necessary to allow designated centers to function as growth areas for the region. NJDEP should expedite and provide technical assistance of permitting for wastewater systems within designated centers and smart growth areas.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

1. Municipal, County, Regional, State Investment Infrastructure to Guide Growth

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

4. Infrastructure Investments, Policy 13 Expeditious Regulatory Review Within Centers and Areas with Endorsed Plans, Page 122

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

In order to encourage the implementation of smart growth policies within designated centers and smart growth areas, it is important for state agencies and departments to make the provision of technical assistance a priority. It is especially critical that the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) prioritize review and make available on an expedited basis technical assistance needed to expedite wastewater system permitting where state standards and rules are achieved in designated centers and smart growth areas because such systems are a precursor for development.

NJDEP agrees municipalities that successfully complete Plan Endorsement should have an easier time in receiving technical assistance and permitting decisions from the Department. NJDEP has started to do this by identifying critical infrastructure, open space or other natural resource issues in the cooperative planning process. Staff would then work with appropriate Department agencies to resolve issues.



OPA Item No. 4

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

4. Infrastructure Investments, Capital Planning and Budgeting Coordination, Several Policies

Salem County requests assistance from the State with regard to regional wastewater management and water supply.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

4. Infrastructure Investments, Capital Planning and Budgeting Coordination, Several Policies, Pages 120-123

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) has been actively working with other agencies to coordinate plans and policies to be consistent with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP). Regional wastewater management and water supply regulatory processes and permitting fall under the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and should be addressed through the Plan Endorsement process.

NJDEP acknowledges the County's concerns about water supplies, and agrees that a regional approach is necessary to enable sustainable growth in the Salem Growth Corridor. NJDEP will assist Salem County in planning for, developing and implementing regional wastewater and water supply solutions that address the needs of Salem municipalities. Ensuring State appropriations for wastewater infrastructure are beyond the scope of cross-acceptance and not within the control of the NJDEP. The NJDEP's Environmental Infrastructure Trust Fund, however, can provide funding assistance for some of the Growth Corridor wastewater infrastructure needs.

Language will be added to the Infrastructure chapter of the new State Plan to address the creation of nodes in rural communities and the lack of water and wastewater availability. The language will also address rural municipalities, such as Salem City, which is a regional center and has a pending application to upgrade water and sewerage treatment plants to regionalize service to area municipalities.



OPA Item No. 5

General Topic:

Economic

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

15. Agriculture, Policy 5. Creative Planning and Design Techniques

Policy needs to create financial incentives in receiving areas to encourage developers to invest in density transfer-based resources (i.e., TDR).

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

5 Innovative Planning and Design Techniques

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

15. Agriculture, Policy 5 Creative Planning and Design Techniques, Page 160

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

We agree appropriate incentives should exist to encourage intermunicipal Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). The revised State Plan will have incentives on TDR incorporated into the overall plan and within the Agriculture chapter of the plan.



OPA Item No. 6

General Topic:

Agricultural and Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

15. Agriculture, Policy 1. Agricultural Land Retention Program Priorities

State needs to add emphasis for providing adequate funding of the preservation of the environs, particularly farmland, open space and environmentally sensitive lands.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

1 Open Space Acquisition Priorities

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

15. Agriculture, Policy 1. Agricultural Land Retention Program Priorities, Page 160

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) already provides local technical assistance and information on all available programs and funds for the preservation and protection of the environs. The State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) also prioritizes those funds needed for agricultural land retention, as seen in 15. Agriculture, Policy 1. Agricultural Land Retention Program Priorities.

In addition, OSG will add language to the SDRP clarifying the policy regarding funding priorities for farmland preservation in Planning Areas 4 (Rural) and 4B (Rural/Environmentally Sensitive).



OPA Item No. 7

General Topic:

Agricultural and Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

11. Water Resources, Policy 26 Agricultural Water Supply

Need clarification concerning how DEP stormwater management regulations will impact Right to Farm Act; under which circumstances will the stormwater runoff impact agricultural development needs.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

26 Agricultural Water Supply

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

11. Water Resources, Policy 26 Agricultural Water Supply, Page 150

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

Language will be added to the new State Plan in the Agriculture Chapter to address stormwater management regulations and their impact under the Right to Farm Act. In addition, the Right to Farm Act does not supersede the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Stormwater Management Rules.

