HIGHLANDS REGIONAL MASTER PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM
FUTURE LAND USE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE:　　　　December 1, 2015

TIME:　　　　12:30PM - 2:30PM

LOCATION:　　Highlands Council Office
　　　　　　　　100 North Road
　　　　　　　　Chester, NJ

ATTENDEES:

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Lou	Cattuna	NJDEP
Dave	Dech	Warren County
Walter	Lane	Somerset County
Jeff	LeJava	Open Space Institute
Jessica	Sanchez	Delaware River Basin Commission
Gerry	Scharfenberger	NJ Office for Planning Advocacy
Eric	Snyder	Sussex County
Chris	Squazzo	NJDEP
Mike	Dressler	NJ Highlands Council – Member
Margaret	Nordstrom	NJ Highlands Council – Executive Director
Chris	Danis	NJ Highlands Council – Staff
James	Humphries	NJ Highlands Council – Staff
Corey	Piasecki	NJ Highlands Council – Staff
Ellis	Calvin	Regional Plan Association
Courtenay	Mercer	Regional Plan Association

New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Employer

MEETING PURPOSE:

Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) serve to engage those with specific technical content knowledge across the ten topic areas included in the Highlands Regional Master Plan (RMP). TAC membership represents academic institutions, business and industry, regulatory agencies, and non-government organizations each providing a unique perspective on their area of expertise. Each TAC will meet two times over the course of the RMP Monitoring Program project.

The purpose of TAC Meeting 1 was to review of the draft proposed indicators under consideration for analysis, as well as sample indicator reports demonstrating the type of output that is anticipated to be included in the Monitoring Program Recommendation Report (MPRR). As time allowed, the TAC could discuss potential milestones.

MEETING SUMMARY:

The meeting opened with welcome remarks by the MPRR project consultant, Courtenay Mercer, New Jersey Director at Regional Plan Association (RPA). After attendees introduced themselves, Ms. Mercer provided an overview of the meeting purpose and an explanation of the meeting materials, which included the Agenda, RMP Goals information sheet, Briefing Memo, and Draft Indicator Spreadsheets.

Participants were presented with several general questions regarding implementation indicators in the MPRR, including:
- Do the indicators adequately analyze the Future Land Use goals and policies of the RMP? Are there any missing indicators, or are any indicators listed in an inappropriate tier?
- For the sample indicators, does the proposed MPRR format present the indicator clearly (in its narrative, tables, charts, and maps)?
- For each indicator, what may serve as the appropriate corresponding milestone?

The TAC first discussed the draft proposed Tier 1 indicators (those with the strongest nexus to the goal and policies of the RMP), which would be analyzed as part of the MPRR.

For the Existing Community Zones (ECZ) indicator and others containing Certificate of Occupancy (CO) data, participants suggested more specific information on the type of COs—for example, whether they represent smart growth or sprawl. This would give it more real-world relevance and get beyond potentially confounding issues in the data, such as the slow-down in construction after 2008. It was also suggested that the analysis distinguish between single family and multifamily COs. Ms. Mercer pointed to the difficulty in reaching strong conclusions at this time, due to the narrow 2-year timeframe of georeferenced CO data available for analysis; and explained that COs would be used as a baseline for this MPRR, but could be used to show trend going forward. The Office for Planning Advocacy's Site Locator was suggested as a potential tool for better understanding the implications of the distribution of COs.

Participants requested clarification about the RMP goals regarding ECZs, to which Ms. Mercer responded that the goal is to direct growth to ECZs, Highlands Redevelopment Areas and Highlands Designated Centers, rather than the more environmentally constrained parts of the Highlands Region. Where an area is already built-up, a Land Use Land Cover analysis will likely not

capture infill and redevelopment. Participants suggested a methodology for measuring infill development using vacant lots derived from MOD IV data and screening for changed land use over time. Ms. Mercer suggested that geo-referenced CO data captures infill and redevelopment.

Participants stressed the necessity to have a meaningful report that demonstrates the impact the RMP has had on land use. For example, in addition to the data analysis, the building community could be surveyed to discover their motives for developing or not developing certain areas. It was also suggested that a statistical method be employed to determine whether there is statistical significance in land use and economic trends between Land Use Capability Zones (LUCZs). Mr. Piasecki explained that the forthcoming Fiscal Impact Assessment (FIA) will include this analysis.

