

Public Comments Received on Draft FY2024-2033 STIP

Commenter Name	Project Name	DB Number	Page	Comment	NJDOT Response
Katelyn Lucas	I-80, Rt 206, Rt 29 Rockfall	09545		Concerned that proposed plans or alternatives for the I-80, Route 206 and Route 29 rockfall projects could result in destruction of valuable cultural resources. Has experienced communications issues on these projects with NJDOT and FHWA. Requests further consultation on these projects and more acceptable mitigation efforts to protect the cultural resources at these sites. Regarding the I-80 project, would like to know whether the Army Corps of Engineers has been consulted and what the National Park Service's role is.	Since the tribal nations are consulting parties under the Rt. 80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project's Section 106 coordination, project coordination meetings have been held with the tribal nations and cultural resources documents have been shared with the tribal nations for review and feedback. Consultation with tribal nations will continue as the Rt. 80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project advances through the Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, and Construction phases. In regard to Rt 29 Rockfall Project in Kingwood Township, tribal nations have been invited by the FHWA to participate in the Design Working Group meetings as well as in the Local Officials Briefings to gather their input and concerns. Meeting minutes have also been forwarded to them. Additional meetings with tribal nation can be coordinated as required. For the Rt. 80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project, consultation with the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) was initiated, through an interagency coordination meeting conducted for the project. The current interpretation, based on coordination with the USACE, is that the project is not located in areas under USACE jurisdiction. Coordination with the USACE will continue, as needed, as the project's development advances. The National Park Service is designated as a Cooperating Agency for the Environmental Assessment being completed for the project's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation.

<p>Vanessa Marquez, Todd Adelman, Alec Melman,</p>			<p>Request that the Northern Valley Greenway rail trail project be included in the FY 2024-2027 Transportation Improvement Program. Notes the trail would connect multiple communities and allow users to cycle or walk safely, especially in neighborhoods without sidewalks.</p>	<p>In 2018-2019, NJDOT Bureau of Safety, Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs provided technical planning assistance to the Northern Valley Greenway Committee. The outcome of that effort was a study evaluating the physical conditions of the 7.4-mile right-of-way (through GIS and limited field observation), identifying opportunities and constraints, and assessing potential planning-level design alternatives (cross-sections) for the greenway. The process included a Stakeholder Workshop and a Public Information Center as outreach events. The study cannot be accurately characterized as a “concept” or a “plan.” At the time it was conducted, the study was the first time many stakeholders and the public were learning about the NVG initiative and the right-of-way. The study provided a good introduction and the two outreach events were productive, but our scope was designed to keep things at an introductory/evaluation level. Developing a concept or plan with true consensus would be a next step for the NVG Committee. In addition, there is an established process for an outside agency, official or resident to request transportation issues be considered for problem statement submission. A letter should be sent to NJDOT Community Relations: attention Megan Fackler. The location and explanation of the issue should be included in the letter. This does not guarantee that a problem will result in a new transportation improvement. An agency, official or resident can also contact their local MPO to initiate this process.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Paul Onish			Said at many intersections with dedicated left-turn arrows, turning movements are only allowed in one direction at a time, when traffic travelling in both directions could be making turns at the same time. Asked that traffic signals be coordinated to allow for this. He said left-turn queues should also be longer, particularly in areas where there is heavy truck traffic. Said he hopes NJDOT and municipalities can address this by elongating turn lanes and coordinating signals on roads such as Route 1, Route 130 and other county roads.	There is an established process for an outside agency, official or resident to request transportation issues be considered for problem statement submission. A letter should be sent to NJDOT Community Relations: attention Megan Fackler. The location and explanation of the issue should be included in the letter. This does not guarantee that a problem will result in a new transportation improvement. An agency, official or resident can also contact their local MPO to initiate this process.
Kristin Shipps, Kailene Molion	I-80 Rockfall, I-80EB Retaining wall	09545, 22360	Please accept Hardwick Township Resolution # 2023-51 Providing draft TIP FY 2024-2027 comment for the \$178.6M NJDOT Delaware Water Gap Projects: \$82.4M I80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project DBN #09545 and \$92.2M I80 EB Retaining Wall Replacement Project DBN#22360, that do not mitigate well known existing design safety hazards. The electronic version of the resolution contains links to sourced material. The Township of Hardwick requests NJTPA, and board member NJDOT, respond to requests for: 1. NJTPA to establish a committee, study group or facilitate the creation of any forum necessary, that includes Warren County Commissioners, Warren County Planning Department and Knowlton and Hardwick Township representatives, to assist with conflict resolution for the issues explained in the	As outlined in the Rt. 80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Public Involvement Action Plan (PIAP), extensive outreach has been conducted, and will continue to be conducted, with numerous stakeholders, including Warren County Commissioners, Warren County Planning Department, Knowlton and Hardwick Township. The project's PIAP can be found on the project's website at the following link: 80_Rockfall_PIAP.pdf (state.nj.us) For the Rt. 80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project, the Department is finalizing Technical Environmental Studies in support of an Environmental Assessment. These documents are currently scheduled for completion during the summer of 2024. For the Rt. 80 EB Retaining Wall Replacement Project, the Department is currently completing environmental coordination and evaluations in support of categorical exclusion document (CED) for this retaining wall reconstruction project. Studies completed for the project, such as a Concept Development Report and Alternatives Analysis can be found on the project website at :I-80 Rockfall

			<p>resolution. 2. NJTPA to encourage a full independent Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that considers impacts of the I80 WB Rockfall Mitigation Project and the I80 EB Retaining Wall Project as a two-phase single project, the EIS includes full Cumulative and Socioeconomic Impact Assessments, and evaluates all reasonable alternatives which would include the original 2011 \$4.5M FHWA, Knowlton and Hardwick Township's approved Rockfall Mitigation Recommended Preferred Alternative. 3. NJTPA to assist NJDOT to initiate a Transportation Problem Statement to study all the safety, mobility and congestion issues I80 Exit 4 to the Delaware Water Gap Bridge. These requests are being made due to the pattern of issues over multiple projects over multiple years, in Knowlton and Hardwick Townships along the Lower and Middle Delaware National Wild and Scenic River, that have been fraught with controversy since 2012 largely due to the following: 1. well-documented environmental, traffic safety, visual, economic and lifestyle impact concerns. 2. questionable existence of studies conducted prior to preliminary engineering that would support a change in scope, purpose and need, justification, original estimates, feasibility, and constructability. 3. NJDOTs inability or lack of willingness to consistently provide stakeholders with notice of projects, changes to projects, updates, reasonable records requested or other timely and accurate information.</p>	<p>Mitigation Project Home - In the Works (state.nj.us). As the project progresses through design phases, additional studies will be included on the project website when approved.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Anne Clifton	Schalk's Crossing Road Bridge, US 1, Alexander Road to Mapleton Road	00321, 17419	<p>We support the cantilevered bicycle/pedestrian shared sidewalk along both the east and west sides of Schalk's Crossing Road. We oppose the widening of US 1. We believe commuting habits have changed in the wake of the pandemic and the peak traffic levels once projected now may not materialize as envisioned. (Note the second and third graphs in the following article: https://www.advisorperspectives.com/dshort/updates/2023/08/10/americas-driving-habits-as-of-june-2023.) Rather than focus on widening Route 1, we request that NJTPA support a bicycle and pedestrian path along the 2.7-mile Dinky line route between the Princeton Junction and Princeton train stations. We recognize that this new east-west pathway would be in Mercer County and therefore outside NJTPA's jurisdiction. However, adding a bicycle and pedestrian path along the Dinky line route would tremendously improve the safety of our transportation infrastructure for residents who bike and walk, including those in Plainsboro and other nearby communities within your jurisdiction. These are our most vulnerable road users (which also includes low-income workers without access to motorized transit), and our transportation dollars and plans should address their needs as well as the needs of motorists. Should you decide to widen Route 1 regardless of the lack of need for additional capacity, please add a multiuse path on both sides, in particular the east side of Route 1 to connect the planned Dinky Line Trail to the Plainsboro path network adjacent to the hospital.</p>	<p>There is an established process for an outside agency, official or resident to request transportation issues be considered for problem statement submission. A letter should be sent to NJDOT Community Relations: attention Megan Fackler. The location and explanation of the issue should be included in the letter. This does not guarantee that a problem will result in a new transportation improvement. An agency, official or resident can also contact their local MPO to initiate this process.</p>
--------------	--	--------------	--	---