However, the Cross Acceptance process is already used to review all forms of Environmental and land use data. The DEP Stormwater Management Rules do not apply to small development projects resulting in less than .25 of an acre of new impervious surface and less than one acre of site disturbance. In addition, projects that have received qualifying approvals prior to the effective date of the rule do not have to meet the new stormwater standards. The qualifying approvals are preliminary or final site plan approval or subdivision approval where subsequent site plan approval is not required or a building permit; and at least one of the following permits (if required) having a stormwater management review component: CAFRA, Waterfront Development, Freshwater Wetlands or Stream Encroachment. The exempted project is limited to the scope and geographic extent of the qualifying approval(s), and the exemption shall terminate with the expiration, termination or loss of effect of either of the qualifying approvals. Revisions to the qualifying approval(s) may void the exemption subject to DEP approval.

In C1 waters, additional measures are necessary to protect the State's high quality waters, including drinking water sources and streams that provide critical natural resource habitat. The Department has proposed Special Water Resource Protection Areas (buffers) as a new BMP to meet the C1 antidegradation standard. The buffers would be imposed adjacent to all C1 waters and upstream tributaries of C1 waters within the same sub-watershed. The buffers would include an area extending 300 feet from the top of the stream bank or center channel if the stream has no defined banks. However, where the buffer is already disturbed, for example by active agriculture, the width may be reduced in the disturbed area, but will not extend less than 150 feet from either bank. The buffer will not affect existing development. The buffer requirement can also be adjusted to reflect local conditions through the



OPA Item No. 7

approval of a stream corridor protection plan as part of a regional stormwater management plan. If adopted as part of a regional stormwater management plan, the buffer will be required for new development and must be maintained in its natural state. Because the buffer is intended to cleanse stormwater through filtration, no direct discharges of stormwater are allowed through the buffer. Exceptions to these standards include redevelopment within the buffer confined to the footprint of existing impervious areas (buildings, roads, parking, etc.). Also, the buffer will not apply for five years to single-family homes being constructed on lots that received subdivision approval prior to the effective date of the Rule. For more information on C1 waters and the Department's Rules go to the Department's web site at www.state.nj.us/dep/



OPA Item No. 8

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

11. Water Resources, Policy 3 Watershed Resource Planning

Salem County maintains a strong concern with the scope and definition of HUC-14 areas as we do not have a clear methodology for the scope of the potentially restricted areas under this designation. Moreover, in Lower Alloways Creek and in Elsinboro, the DEP data identifies HUC-14 areas that do not include C-1 waters. This would appear to be a complete error, based upon our understanding that C-1 designation is necessary to trigger protection for HUC-14.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Surface Water

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

11. Water Resources, Policy 3 Watershed Resource Planning, Page 147

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) has been actively working with other agencies to coordinate plans and policies to be consistent with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Mapping of HUC-14 and C1 data falls under the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and should be addressed through the Plan Endorsement process. Language will be added to the Environmental chapter of the new State Plan to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

Sub-watersheds for use in the Cross Acceptance process are based on the NJDEP HUC14 data set. The minimum size of a HUC 14 watershed as determined by the USGS is 3,000 acres. A description of this data set can be found at: http://www.nj.gov/dep/gis/stateshp.html#HUC14.

The first step in creating the cross acceptance layer was to code the HUC14 sub-watershed polygons with some additional attributes. The HUC14 layer was merged with the 1995/97 LU/LC layer so that the mean impervious surface percent of each HUC14 basin could be calculated. The LU/LC layer includes an estimate of the impervious surface percentage of each polygon mapped in that layer. Using this value, a mean impervious surface percentage could be calculated for each sub-watershed mapped in the HUC14 layer. Once the mean value was calculated, all HUC14 basins with a value of less than 10%, could be identified, and coded as such.

HUC14 basins were also analyzed to identify those that drained to water supply intake points, those that contained existing C1 water features and those that were identified as providing natural drainage to selected water supply reservoirs. For the first, an existing NJDEP data layer showing water supply intakes was merged with the above HUC14 layer, and all sub-watersheds draining to a subset of mapped surface water intake points were identified



OPA Item No. 8

and coded. The intakes subset included those intakes that supplied water from natural drainage only. It is to be noted that all HUC14 sub-watersheds above the location of the selected intake points, i.e., all upstream watersheds, were identified as a water supply watershed.

To identify sub-watersheds containing Category One (C1) waters, a NJDEP layer with existing C1 waters was merged with the sub-watershed layer from the above analysis. This C1 layer is described at: http://www.nj.gov/dep/cleanwater/c1.html. Sub-watersheds containing a C1 water feature were identified and coded as such. For C1 coding, note that only the sub-watershed containing the C1 feature was coded for C1 status.