Participants suggested that some development in environmentally constrained areas might not be a concern if the areas were originally mapped inaccurately. They further suggested that looking within Land Use Land Cover classifications could be useful. A fine-grained, parcel-by-parcel examination may be necessary to understand the whole story. Participants recommended looking at increase in population or square feet of residential development, and increase in impervious surface per unit of population. This could indicate the level of sprawl versus smart growth. Change in impervious surface was also suggested as a helpful component of the LUCZ index, though Highlands Council staff noted that there is no new LIDAR data available since the development of the RMP. Even as new data becomes available, the amount of analysis involved would be too much to cover the whole region. That considered, it was suggested that a threshold for impervious surface could be established, and when triggered, a closer examination of the area in question could be conducted. Participants suggested a threshold consistent with the watershed models, above which water quality is degraded. Consensus was that impervious cover could be a Tier 2 indicator, analysis of which was triggered by the degree of land use change.

Participants offered suggestions for how the list of indicators may be consolidated to eliminate unnecessary redundancy. Accordingly, due to significant overlap, LUCZ, ECZ, Building Permits, New Residential Development Density, Redevelopment Areas, Population Density, and Population Growth and Distribution indicator analyses should be consolidated into a LUCZ Index. It was also suggested that the LUCZ index indicator components also be analyzed by HUC14 watersheds where relevant to the RMP, but referred the decision to the Water Resources TAC. Further, the Affordable Housing was removed because it duplicated an indicator in the Implementation topic area. The Land Use indicator was removed, as it was duplicative of a Natural Resources topic area analyses. The Brownfield Sites indicator was re-assigned as Tier 2. Finally, Planned Growth and Urban Land Cover were removed as a stand-alone indicators, as they are already part of the LUCZ and Land Consumption indicators.

Participants noted that Broadband Infrastructure was suggested as a useful way of looking at Future Land Use, and suggested that service areas be moved to Tier 1, while franchise areas would remain in Tier 2. Participants also recommended adding an indicator that identifies zoning changes in conforming municipalities.

Ms. Mercer then reviewed the final proposed changes to the Implementation indicators:

Affordable Housing:
- Eliminate – redundant to Implementation indicator

Brownfield Redevelopment Sites
- Move to Tier 2

Building Permits
- Change to Certificates of Occupancy
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development

Broadband and Fiber Optic Infrastructure
- Move from Tier 2 to Tier 1

Density of New Residential Development
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development

Existing Community Zone Development:
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development
- Distinguish between single and multi-family residential COs
- Remove change in assessed value

Impervious Cover
- Move from null to Tier 2

Land Use Capability Zone Development
- Incorporate analyses from ECZ, Building Permits, New Residential Development Density, Redevelopment Areas, Population Density, and Population Growth and Distribution indicators to form a LUCZ index
- Distinguish between single and multi-family residential COs (originally in ECZ Development)
- Remove change in assessed value (originally in ECZ Development)

Land Consumption Index
- No changes suggested

Land Use
- Eliminate – redundant to Natural Resources indicator

Planned Growth
- Eliminate – redundant to LUCZ Development

Population Density
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development

Population Growth and Distribution
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development

Redevelopment Areas
- Consolidate into LUCZ Development

Sewer Service Area:
- No changes suggested

Urban Land Cover
- Eliminate - redundant to LUCZ Development

Zoning Change (new)
- Add new indicator identifying zoning changes in conforming municipalities

Ms. Mercer thanked everyone for their participation, and explained that the TAC will be able to view the final revisions via an online project management portal.

REVISED DRAFT FUTURE LAND USE INDICATORS LIST:

TIER 1 INDICATORS:
- **Broadband and Fiber Optic Infrastructure:** Measures broadband internet and fiber optic service area.
- **Land Use Capability Zone (LUCZ) Index:** Measures change in developed land, new residential development density, certificates of occupancy, employment, and population growth, distribution and density according to Land Use Capability Zone, Highlands Designated Centers, and Highlands Redevelopment Areas.
- **Land Consumption**: Measures change in the ratio of developed to undeveloped land according to Highlands Land Use Capability Zone and Highlands Designated Centers.
- **Sewer Service Areas**: Measures development patterns within approved Sewer Service Areas (SSAs) by analyzing change in developed land, population density, and certificates of occupancy.
- **Zoning Change:** Identifies zoning changes in conforming municipalities.

TIER 2 AND 3 INDICATORS:
- **Brownfield Redevelopment Sites:** Measures change in development according to Certificate of Occupancy activity at Brownfield Redevelopment sites.
- **Housing Occupancy**: Measures change in the proportion of renter- to owner-occupied housing units
- **Impervious Cover:** Measures change in impervious cover according to Land Use Capability Zone, Highlands Designated Centers, and Highlands Redevelopment Areas.
- **Known Contaminated Sites**: Measures change in the number, location and status of known contaminated sites.
- **Septic Yield**: Measures changes in land use or preservation in low septic system yield areas, by LUCZ, centers, redevelopment areas.