<p>Corey Hannigan</p>			<p>I strongly urge the NJTPA board to add either more Bike/Ped construction projects (such as DB# 11406 or any construction-ready projects identified in TMA Safe Routes to School Plans) or increase funding for ongoing Bike/Ped projects (such as DB#s 99409, X185), to better align with Long Range Plan allocations. a. The Long Range Transportation Plan 2050 elevated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as a key theme and equity/need highlighted for vulnerable population groups, as well as within/between urban areas and rural areas, emphasizing that “addressing bicycle and pedestrian network connectivity...must be a priority.” (Figure 4-9 in the long range plan shows that 17.2% of households below the Federal Poverty Level walk or bike to work. b. The Long Range Plan outlines RCIS Category: Bike/Ped expenditures of \$128M for FY2022-2025, and \$166M for FY 2026-2031, but the TIP only allocates roughly \$102M across a similar four-year period (2024-2027). I do not support any Road Expansion or roadway widening projects (e.g., DB#s 103A1, 11415, N1402, 08327C, 08327D, 99316, 17419, NS9802, N1405, 11415, 14416, 780A, 95023, 16344, 97062B). Between FY 2025 and 2027 Road Expansion projects are forecast to be 1.2 percent of total spending, beyond the 1% limit outlined in the Long Range Plan. Beyond that, many roadway widening projects are classified as RCIS Category: Bridge(s), Bridge Enhancement, and are thus treated the same as Bridge Preservation projects, but these are categorically different. These projects are not about prioritizing the maintenance of existing infrastructure - in fact, they expand the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Transportation Alternatives Program provides federal funding for projects such as bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In addition, NJDOT funds bicycle and pedestrian projects through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities/ Accommodations program.</p>
-----------------------	--	--	---	--

			<p>maintenance burden for the state by adding to our wasteful and polluting car-dependent transportation network. Why are we expanding impermeable surface and personal motor-vehicle oriented transportation expansion while the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change? It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects. Route 206, Valley Road to Brown Avenue (DB# 780A) claims to be bicycle/pedestrian compatible, but it is unclear how that is possible when the road is being widened from two lanes to four, with signals being replaced by jughandles (which will naturally include slip lanes, which are dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

David Dech	Route 80 EB, Retaining wall and I-80 WB Rockfall mitigation	22360, 09545	<p>The Route 80 EB Retaining Wall Replacement project is actually part of the I-80 Rockfall Mitigation project. It is evident that to construct the rock fall mitigation project, the eastbound retaining wall replacement must be completed to handle the lane diversions that would be required if the rock fall project moves forward. This is indicative in the draft FY 2024 TIP where the retaining wall replacement project programs construction funds in 2025 and rock fall mitigation programs construction funding in 2028. Because the Rockfall project cannot move forward toward construction until the retaining wall is replaced, it is obvious that the two must be treated as one project. Per NEPA rules, they cannot be improperly segmented into two separate projects to avoid a higher level of NEPA documentation such as an Environmental Impact Statement. At a Local Officials Briefing held on May 22, 2023, the NJDOT stated that the retaining wall project would be processed as a Categorical Exclusion. However, according to USC Title 23 § 771.117 FHWA Categorical Exclusions are reserved only for projects that are; not more than \$30 million; have little chance of having a significant impact on the environment, federal or state protected resources, or travel patterns; are not in the proximity of threatened or endangered species; has no substantial controversy on environmental grounds; not in the proximity of other planned projects that may result in cumulative impacts; or do not involve multiple agencies during the environmental review. Individually, it appears that both projects would generate the need for an EIS inasmuch as both are over \$30 million, will have a significant</p>	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to previous responses.
------------	---	--------------	---	--

			<p>impact on the environment including federal and state parklands, will have an impact on travel patterns due to lane shifts, cross overs, and traffic stoppage due to blasting, has controversy on environmental grounds, is in the proximity of other planned projects, and involves multiple agencies during the environmental review. With the foregoing said, the NJDOT should explain how the I-80 Retaining Wall Replacement project meets the Categorical Exclusion criteria. As documented in many letters and resolutions, the Rockfall Mitigation Project as currently proposed continues to face widespread opposition from local, county, state, and federal elected officials from NJ and PA. While there are many issues and objections to the project as currently proposed, its impacts on the environmental, scenic, cultural, tribal, and natural resources are of major concern. Formal resolutions have been passed by the Warren County Board of County Commissioners with no response from the NJDOT. They are listed below by date of passage and topic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. March 25, 2020 Resolution 154-20 which along with several NJ and PA legislators and organizations, called for an I80 Rockfall Mitigation Project Environmental Impact Statement, noting known retaining wall issues, issues with no suitable detour route, the likelihood that 611 could be closed for an extended period of time due to common rock fall and tree fall occurrences and structural issues and other safety and traffic impact issues of top concern. 2. March 10, 2021 Resolution 130-21 which, along with Sussex and Hunterdon Counties, called for the I80 WB Rockfall Mitigation 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Project to return to the original 2011 Concept Development Report as estimated in the 2012 TIP costing \$6M. 3. September 22, 2021 Resolution 420-21 which, along with several NJ and PA counties and municipalities, called upon NJDOT to initiate a Problem Statement to study safety, mobility and congestion issues I80 Exit 4 to the Delaware Water Gap Bridge. The 2011 Concept Development Report recommended a preliminary preferred alternative with an estimated total cost of \$6 million. Since the report was generated, the scope and cost of the project has risen exponentially. To understand the project's evolution it would be helpful to see the additional studies that were conducted since the 2011 Concept Report was released that generated the change in scope and ultimately the cost. The basic need for the rock fall project is questioned. Both projects are located in the area known as the S-Curves. Crash records indicate that the vast majority of crashes that occur in this half-mile segment are the result of inclement weather, speeding, poor drainage, and driver error. The number of crashes caused by rock fall are relatively few. According to the 2011 Concept Development Report, out of the 81 crashes documented from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2009, three were caused by "debris in road" equating to less than 4% of the total crashes. Rockfall does not seem to be the problem. A better long-term remedy to improve motorist safety, reduce congestion and address the perceived rock fall problem should focus on the S-Curves. Several of the alternatives that include bridging and tunneling that had been developed but not presented on the NJDOT's I-80 Rockfall</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Mitigation website, were not considered as viable alternatives. A full study should be conducted to evaluate the feasibility of these alternatives. Alternatively, if an analysis had been conducted, please provide. A comprehensive bi state traffic study of the region needs to be conducted before any work begins on rock fall mitigation. With PA 611 closed for an indefinite amount of time, a regional traffic plan needs to be prepared to deal with bi-state automobile and freight traffic and how emergency service vehicles will be able to respond quickly when I-80 is congested due to crashes and traffic volume. Regarding local elected official involvement in this regionally significant project, requests to the NJDOT to have a meeting have not been granted. To facilitate local involvement the Warren County Board of Commissioners requested that the County be a "Participating Agency" and a "Cooperating Agency". "Participating Agency" request was denied and no reply has been received about the Cooperating Agency request. The reasoning given for the denial was that there are opportunities for local participation when the public meetings are scheduled. This is concerning because per the federal requirements, the NJTPA promotes a robust public engagement process and coordination with all stakeholders. Being that federal monies are being used to fund the 1-80 Rockfall Project, it would seem that public and stakeholder cooperation in a "continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C)" process" would be paramount. It would be helpful if the NJTPA would facilitate a constructive meeting</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>with the local elected and unelected officials were legitimate serious concerns and questions can be discussed. Meetings with local officials on a regular basis would help ensure a productive continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C") process.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