Those sub-watersheds containing natural drainage to selected reservoirs were also identified and coded. The natural drainage layer was created by NJDEP to supplement the C1 and water intake layers. Although a separate attribute, all watersheds coded as having natural drainage for the selected reservoirs also are, in fact, coded for the water supply intake or C1 attributes. The sub-watersheds with the natural reservoir drainage were identified in a process similar to that described above for the other watershed attributes.

Sub-watersheds that had either an impervious surface less than 10%, that drained to water supply intake points, that contained C1 waters, or had natural drainage to selected reservoirs, or any combination of these factors, are considered critical sub-watersheds. A particular basin may have more than one of the above characteristics, but only needed a positive in one of the four categories to be considered for further analysis. Sub-watersheds without any of these characteristics were not included in any further analysis.

Once the sub-watershed layer was coded, and all critical sub-watersheds identified, the layer underwent an additional analysis step. The critical sub-watersheds identified in the above steps were merged with the developed lands layer selected from the 1995/97 LU/LC dataset. All those portions of the critical sub-watersheds that were undeveloped could then be identified, and selected for inclusion in the final layer. Those watershed portions that were developed, or built up, were eliminated from further consideration.



OPA Item No. 9

General Topic:

InterGovernmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

2. Comprehensive Planning, Policy 1 Planning Resources

Several municipalities recommended that the State provide technical assistance to help them in their efforts to update their plans and ordinances to be in compliance with the State Plan. Municipalities currently revising/upgrading their plans would like OSG involvement and guidance in developing plans that could be submitted for Plan Endorsement.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

1.Planning Resources

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

2. Comprehensive Planning, Policy 1 Planning Resources, Page 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) already provides technical assistance and funding at all levels of government for capacity-based planning and for assistance with Plan Endorsement petitions.



OPA Item No. 10

General Topic:

Transportation

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policy

8. Transportation, Policy 19 Regional and Local Traffic Patterns

Reduction of congestion (particularly truck traffic) on US Route 40 through and around the Woodstown Borough.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Transportation Systems Management

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

8. Transportation, Policy 19 Regional and Local Traffic Patterns, Page 143

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

This is a site specific issue that can be addressed with assistance from the appropriate state agency, such as NJ Department of Transportation (DOT), or through the Plan Endorsement process. The revised goods movement policies submitted for the Preliminary Plan are intended to reflect the DOT's direction on goods movement issues. The Department is engaged in ongoing efforts to find innovative solutions for managing truck traffic throughout the state, and looks forward to strengthening our partnership with the counties and municipalities to that end. In addition, language in reference to innovative solutions for managing truck traffic throughout the state will be added to the Transportation chapter of the new State Plan.



OPA Item No. 11

General Topic:

Other (BPU)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

13. Energy Resources, Policy 4 Energy-efficient Buildings

BPU Green Energy incentives and rebates should be made available in PA 3-5 in addition to PA 1 and 2.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

4 Energy-efficient Buildings

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

13. Energy Resources, Policy 4 Energy-efficient Buildings, Page 157

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

STATEWIDE ISSUE

The Green Energy incentive is a Board of Public Utilities (BPU) rule. Green Energy incentives are available not only in PA1 and PA2, but also in Centers in PA3, PA4, and PA5 and complements the State Plans goals in encouraging good planning. However, language will be added to the new State Plan encouraging energy efficient standard use in all State Plan planning areas.

In addition, BPU offers the rebates to those install utilities to service agricultural operations. The New Jersey Department of Agriculture (NJDA) is currently working with BPU to revise the rules to address the needs of agricultural operations outside of PA1, PA2 and centers.



OPA Item No. 12

General Topic: InterGovernmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

State Plan Policy Map Centers

Alloway Township requested cooperation from the State Planning Commission and Office of State Planning to resolve problems standing in the way of the designation or recognition of Alloway Village (Center).

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Centers

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Centers, Pages 230-252

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

This recommendation falls outside the scope of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The designation of Centers is addressed through the Plan Endorsement process.



OPA Item No. 13

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

15. Agriculture

It has been acknowledged throughout the GIS community that the NJDEP's soil data for Salem County is significantly flawed. Based upon the flaws in the GIS data used for this analysis, Farmland Preservation Priorities data should not be used for planning in Salem County until more accurate information can be used for the evaluation of farmland in the County.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 15. Agriculture

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

15. Agriculture, Page 160

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

This issue should be addressed with assistance from the State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) within the NJ Department of Agriculture (NJDA), which manages the Farmland Preservation Program, as well as the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) or through the Plan Endorsement process.