David Dech	Rt 57 Bridge over Branch Lopatco ng Creek	16345		<p>Design is being delayed by two years from 2023 to 2025 and Construction is being delayed by two years from 2025 to 2028 and increasing in cost from \$5.35 million to \$6.85 million. The project first appeared in the FY 2018-2021 TIP with Design scheduled in FY 2021 and Construction programmed in the out years 2022 - 2027. Please explain why the delay and cost increase. NJDOT had responded to the initial inquiry that planned funding for this project is based on the current project delivery schedule, budget estimate, and federal fund availability. Schedule delays are due to significant additional hydraulic analysis and terrestrial crossing studies required by NJDEP. NJDEP's requirement for additional studies should be complete as quickly as possible as the bridge is structurally deficient and functionally obsolete.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please refer to previous responses.</p>
------------	---	-------	--	---	---

David Dech	Rt 57 CR 517 Intersection Improvement	97062B	<p>Despite assurances by NJDOT that this project would go to construction in 2024, this project is being delayed another five years from 2024 to 2029 with a cost increase from \$17.25 million to \$23.80 million. This project was first initiated in 1992 when a letter from Assemblyman Chuck Haytaian was sent to NJDOT Commissioner Thomas Downs. Thirty-one years have passed and now the project is slipping another five years. When the NJDOT was asked during the preliminary comment period why the project is slipping five years to 2029, NJDOT response was as follows: <i>“Planned funding for this project is based on the current project delivery schedule and budget estimate; and federal fund availability. The original Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) for the project proposed to realign Lopatcong Creek to move the two structures on Route 57 and CR 519 away from the intersection. As the project progressed through design, NJDEP expressed concerns with realignment of the creek. Several years have been spent developing a new PPA that avoided impacts to the creek. This PPA was presented to County officials in February 2021, and a Resolution of Support was passed. The new alternative still needs to complete Preliminary Engineering and obtain an approved NEPA document. PE is scheduled for completion in Spring 2024.”</i> The County Commissioner resolution of support for the PPA was passed in February 2021, 2 ½ years ago with the understanding that the project would be able to advance in a timely manner. It must be reiterated that the Route 57/CR 519 project is a high priority intersection project as it is noted that within the last year or so, the NJDOT</p>	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to previous responses.
------------	---------------------------------------	--------	--	--

				<p>installed reinforcements on the Rt 57 Bridge over the Lopatcong Creek signifying that the bridge's condition is worsening. In addition, there a number of warehouses that have been proposed in the vicinity that, if built, would contribute a substantial amount of additional truck traffic through the intersection. This additional traffic will exacerbate an existing obsolete intersection and further compromise the existing bridges. A meeting with the NJDOT project manager is requested to discuss the project's status.</p>	
David Dech	Rt 94 Bridge over Jacksonburg Creek	11322		<p>Construction is slipping from 2025 to 2028 with an increase in ROW cost from \$1.0 million to \$4.0 million and an increase in construction cost from \$4 million to \$11.20 million. NJDOT was asked to explain the delays and cost increases. NJDOT response: <i>"Planned funding for this project is based on the current project delivery schedule and budget estimate; and federal fund availability. Cost increases and delays during Preliminary Engineering are due to the need to address large truck turning movements, which resulted in impacts to the adjacent historic property, resulting in additional alternative analysis. This analysis resulted in a roadway and bridge realignment. A wildlife crossing is also being added to the project."</i> It is noted that this project has been on the TIP since 2014. The total estimated project cost increased from \$3.3 million in 2014 to \$17.85 million.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please refer to previous responses.</p>

David Dech	Bridge over Furnace Brook	09325	<p>Please explain the 100% cost increase from \$6.3 million to \$13.0 million. NJDOT's response was: "Planned funding for this project is based on the current project delivery schedule and budget estimate; and federal fund availability. This project consists of three distinct structures, a wildlife crossing and ROW acquisition of Green Acres encumbered properties. Changes in Flood Hazard Area rules and Stormwater Management Rules caused additional engineering tasks, resulting in schedule delays. Cost increases are due to changes in the foundation type of structures, compliance with NJDEP regulations and an overall increase in construction costs due to inflation and supply chain issues." It is noted that this project has been on the TIP since 2014. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please refer to previous responses.</p>
James Lee			<p>I give the following personal comments regarding the draft NJTPA FY24-27 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP): <u>On metrics:</u> 1) I applaud the NJTPA's adoption of reaching a goal of zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2050. The number of fatalities is a good metric and we hope that as a state we move towards a statewide goal of zero road deaths overall. We know from the progress of Jersey City and Hoboken that progress is not only possible, but practical with quick builds and pilot projects. 2) On air quality: NJ has very few air quality monitoring sites and many counties have no monitoring of PM2.5. For example, there is currently no monitoring of PM2.5 in the City of Newark. There is no monitoring of PM2.5 in Monmouth County. Without comprehensive monitoring it is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please note that all federally funded projects are designed within federally mandated design standards.</p>

			<p>dubious that we are able to understand data and conformity especially for mobile sources of pollution. I urge the installation of PM2.5 air quality monitoring sites, with at least one primary and secondary in every single county. Further, I urge the installation of air quality monitoring sites including for PM2.5 adjacent to every heavily traveled roadway including at the Holland Tunnel approach/139/NJ Turnpike Extension, the Keasbey Interchange, the Lincoln Tunnel approach, Newark Airport, and Ports of Elizabeth/Newark/Bayonne. <u>On Congestion Management Process</u> I oppose all roadway widening projects because it is not the most efficient or safe solution to increase capacity and improve safety. Despite a statewide transit agency in NJ Transit and despite high levels of urbanization, NJ has very few bus lanes. We know from the Lincoln Tunnel's XBL and the experience of bus lanes in NYC, Boston, Seattle, and others that bus lanes can serve up to 10X the passenger capacity of an automobile lane. And we also know from National Safety Council data that buses are 20X safer per passenger mile than automobiles. Given the much higher capacity gains and also considering safety benefits, any rational consideration of alternatives to relieve congestion through highway expansion should be addressed with bus-only transit lanes before any lane expansion can be considered. Operational expenses for NJ Transit are an important concern. A large investment in the bus lane network would also provide a reduction in operational costs for NJ Transit given the same hours, drivers, and equipment. Riders would benefit from improved reliability,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>frequency, and travel times. Further, given induced demand, highway expansion proposals purportedly for relieving congestion must explain how they may be exempt from the phenomenon of induced demand and would have to meet a very high bar of explaining how they would avoid future congestion. Highway expansion would also worsen air quality including PM2.5 for which EV has been slow and EVs will still emit 50% of current vehicles via brake and tire dust. <u>Bridges and Bike Lanes</u> The bike and walk network is fragmented even in heavily traveled urban areas. I urge that lane widths be readjusted for non-highway bridges to be a maximum of 11ft and that protected bike lanes be the default for every bridge project. For example, Clay St Bridge connecting the City of Newark to Hudson County should not be using 12ft lanes that are known to encourage dangerous speeds, especially in an urban area. The bridge should also be built with a protected bike lane as part of its design given the plan to rebuild from new a replacement bridge. <u>Urban Areas and Bike Lanes</u> I also urge the discouragement of all county projects on county roads in urban areas that do not include protected bike lane components. We now know that protected bike lanes are an important tool for making roadways safer for all road users and bike lanes serve a higher capacity than single occupancy vehicle traffic. We must plan for the future, not be stuck in the ways of the past. Citibike growth year-over-year in Jersey City and Hoboken has grown consistently at 25%. This means a doubling every 3 years in demand. Last, I support all projects that support freight rail</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>viability and efficiency and discourage the growth of warehouse sprawl, which is creating unnecessary truck traffic even in the midst of growth of online commerce. I also call for the investigation of a regional inland port, which could serve the purpose of improving rail-served freight and decreasing inefficient truck traffic. Large trucks will be the last to electrify, cause the majority of wear on roadways, and create substantial road dangers in urban areas.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Susan Soloway</p>	<p>Rt 29 Rockfall, Kingwood Twp., Rt 29 Rockfall, W Amwell and Lambertville</p>	<p>11413B, 15443</p>	<p>I am reaching out to you on behalf of the Hunterdon County Board of Commissioners, as a result of local officials contacting us from the Kingwood and West Amwell Townships, to address their concerns regarding the Route 29, Rockfall Mitigation Project. On April 20th, 2021, the Board passed a resolution requesting that the NJTPA and NJDOT examine alternative, less invasive solutions to the proposed rock mitigation project. Specifically, assessing, saving money and lessening environmental damage to a federally designed Scenic Byway. The rockfall mitigation plan is intended as designed, to protect the driving public on Route 29 in Kingwood Township from falling rocks. To our knowledge, there have been no records of accidents or injuries due to rockfall in this area. I recently toured the projected land area, along with Deputy Commissioner, Jeff Kuhl and Congressman Tom Kean Jr., to learn more about the proposed rockfall mitigation plan. What was learned raised disturbing concerns about the negative impacts the project would have on a three mile stretch along Route 29 in Kingwood Township, including the Devil's Tea Table area and a one mile stretch in Lambertville and West Amwell. Some of these concerns include possible destructive impacts and damage to local wells from rock blasting, proposed detour plans that would increase traffic congestion and reduce safety, environmental degradation, extinction of endangered species as well as, costly ongoing</p>	<p>The Route 29 Kingwood and Lambertville Rockfall Mitigation Projects' purposes are to reduce the frequency and severity of rockfall events. The Kingwood location is currently ranked second highest in the state for rockfall hazard, and the Lambertville location is ranked fourth. For both projects, the NJDOT is carefully examining many different possible solutions to proactively address the rockfall hazard. For both projects, the NJDOT is engaging with the public in many different venues, from Local Officials Briefings to Public Information Centers, to Design Working Groups. Kingwood's Design Working Group has held two (of up to five) meetings to gather their input and concerns. The Design Working Group consists of 13 members of the public, seven of whom were recommended by Kingwood to represent the Township, as well as members of local interest groups and the National Park Service. The Kingwood Design Working Group also includes a current member, recommended by Kingwood Township who also represents the Lower Delaware River Wild and Scenic River Management Council, who currently serves on the Hunterdon County Planning Board. In addition, Tribal Nations are invited by the FHWA to participate in this group as well as in the Local Officials Briefings. The Lambertville Design Working Group has yet to commence but is anticipated to follow the same structure as Kingwood's. For both projects, the Design Working Group members will be reviewing project's existing conditions, purpose and needs/goals, as well as alternatives and providing their respective group's input and concerns. The issues highlighted by the Hunterdon County Board of County Commissioners have been shared and discussed at the Kingwood Design Working Group meetings. These issues will also be discussed at our future Lambertville meetings. NJDOT remains committed to working with the public and local elected officials to develop rockfall mitigation projects that meet the area's safety needs as well as minimize environmental, social, and economic impacts.</p>
----------------------	---	----------------------	--	--

				<p>maintenance of this area which would raise taxes for surrounding residents. Additionally, this specific corridor along Route 29 is federally designated as a "Wild & Scenic" area that has unique local, historical, and geological significance. It is also a sacred area that holds religious significance to Native American peoples. The project has the potential to affect the water quality of the Delaware River, and negatively impact tourism in this area. I am respectfully requesting the NJTPA review the Route 29 Rockfall Mitigation Project and obtain full input by the public and elected officials on the need, design and implementation of this project before proceeding further. Perhaps there is an alternative design that could achieve the same goals without begin as invasive as what is currently proposed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Valerie Sassaman	CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)	17411		<p>Demolishing and replacing this bridge/tunnel would cause a financial hardship on Bordentown City. Closure of a year to 3 years will end with empty storefronts. Small businesses will give up their leases. I don't think I need to explain the domino effect of an abandoned Main Street in a small town. The historic value is undeniable and should be maintained. Just the thought of dismantling this bridge is upsetting and extremely disappointing. When did it become an orphan bridge? When it was decided to replace the bridge?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
Steve Warner	ADA South, Contract 4	15423	<p>*ONE OF ### identical comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia* Dear members of the DVRPC Board, : I am writing to provide the following comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27):</p> <p>1) I would like to thank the DVRPC Board for programming the Rancocas Creek</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	

			<p>Greenway, Laurel Run Park (DB# D2207), a Circuit Trails project, into the NJ TIP.</p> <p>2) I would also like to thank the Board for programming the following projects which include bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements: DB#'s 15423, 18383, 29337, D2023, D1910, 12346, 12346A, D2216, D2014</p> <p>3) I urge the DVRPC to use a portion of the new Carbon Reduction Program (DB# D2305) and eligible highway funds to fund prioritized Circuit projects. The Draft TIP is silent on what NJDOT or DVRPC plans to spend Carbon Reduction Program funds on. It should at least reveal what NJDOT is spending Carbon Reduction Program funds in the 2023 TIP Program Year if decisions have been made for this current year.</p> <p>4) The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the NJ TIP should be spending roughly \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. I ask the Board to commit \$69 million more to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>5) I ask the Board to program the following 5 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glassboro-Elk Trail (previously listed as DB #D1203 in the FY22-25 NJTIP) - Camden County LINK Trail - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro <p>6) I do not support Highway Expansion projects proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (TPK Mainline Capacity Enhancements Between I/C 1 - 4)</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>and the South Jersey Transportation Authority (ACE Widening (MP 30.6-44): Widening of the Atlantic City Expressway from milepost 31.6 to 44.2.).</p> <p>Between these two agencies, they are proposing to spend over \$3.6 billion dollars on highway expansion that is above and beyond the 4% allocated for highway expansion in the Long Range Plan. Meanwhile the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change. It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Warner sdwarner65@gmail.com</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Steve Warner	Route 73, Granite Avenue to Route 41	18383	<p>*ONE OF ### identical comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia*</p> <p>Dear members of the DVRPC Board, :</p> <p>I am writing to provide the following comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27):</p> <p>1) I would like to thank the DVRPC Board for programming the Rancocas Creek Greenway, Laurel Run Park (DB# D2207), a Circuit Trails project, into the NJ TIP.</p> <p>2) I would also like to thank the Board for programming the following projects which include bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements: DB#'s 15423, 18383, 29337, D2023, D1910, 12346, 12346A, D2216, D2014</p> <p>3) I urge the DVRPC to use a portion of the new Carbon Reduction Program (DB# D2305) and eligible highway funds to fund prioritized Circuit projects. The Draft TIP is silent on what NJDOT or DVRPC plans to spend Carbon Reduction Program funds on. It should at least reveal what NJDOT is spending Carbon Reduction Program funds in the 2023 TIP Program Year if decisions have been made for this current year.</p> <p>4) The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the NJ TIP should be</p>	Thank you for your comment.
--------------	--------------------------------------	-------	--	-----------------------------

			<p>spending roughly \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. I ask the Board to commit \$69 million more to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>5) I ask the Board to program the following 5 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glassboro-Elk Trail (previously listed as DB #D1203 in the FY22-25 NJTIP) - Camden County LINK Trail - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the trail bridge over I-295. - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>6) I do not support Highway Expansion projects proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (TPK Mainline Capacity Enhancements Between I/C 1 - 4) and the South Jersey Transportation Authority (ACE Widening (MP 30.6-44): Widening of the Atlantic City Expressway from milepost 31.6 to 44.2.).</p> <p>Between these two agencies, they are proposing to spend over \$3.6 billion dollars on highway expansion that is above and beyond the 4% allocated for highway expansion in the Long Range Plan. Meanwhile the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change. It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Warner sdwarner65@gmail.com</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Steve Warner	Route 130/206 , CR 528 (Crosswicks Rd) to Rt 206 at Amboy Rd	12346	<p>*ONE OF ### identical comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia*</p> <p>Dear members of the DVRPC Board, :</p> <p>I am writing to provide the following comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27):</p> <p>1) I would like to thank the DVRPC Board for programming the Rancocas Creek Greenway, Laurel Run Park (DB# D2207), a Circuit Trails project, into the NJ TIP.</p> <p>2) I would also like to thank the Board for programming the following projects which include bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements: DB#'s 15423, 18383, 29337, D2023, D1910, 12346, 12346A, D2216, D2014</p> <p>3) I urge the DVRPC to use a portion of the new Carbon Reduction Program (DB# D2305) and eligible highway funds to fund prioritized Circuit projects. The Draft TIP is silent on what NJDOT or DVRPC plans to spend Carbon Reduction Program funds on. It should at least reveal what NJDOT is spending Carbon Reduction Program funds in the 2023 TIP Program Year if decisions have been made for this current year.</p> <p>4) The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the NJ TIP should be</p>	Thank you for your comment.
--------------	--	-------	--	-----------------------------