The SADC's Strategic Targeting Project which prioritizes farmland on a statewide basis used a draft of the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Geographic Data Base (SSURGO) soils for Salem County. NJDEP's soils were only used for Warren County. Draft SSURGO soils were used for Salem, Sussex and Gloucester and the remaining counties officially adopted SSURGO soils were used. The NRCS SSURGO soils for Salem County have since been adopted and the County should these soil maps for agricultural planning efforts.



OPA Item No. 14

General Topic:

Housing

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Statewide Policies

7. Housing, Coordination with the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing

There is a need to coordinate COAH affordable housing obligations with regional planning initiatives such as the Planned Growth Corridor and TDR Pilot Project.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Coordination with the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

7. Housing, Coordination with the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, Page 139

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

Regional Planning is coordinated with the Council On Affordable Housing (COAH) through Plan Endorsement. The processes of COAH certification and Plan Endorsement should work in tandem since they both pertain to local planning. Adequately addressing a community's affordable housing obligation is essential to good planning. Preparation of an appropriate housing plan will be addressed on a community-specific basis in the Plan Endorsement process.



OPA Item No. 15

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

It appears that the areas identified as LS345 and LS2 in the CEFO do not correspond with the data currently available on the NJDEP's Endangered and Nongame Species Program's website. It is unclear if the data used is newer or older than the Landscape Project data of 3/15/02.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan policies to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

The data presented on the NJDEP's Endangered and Nongame Species Program's website is an updated version of the data released 03/15/02 which was based upon Landsat images. The current data was adjusted based upon Land Use/Land Cover information which was based upon 1995 aerial photo imagery. The Landscape Project data will be updated again when new Land Use Land Cover data based upon the 2002 aerial imagery is made available.



OPA Item No. 16

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

Landscape Rank 2 denotes areas that are habitat for species concern. These areas are not documented habitat for Threatened or Endangered species. Therefore, the need to restrict development in all of these areas is questionable.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan policies to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

Areas mapped by the Landscape Project as Rank 2 are done so based upon the best available information at the time of mapping. Over time as lands are developed, species are added or removed from the Endangered and Threatened Species list and new information about Endangered and Threatened species documented habitat is developed, some areas depicted on the most current Landscape Project mapping as Rank 2 may be upgraded to Rank 3, 4, or 5 and some areas may be downgraded to Rank 1 or less. Concerns about site specific areas need to be addressed with site specific information. NJDEP will work with Salem County to help resolve land management conflicts indicated by the Landscape Project on locally significant sites that advance Smart Growth initiatives.



OPA Item No. 17

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

The proposed Landscape 3-5 Data identifies endangered species with no documented history in Salem County, such as Bobcats in Oldmans Township.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan policies to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency. DEP data on endangered and threatened species that is depicted on the Landscape Project has been verified by DEP biologists.



OPA Item No. 18

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

The Open Space data used for the CEFO does not correspond with the data currently available on the NJDEP's GIS website. It is unclear if the data used is newer or older that the Open Space data of 10/6/99.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Green Acres Program, but the Office of Smart Growth (OSG) maintains a more current open space file, which was updated based on data received from the Counties on their Recreation and Open Space Inventories (ROSI). Delineation of dedicated open space can be done through Cross Acceptance or Plan Endorsement.



OPA Item No. 19

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

Special Non-Sewered Areas

There is no explanation of how this area is determined. In Salem County there are 600± acres of NONSSA within the Smart Growth Zone, some of which already is developed.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

DEP mapping of Sewer Service Areas and areas not served by sewage collection systems are based upon approved Wastewater Management Plans. Historically, the mapping of these areas was not done to a high level of accuracy. The Department's wastewater service area mapping effort is always undergoing improvement and revisions.



OPA Item No. 20

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

There is no explanation of how this area is determined. This "environmentally sensitive" area has a significant impact upon the CEFO mapping of Salem County. It appears that only Category 1 (C1) waters and HUC-14s should be included in this classification. However, the CEFO mapping of these areas is far more expansive then the identified C-1 Waterways to support this designation.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan policies to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

Sub-watersheds for use in the Cross Acceptance process are based on the NJDEP HUC14 data set. The minimum size of a HUC 14 watershed as determined by the USGS is 3,000 acres. A description of this data set can be found at: http://www.state.nj.us/dep/gis/stateshp2.html#HUC14.

The first step in creating the cross acceptance layer was to code the HUC14 sub-watershed polygons with some additional attributes. The HUC14 layer was merged with the 1995/97 LU/LC layer so that the mean impervious surface percent of each HUC14 basin could be calculated. The LU/LC layer includes an estimate of the impervious surface percentage of each polygon mapped in that layer. Using this value, a mean impervious surface percentage could be calculated for each sub-watershed mapped in the HUC14 layer. Once the mean value was calculated, all HUC14 basins with a value of less than 10%, could be identified, and coded as such.