			<p>spending roughly \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. I ask the Board to commit \$69 million more to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>5) I ask the Board to program the following 5 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glassboro-Elk Trail (previously listed as DB #D1203 in the FY22-25 NJTIP) - Camden County LINK Trail - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the trail bridge over I-295. - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>6) I do not support Highway Expansion projects proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (TPK Mainline Capacity Enhancements Between I/C 1 - 4) and the South Jersey Transportation Authority (ACE Widening (MP 30.6-44): Widening of the Atlantic City Expressway from milepost 31.6 to 44.2.). Between these two agencies, they are proposing to spend over \$3.6 billion dollars on highway expansion that is above and beyond the 4% allocated for highway expansion in the Long Range Plan. Meanwhile the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change. It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Warner sdwarner65@gmail.com</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Steve Warner	Route 130, CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue)	12346A	<p>*ONE OF ### identical comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia*</p> <p>Dear members of the DVRPC Board, :</p> <p>I am writing to provide the following comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27):</p> <p>1) I would like to thank the DVRPC Board for programming the Rancocas Creek Greenway, Laurel Run Park (DB# D2207), a Circuit Trails project, into the NJ TIP.</p> <p>2) I would also like to thank the Board for programming the following projects which include bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements: DB#'s 15423, 18383, 29337, D2023, D1910, 12346, 12346A, D2216, D2014</p> <p>3) I urge the DVRPC to use a portion of the new Carbon Reduction Program (DB# D2305) and eligible highway funds to fund prioritized Circuit projects. The Draft TIP is silent on what NJDOT or DVRPC plans to spend Carbon Reduction Program funds on. It should at least reveal what NJDOT is spending Carbon Reduction Program funds in the 2023 TIP Program Year if decisions have been made for this current year.</p> <p>4) The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the NJ TIP should be</p>	Thank you for your comment.
--------------	---------------------------------------	--------	--	-----------------------------

			<p>spending roughly \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. I ask the Board to commit \$69 million more to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>5) I ask the Board to program the following 5 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glassboro-Elk Trail (previously listed as DB #D1203 in the FY22-25 NJTIP) - Camden County LINK Trail - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the trail bridge over I-295. - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>6) I do not support Highway Expansion projects proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (TPK Mainline Capacity Enhancements Between I/C 1 - 4) and the South Jersey Transportation Authority (ACE Widening (MP 30.6-44): Widening of the Atlantic City Expressway from milepost 31.6 to 44.2.).</p> <p>Between these two agencies, they are proposing to spend over \$3.6 billion dollars on highway expansion that is above and beyond the 4% allocated for highway expansion in the Long Range Plan. Meanwhile the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change. It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Warner sdwarner65@gmail.com</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Steve Warner	Transportation Alternatives Program	X107	<p>*ONE OF ### identical comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia*</p> <p>Dear members of the DVRPC Board, :</p> <p>I am writing to provide the following comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27):</p> <p>1) I would like to thank the DVRPC Board for programming the Rancocas Creek Greenway, Laurel Run Park (DB# D2207), a Circuit Trails project, into the NJ TIP.</p> <p>2) I would also like to thank the Board for programming the following projects which include bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements: DB#'s 15423, 18383, 29337, D2023, D1910, 12346, 12346A, D2216, D2014</p> <p>3) I urge the DVRPC to use a portion of the new Carbon Reduction Program (DB# D2305) and eligible highway funds to fund prioritized Circuit projects. The Draft TIP is silent on what NJDOT or DVRPC plans to spend Carbon Reduction Program funds on. It should at least reveal what NJDOT is spending Carbon Reduction Program funds in the 2023 TIP Program Year if decisions have been made for this current year.</p> <p>4) The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the NJ TIP should be</p>	Thank you for your comment.
--------------	-------------------------------------	------	--	-----------------------------

			<p>spending roughly \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. I ask the Board to commit \$69 million more to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>5) I ask the Board to program the following 5 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glassboro-Elk Trail (previously listed as DB #D1203 in the FY22-25 NJTIP) - Camden County LINK Trail - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295. - Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the trail bridge over I-295. - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>6) I do not support Highway Expansion projects proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (TPK Mainline Capacity Enhancements Between I/C 1 - 4) and the South Jersey Transportation Authority (ACE Widening (MP 30.6-44): Widening of the Atlantic City Expressway from milepost 31.6 to 44.2.). Between these two agencies, they are proposing to spend over \$3.6 billion dollars on highway expansion that is above and beyond the 4% allocated for highway expansion in the Long Range Plan. Meanwhile the region is experiencing historic heat and flooding impacts of climate change. It is irresponsible to fund these expansion projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve Warner sdwarner65@gmail.com</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>Fleming Jr., William H.</p>	<p>Route 45, Bridge over Woodb ury Creek</p>	<p>14348</p>	<p>DVRPC FY 2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27) NJ Route 45 Bridge over Woodbury Creek, MP 26.21 DB# 14348 – Str. No. 0810150 July 31, 2023 Background This Route 45 Bridge over Woodbury Creek was built in 1892 and widened in 1958, when all or portions the deck and superstructure were likely replaced. The bridge has a length of 45 feet and a width of 66.5 feet, providing a curb to curb pavement width of 46’ and two 10’ wide sidewalks. The deck is reinforced concrete on stay-in place (SIP) steel forms, topped by an asphalt surface course. The superstructure consists of a simply supported single span with 13 steel girders (+2 sidewalk beams), five floor beams, and 12 stringers. There are multiple bridge-attached utilities in conduits and pipes in three or more of the girder bays and also overhead utilities on poles along the east sidewalk. Structurally Deficient and Functionally Obsolete Bridge Condition The bridge is classified as Structurally Deficient and Functionally Obsolete. The last available bridge inspection report from September 2020 indicates the following: ¿ “The deck is in poor condition due to large bituminous asphalt patches and several areas of severely rusted SIP forms exhibiting holes where the SIP forms sit on the steel stringer, an indication of deck contamination [and likely indicating rebar corrosion and loss of deck strength].” ¿ “The superstructure is in poor condition due</p>	<p>Planned funding for a project is based on the current project delivery schedule, budget estimate, and available funding. A project schedule can differ from the STIP. Since the STIP is updated every two years, there is a possibility for phase(s) to be advanced.</p>
------------------------------------	--	--------------	--	---

			<p>to all steel components exhibiting severe corrosion, delamination and section loss. The curb line, double line stringers exhibits 20% section loss with a few isolated areas of to 90% section loss. Several interior stringers have knife edges at the flange tips exhibiting section loss varying from 30% to 50%, the stringer was bent up when struck with a hammer. Floor beam 2 exhibits a 6-foot diameter corrosion hole in the web. Girder G11 and G13 are severely corroded. G13 is laterally bowed-out and has 50% to 75% section loss with knife edges on the top flange.” The girder bearings are inside of the abutments and not visible. Photos in the inspection report clearly depict the horrendous condition of the superstructure steel, including the bridge attached utility conduits and pipes.</p> <p>¿ The steel supports for the sidewalk on the east side of the bridge are apparently failing, as the sidewalk is tilting towards the Creek sufficiently to warrant barricading and closing the sidewalk to all pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>¿ “The condition of the substructure has been upgraded from poor to fair condition due to both the north and south abutment breastwalls, backwalls and wingwalls being repointed with gunite and all missing stones replaced with new stones.”</p> <p>¿ The abutment, wingwall and retaining wall footings are buried and not visible for inspection. However, the earthen areas behind these structural walls show unstable differential settlement.</p> <p>Three years have passed since the last available bridge inspection, and the deck and steel superstructure conditions have invariably</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>continued to deteriorate.</p> <p>DVRPC FY 2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-FY27) NJ Route 45 Bridge over Woodbury Creek, MP 26.21 DB# 14348 – Str. No. 0810150 July 31, 2023 TIP Funding Priority The bridge is 130 years old, structurally deficient, and functionally obsolete, and the pedestrian sidewalk has already been restricted due to structural failure. Route 45 is a major state roadway accessing Gloucester County’s seat of government that serves 300,000 people through its County facilities in Woodbury immediately south of the bridge. On the north side of the bridge there is the Inspira emergency medical facility that serves nearly 200,000 people. Route 45 is also a primary commuter route to Philadelphia and it provides a major access route to local communities and businesses in the western portion of the County (Westville to Harrison). If this bridge were closed to traffic (or otherwise weight restricted) du</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>Steven Lederman</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The Bordentown Historical Society officers and directors have voted to submit the attached Resolution opposing the present plan to replace the Farnsworth Avenue Bridge. Please confirm receipt of this email. Thank you.</p> <p>Dr. Steve Lederman, Co-President Bonnie Goldman, Esq, Co-President See Attachment</p> <p>Bordentown Historical Society RESOLUTION OF THE BORDENTOWN HISTORICAL SOCIETY IN SUPPORT OF THE REHABILITATION OF THE FARNSWORTH AVENUE STONE ARCH BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CONSTRUCTED IN 1831</p> <p>WHEREAS, there exists in the City of Bordentown, County of Burlington, State of New Jersey, an historically significant stone arch carriage bridge and tunnel carrying Farnsworth Avenue also known as County Road 545 over the railroad now owned by Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) that was constructed in 1831 as part of the Camden & Amboy Railroad; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has identified the Farnsworth Avenue (CR 545) Bridge and Tunnel over Conrail as being "structurally deficient" because it has missing stones and water leakage, as well as cracked and bulging walls in certain places; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, NJDOT has also deemed the historically significant stone arch bridge and tunnel "functionally obsolete" because the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
------------------------	---	--------------	--	---

			<p>tunnel through which Conrail trains pass allegedly has inadequate vertical clearance; and WHEREAS, NJDOT has proposed to demolish the historically significant stone arch bridge and tunnel and replace it with a prefabricated modern bridge as well as sidewalks and curbing for one hundred (100) feet to the north and south of the existing stone arch bridge; and WHEREAS, Bordentown City residents and historians have rallied around the cause to preserve the historic stone arch bridge and tunnel, and hired a professional engineer to assess its structural integrity, maintaining that the bridge and tunnel should be rehabilitated, rather than demolished and replaced; and WHEREAS, New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has recognized that the Farnsworth Avenue bridge is the oldest carriage bridge still in use in America, and the first carriage bridge and tunnel constructed over railroad tracks made of Steven's style, rolled iron, flat bottom inverted T-rails, and is the largest man-made structure built by the former Camden and Amboy Railroad; and</p> <p>1</p> <p>WHEREAS, Camden & Amboy Railroad is New Jersey's first permanent railroad and one of the first commercial railroads constructed in the United States; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, historically significant trains and engines traveled under the Farnsworth Avenue stone arch bridge and through the tunnel including, most notably the John Bull locomotive, the world's oldest operable steam locomotive, which is now in the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C.; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, under NJDOT's proposal, a memorial</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>to veterans located on Farnsworth Avenue would also be removed, stored and replaced with a new structure, according to members of the Bordentown City Veterans Memorial Committee; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the residents and historians who want to preserve the historic bridge have criticized the pre-fab aesthetic of the replacement bridge which is inappropriate to the 1831 construction era of the original bridge, in comparison to the building facades on Farnsworth Avenue; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the reason the railroad tracks pass under the bridge can be traced to an 1830 settlement of a lawsuit between Joseph Bonaparte and the Camden & Amboy Railroad when Robert Stevens, who was then president of the Railroad, planned to route the Railroad line over Blacks Creek, curving along the shoreline of Crosswicks Creek, up Thornton Creek valley on the west side of the Bonaparte Estate Pond to which Bonaparte objected, and then to former farmland located in an upland area south of Park Street; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, historians noted that it would have been easier to excavate a notch on the hill slopes that flank Crosswicks Creek and Thornton Creek rather</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>Suzanne Wheelock</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue), Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sent from the all new Aol app for iOS</p> <p>On Monday, August 7, 2023, 4:59 PM, Steven Lederman <smlederman@mac.com> wrote:</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The Bordentown Historical Society officers and directors have voted to submit the attached Resolution opposing the present plan to replace the Farnsworth Avenue Bridge. Please confirm receipt of this email.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Dr. Steve Lederman, Co-President Bonnie Goldman, Esq, Co-President</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
-------------------------	--	--------------	--	---

<p>Downtown Bordentown Association</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue), Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>DOWNTOWN BORDENTOWN ASSOCIATION P.O. BOX 686, BORDENTOWN, NJ 08505 www.downtownbordentown.com</p> <p>Vincent Schino, Jr., President Zack Melker Director C.J. Mugavero Vice President Paul Sabol Director Rebecca Moslowski Treasurer George Xuereb Director Doug Palmieri Secretary</p> <p>August 10, 2023</p> <p>Re: Project 17411 CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue), Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail) (Bordentown Twp, Burlington County)</p> <p>We write to you today regarding the replacement/repair of the bridge and roadway that passes over the NJTransit rail line and is part of the Farnsworth Avenue roadway in Bordentown City. Farnsworth Avenue is the main thoroughfare of Bordentown City and the primary artery of its business district. Closure of this section of Farnsworth Avenue would have an immediate and catastrophic impact on the business district and hence the economy of the City.</p> <p>To exacerbate the potential problem, with our business district still struggling to recover economically from the pandemic, our local</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
--	--	--------------	---	---

			<p>business district simply cannot suffer the closure—for any length of time—of this main business artery. Undoubtedly a number of our businesses would not survive such a closure and the economic impact for our city would be dire.</p> <p>While the impact on the City’s economy would be disastrous enough, we also note certain other serious issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The forced re-routing of county bus lines and large-truck traffic onto small residential streets that cannot support such traffic b) The isolation of residents to the north of the railroad bridge who, in order to walk or drive into the main business district, would have to detour several blocks. Of particular concern is the impact on those residents who have physical handicaps. Furthermore, the isolation of that sector of that sector would exacerbate Bordentown’s already critical problem of insufficient parking for visitors and tourists, whose custom is vital to our local businesses. c) There is considerable concern over the impact on navigation and speed of response for police, fire, and other emergency vehicles on route to the northern sector of the City d) The historic aspect of our city, particularly the Veteran’s Memorial on the corner of Farnsworth and Railroad Avenues, would be irreparably harmed. <p>If businesses on Farnsworth Avenue are forced to close, it would create a downward spiral of decreasing tax revenues and real estate valuations.</p> <p>It is, therefore, absolutely imperative that the NJDOT propose a more suitable and comprehensive solution to the repair or</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				replacement of the structure. Respectfully, Board of Directors Downtown Bordentown Association	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<p>Downtown Bordentown Association</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue), Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>DOWNTOWN BORDENTOWN ASSOCIATION P.O. BOX 686, BORDENTOWN, NJ 08505 www.downtownbordentown.com</p> <p>Vincent Schino, Jr., President Zack Melker Director C.J. Mugavero Vice President Paul Sabol Director Rebecca Moslowski Treasurer George Xuereb Director Doug Palmieri Secretary</p> <p>August 10, 2023</p> <p>Re: Project 17411 CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue), Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail) (Bordentown Twp, Burlington County)</p> <p>We write to you today regarding the replacement/repair of the bridge and roadway that passes over the NJTransit rail line and is part of the Farnsworth Avenue roadway in Bordentown City. Farnsworth Avenue is the main thoroughfare of Bordentown City and the primary artery of its business district. Closure of this section of Farnsworth Avenue would have an immediate and catastrophic impact on the business district and hence the economy of the City.</p> <p>To exacerbate the potential problem, with our business district still struggling to recover economically from the pandemic, our local</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
--	--	--------------	---	---