HUC14 basins were also analyzed to identify those that drained to water supply intake points, those that contained existing C1 water features and those that were identified as providing natural drainage to selected water supply reservoirs. For the first, an existing NJDEP data layer showing water supply intakes was merged with the above HUC14 layer, and all sub-watersheds draining to a subset of mapped surface water intake points were identified and coded. The intakes subset included those intakes that supplied water from natural drainage only. It is to be noted that all HUC14 sub-watersheds above the location of the selected intake points, i.e., all upstream watersheds, were identified as a water supply watershed.



OPA Item No. 20

To identify sub-watersheds containing Category One (C1) waters, a NJDEP layer with existing C1 waters was merged with the sub-watershed layer from the above analysis. This C1 layer is described at: http://www.nj.gov/dep/cleanwater/c1.html. Sub-watersheds containing a C1 water feature were identified and coded as such. For C1 coding, note that only the sub-watershed containing the C1 feature was coded for C1 status.

Those sub-watersheds containing natural drainage to selected reservoirs were also identified and coded. The natural drainage layer was created by NJDEP to supplement the C1 and water intake layers. Although a separate attribute, all watersheds coded as having natural drainage for the selected reservoirs also are, in fact, coded for the water supply intake or C1 attributes. The sub-watersheds with the natural reservoir drainage were identified in a process similar to that described above for the other watershed attributes.

Sub-watersheds that had either an impervious surface less than 10%, that drained to water supply intake points, that contained C1 waters, or had natural drainage to selected reservoirs, or any combination of these factors, are considered critical sub-watersheds. A particular basin may have more than one of the above characteristics, but only needed a positive in one of the four categories to be considered for further analysis. Sub-watersheds without any of these characteristics were not included in any further analysis.

Once the sub-watershed layer was coded, and all critical sub-watersheds identified, the layer underwent an additional analysis step. The critical sub-watersheds identified in the above steps were merged with the developed lands layer selected from the 1995/97 LU/LC dataset. All those portions of the critical sub-watersheds that were undeveloped could then be identified, and selected for inclusion in the final layer. Those watershed portions that were developed, or built up, were eliminated from further consideration.



OPA Item No. 21

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

NJ DEP Mapping Data

Based upon the State's use of outdated GIS data and the lack of a detailed analysis of the Critical Environmental Factors Overlay, Salem County strongly concludes that this data is currently insufficient for use in planning the future of Salem County. Given the concerns detailed above, Salem County urges the SPC to develop a "vetting process" to verify the underlying data. At a minimum, the SPC should create a process for the County Planning Board to submit data to correct the environmental overlays as site-specific information becomes available.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

OTHER

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Updates to the map are not addressed in the Plan

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response during Cross Acceptance 2009:

PROPOSED STATEWIDE ISSUE

The map is routinely updated based on decisions made by the State Planning Commission during Cross Acceptance and with Plan Endorsement. This data layer is maintained by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and not a layer depicted on the State Plan Policy Map. However, language will be added to the new State Plan policies to address the need for State Agency mapping protocols and data transparency.

DEP data does not reflect the scope of lands developed as of 2004, but is by far the most extensive and accurate collection of GIS data publicly available for planning in New Jersey.

For land use planning purposes, the underlying factors used to map environmentally sensitive lands are essentially static. The physical extent of wetlands or soils or watersheds change over geologic time scales and do not vary from year to year absent massive natural or man made alterations. Generally the only changes that are made to the Department's GIS mapping occur when Land Use Land Cover data is periodically updated. These changes in mapping are the result of new data used to map areas where the key mapping factor is based upon lands that are developed versus undeveloped lands.

The Landscape Project, for instance, uses Land Use Land Cover information to determine if a location with documented wildlife habitat is adjacent to or surrounded by suitable habitats large enough to sustain a viable local population of a given species. If the area has an adequate amount of habitat based upon scientific studies of a species, the area would be mapped and ranked as appropriate. In some areas of New Jersey permitted development constructed since the last Land Use Land Cover data set information was collected reduces the total extent of remaining suitable habit to the point which the Non Game Program's biologists would no longer consider the area suitable habitat for a given species. Currently, the Department is working with a contractor to update the Land Use



OPA Item No. 21

Land Cover GIS dataset to reflect new information on developed lands based upon 2002 aerial photo imagery.

DEP notes that no new GIS information is supplied by the County in the Cross Acceptance Report that may be used in combination with the DEP GIS data to improve or otherwise update the Departments' information.