			<p>business district simply cannot suffer the closure—for any length of time—of this main business artery. Undoubtedly a number of our businesses would not survive such a closure and the economic impact for our city would be dire.</p> <p>While the impact on the City’s economy would be disastrous enough, we also note certain other serious issues:</p> <p>a) The forced re-routing of county bus lines and large-truck traffic onto small residential streets that cannot support such traffic</p> <p>b) The isolation of residents to the north of the railroad bridge who, in order to walk or drive into the main business district, would have to detour several blocks. Of particular concern is the impact on those residents who have physical handicaps. Furthermore, the isolation of that sector of that sector would exacerbate Bordentown’s already critical problem of insufficient parking for visitors and tourists, whose custom is vital to our local businesses.</p> <p>c) There is considerable concern over the impact on navigation and speed of response for police, fire, and other emergency vehicles on route to the northern sector of the City</p> <p>d) The historic aspect of our city, particularly the Veteran’s Memorial on the corner of Farnsworth and Railroad Avenues, would be irreparably harmed.</p> <p>If businesses on Farnsworth Avenue are forced to close, it would create a downward spiral of decreasing tax revenues and real estate valuations.</p> <p>It is, therefore, absolutely imperative that the NJDOT propose a more suitable and comprehensive solution to the repair or</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				replacement of the structure. Respectfully, Board of Directors Downtown Bordentown Association	
--	--	--	--	---	--

William Brown	CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)	17411		<p>I'm a resident living in Bordentown City, just blocks from the bridge. I worry that the historical nature of the bridge has not been taken into account with the proposed replacement of the bridge. The bridge is the biggest remaining structure of the Camden and Amboy railroad, one of the first steam railroads in the country, which hosted the John Bull steam locomotive that is currently preserved in the Smithsonian in Washington DC. It is also, to my knowledge, the oldest railroad overpass in the country. I understand that engineers from Bordentown also surveyed the bridge and deemed it to be structurally sufficient with rehabilitation to be the better option. Please consider the historical importance of the bridge before deciding to replace it.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
---------------	--	-------	--	---	---

<p>Susan Magee Carr</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern: The Railroad Bridge under Farnsworth Ave in this project is of vital historic value to Bordentown, as well as New Jersey as a whole. It was built in 1831 by the Camden and Amboy RR as part of the FIRST RR in NJ. The RR chose to start construction in Bordentown, because of its strategic position between New York and Philadelphia. It was vital in bringing people, industry and prosperity to town and state. We as a nation are too quick to destroy our history for the sake of "progress". Bordentown was the home of many early public figures such as John and Francis Hopkinson, Thomas Paine and Joseph Bonaparte to name just a few. As a matter of fact, this bridge was built in this location, because Joseph Bonaparte sued to not have the RR run along his property. This bridge is within the recognized Historical district of the city. Replacing this bridge with a pre-fab bridge would not only destroy a part of our history, it would ruin the integrity of the historic district. Replacing this bridge would also compromise the stability of surrounding roads and historic buildings.</p> <p>Also, there is a beautiful granite Veterans Memorial above the bridge that would need to be dismantled, should the bridge be replaced. This memorial recognizes the sacrifice of over 1800 Bordentown citizens who fought in all American wars, some of who died in service. Noone will guarantee that the memorial will be preserved and restored to its current splendor.</p> <p>Another thing to consider, is that this bridge is located in the heart of the Bordentown</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
-------------------------	---	--------------	--	---

			<p>Business District. It is imperative that there be as little disruption to local merchants as possible. Small businesses on a whole struggle as it is. Many have not fully recovered from being shut down during the COVID crisis. Long construction delays and closures could mean the difference between staying open and closing to many.</p> <p>It would be a travesty for this history to be destroyed. My G-G-Grandfather came to Bordentown from Ireland in 1830 and worked for the C&A Railroad. PLEASE RECONSIDER AND REPAIR THIS BRIDGE, RATHER THAN REPLACE IT.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Joan James	CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)	17411		Rehabilitate not replace !!!	Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.
John Boyle on behalf of the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Route 1, Alexander Road to Mapleton Road	17419		The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia opposes road widening projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues. Route 1 is a barrier for safe non-motorized access between Downtown Princeton and the Princeton Junction Station and the surrounding employment center.	Thank you for your comment. The current plan provides for a bicycle and pedestrian path offset from Route 1 NB starting at Fisher Place (West Windsor) and extending north over the Millstone River Bridge and connecting to an existing bike path on the other side (Plainsboro). The current plan was based on coordination with Princeton University and information provided by West Windsor Township in 2020. The NJDOT team in 2020 also met with a bicycle and pedestrian group to

					discuss proposed improvements. The bicycle and pedestrian elements will be revisited in the Final Design Phase.
Lori Howard	Route 38, South Church Street (CR 607) to Fellowship Road (CR 673), Operational and Safety Improvements	12307		The traffic during rush hour is awful. I am in support of this project to improve congestion on Route 38.	Thank you for your comment.
Lori Howard	Route 295 and Route 38 Interchange Operational Improvements	21311		It is very congested in this area. Would also like to indicate that there are issues on Marter Avenue as well. People cross over 38, going towards 295 and instead of making a right, in the right-hand turning lane, they go straight. Not sure if both lanes need to go straight.	Thank you for your comment. The project area for this project is not limited to the interchange of I-295 and Route 38. The project area includes Midlantic Drive, Marter Avenue, the interchange and east towards Briggs Road. NJDOT is aware of the use of Marter Avenue to accomplish the missing moves at the interchange and is investigating options that will improve safety at this intersection and address the congestion.
Lori Howard	Route 38 and Lenola Road (CR 608)	15353		Route 38 & Lenola Road Project (DB# 15353) - This is something that is needed in the area. There will be an increase of traffic with the Cooper facility and new apartments. Please ensure that the project addresses future	Thank you for your comment. This project has been removed from the FY2024-2033 STIP. Removal was approved by the NJDOT Capital Program Committee on July 26,2023. Operational deficiencies and overall safety improvements will be addressed through the Adaptive Traffic Signal System

				growth in the area, not a project based on current traffic.	(ATS) project; Route 38, Route 73 to Union Mill Road (ATS C#2, UPC 216040).
Katherine J. Carr	CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)	17411		I am registering my objection to a complete overhaul of the Farnsworth Avenue bridge over the railroad tracks, at the site of the Veteran’s Memorial. It appears that engineers have determined the bridge to be safe, or that modest updates could be made to improve the structure. Changing the historic nature of that site, and affecting the entire nature of the Main Street in my charming city, is not warranted. Do not find ways to change things that don’t need changing. It’s wasteful and destructive.	Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.
Donna Thwaites	Route 42 SB, Leaf Avenue Extension to Creek Road (CR 753)	18313		Good Afternoon, Please see the attached. Thank you. Stay Safe and Healthy! Donna Donna Thwaites, Office Manager McKenna Law, P.C. 648 Longwood Avenue Cherry Hill, NJ 08002 T856-665-7771 F856-665-7766 donna@mckennalawoffices.com www.mckennainjurylaw.com August 18, 2023 VIA: EMAIL tip@dvrpc.org The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission Re: Public Comment - Route 42 Southbound, Leaf Avenue Extension to Creek Road (CR 753)	Planned funding for a project is based on the current project delivery schedule, budget estimate, and available funding. A project schedule can differ from the STIP. Since the STIP is updated every two years, there is a possibility for phase(s) to be advanced.

			<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>I represent the Bellmawr Redevelopment Agency, an agency that, with other public and private stakeholders has put in enormous time in an important redevelopment plan for a 126 acre tract adjacent to the Connector Road in question. We were all significantly disappointed to hear that the 2024 draft STIP is now listed as being completed in 2030, wherein the prior 2022 STIP document approved by the DVRPC, the completion date was 2027.</p> <p>The public benefits of the redevelopment project in question are many and substantial. Initially, it should be noted that the NJ DOT first proposed the connector road as a traffic mitigation project with promises to be completed by 2021. The need for this mitigation is well chronicled over many years and has been repeatedly revisited at state, regional, county and local levels. The urgency of the traffic issues sought to be minimized are uniquely impactful of the Borough of Bellmawr and exacerbated by the significant state highway projects traversing the Borough of Bellmawr with little benefit to the Borough itself due to the lack of local access ramps. The potential economic benefits of this highway project were a catalyst for a brownfields redevelopment project, and after completion of environmental remediation at three landfills along Creek Road and the Big Timber Creek, a new 38-acre waterfront project will, with the advance of the connector road, be erected along the Big Timber Creek as part of the redevelopment. Moreover, Bellmawr's redeveloper presently has plans pending before various approving authorities for very</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>significant commercial development with the anticipated economic benefits in the form of jobs and tax revenues for both Bellmawr and Deptford.</p> <p>The access to this new waterfront park as well as the redevelopment that is an engine for local economies is impossible without the Creek Road connector.</p> <p>To demonstrate the importance of this project to local interests, and to mitigate the delays that DOT alerted Bellmawr to in 2022, Bellmawr and its redeveloper have secured voluntary acquisitions of all the required right of way without the need to resort to condemnation. Camden County has put its shoulder to the wheel, as has the Bellmawr Redevelopment Agency, which I represent.</p> <p>In short, there are substantial traffic safety and economic issues that are implicated here, and any delay beyond 2027 will deleteriously affect the potential for these benefits to bear fruit.</p> <p>Anything that the DVRC can do to advance the restoration of the 2027 project completion date would be a significant public benefit and deeply appreciated by all.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, /s/ Michael J. McKenna Michael J. McKenna</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Howard Long	Route 42 SB, Leaf Avenue Extension to Creek Road (CR 753)	18313	<p>Please accept these comments on behalf of Charles J. Sauter, III, Mayor Borough of Bellmawr, 21 East Browning Road, Bellmawr, NJ 08031 and Borough Council (Transmitted with permission by: Howard C. Long, Jr., Municipal Solicitor)</p> <p>Friday, August 18, 2023 See Attached. Dear Sir/Madam:</p> <p>The Route 42 SB, Leaf Avenue extension to Creek Road, more commonly known in Bellmawr Borough as the "Creek Road Connector", is a project that is essential to the public health, safety and welfare of the residents of Bellmawr. Presently, large volumes of interstate traffic from the New Jersey Turnpike, bound for Philadelphia or Atlantic City, are forced onto local residential streets in Bellmawr. This is particularly true of Creek Road (CR 753), a residential street. The problems caused are too exhaustive to list here but include: constant and daily traffic delays, unsafe driving conditions and intolerable air pollution caused by hundreds of idling vehicles.</p> <p>When first proposed by the NJDOT in 2017, our residents received a promise that the building of the Creek Road Connector, as a traffic mitigation project, would be completed no later than 2021. The Creek Road Connector was designed to improve safety and traffic flow to and from Route 42, reduce idling and queuing along Creek Road, and improve travel times from the Turnpike to Philadelphia and Atlantic</p>	<p>Planned funding for a project is based on the current project delivery schedule, budget estimate, and available funding. A project schedule can differ from the STIP. Since the STIP is updated every two years, there is a possibility for phase(s) to be advanced.</p>
-------------	---	-------	---	---

			<p>City.</p> <p>The Connector Road relocates the Creek Road intersection over 1,000 feet further west on Creek Road from its current location at Harding Avenue and provides signalized and dedicated turn lanes. These improvements will ultimately serve Bellmawr Borough well, dramatically improving current backup onto the Creek Road Bridge over Route 42. Moreover, the Connector Road will ease traffic delays and improve safety by providing two lanes in each direction to and from Route 42, while relieving the narrow local Bellmawr Streets (Harding, Coolidge and Stanley Avenues) of this traffic. The current situation is a living nightmare from which our residents suffer daily. .</p> <p>The NJDOT has spent billions of federal and state dollars building (and rebuilding) highways through Bellmawr over the past few years including both the Direct Connect and Missing Moves Projects. Bellmawr has been forced to endure the secret overnight demolition of historic buildings, road collapses and worse. The other prior completed project serve no particular use to Bellmawr or its residents as a result of the lack of local access ramps. The NJDOT has requested and received millions of dollars in benefits from Bellmawr in support of these other NJDOT projects, including the land needed for these projects, as well as a multi-million-dollar drainage culvert along Route 42. We have been a cooperative collaborator in these projects but our voiced concerns are frequently ignored.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Despite the significant burden imposed upon Bellmawr citizens by these various NJDOT projects, and Bellmawr's own investment in infrastructure needed by NJDOT, the NJDOT has inexplicably determined to delay constructing the one simple, relatively inexpensive project planned in this area that would greatly benefit the citizens of Bellmawr - the Creek Road Connector. The proposed extension is simply not acceptable to the residents of Bellmawr.</p> <p>Bellmawr fully expected, when advised that the project would be completed by 2021, the project would receive the necessary priority and resources to meet that deadline. Furthermore, in the 2020 DVRPC TIP, the Creek Road Connector's projected completion date was pushed back to 2024. In the 2022 TIP, the completion date was pushed back to 2027; in the current draft 2024 TIP, the completion date was pushed back to 2030. We have had enough delays. Why should Bellmawr continue to suffer the burdens of this project year and year after year? Both residents and businesses have endured enough and our quality of life has been significantly diminished.</p> <p>Based upon NJDOT's representations regarding the C</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Neil Sander	CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)	17411	<p>Dear DVRPC,</p> <p>As a City resident, City business owner, and professional civil engineer, I am concerned that NJDOT has been taking a cavalier approach to repairs to the Farnsworth Avenue Bridge. While assessed as "structurally deficient," the bridge is not an imminent danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the public. Simultaneously, insufficient analysis of the socioeconomic impact of replacing the bridge has been done, with NJDOT's assessment document characterizing it as "minimal." This is false.</p> <p>I commissioned a third-party structural engineer to inspect and evaluate the existing structure. Not only did he concur that there was no short-term danger, but that removing and replacing the bridge could have the unintended consequence of undermining adjacent properties. Rehabilitation of the existing structure would be the preferred solution. Please find this report attached.</p> <p>[cid:image001.jpg@01D9D157.1535AF20] Neil E. Sander, PE, President 123 Farnsworth Avenue Bordentown, NJ 08505 (609) 496-9369 (O) (609) 947-9787 (M) See Attached.</p> <p>Brian E. Nannis, PE Farnsworth Avenue Stone Arch Bridge Consulting Structural Engineer Bordentown, NJ 3683 Morning Meadow LN •</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
-------------	--	-------	--	---

			<p>Buford, GA 30519 t: 678.735.0944 e: brian@nannis.us January 15, 2023</p> <p>Mr. Neil Sander, PE Independence Engineering, LLC 102 Farnsworth Ave Bordentown, NJ 08505</p> <p>Dear Neil, On Wednesday, November 2, 2022, general observations were made of the existing Farnsworth Avenue stone arch bridge. The keystone indicates the bridge was constructed circa 1831.</p> <p>SCOPE This report is based on observations made of the bridge strictly from a structural viewpoint. Findings and recommendations are to offer insight when determining replacement versus rehabilitation of the bridge. Neither destructive nor non destructive testing was performed at the time of the visit.</p> <p>BACKGROUND Stone arch construction dates to first century Roman empire. Examples of this efficient method of load distribution are found throughout the world. Bordentown's stone arch bridge was constructed using dry-laid stone (rubble) as opposed to mortared masonry. Dry-laid stone is conveniently self draining. Storm water passes through the voids between stone, rather than loading the structure. The early days of the bridge supported pedestrians and horse-drawn carriage traffic. Stormwater would pass through and around the stone.</p> <p>Bordentown Stone Arch Bridge (11/2022)</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Roman Stone Arch in Caesarea Israel (Constructed circa 1st century)</p> <p>Over time, however, stones below were replaced with mortared masonry, skim coated surfaces and pointed/ filled voids. This prevented stormwater from freely passing through. The additional load was directed around the arch through an efficient drainable fill and/or by the load transferring strength of the structure.</p> <p>Page 1 of 6 ,</p> <p>January 15, 2023</p> <p>Aside from the enormous historical implications and any bias toward the preservation of early Americana, serious consideration should be taken regarding rehabilitation vs. replacement of the bridge.</p> <p>REPAIR OVER REPLACE</p> <p>The proximity of the adjacent existing three-story building (130 Farnsworth Ave.,) to the bottom of the “trench” clarifies the rehabilitation option as the prudent option over replacement of the bridge. Both gravity and transient lateral loads from the adjacent structure are relieved through their foundations, finding equilibrium in the stable undisturbed soil below. The loads delivered are resisted by the soil in a “bulb” pressure distribution. The pressure is felt a horizontal distance from the initial foundation to soil interaction. The undisturbed stone arch bridge is acting as a horizontal support or pass through for these pressures. The horizontal relationship of the building to the base of the arch is so that the demolition of the existing</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>bridge would disrupt the existing building's load path. Demolition of the bridge</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<p>Jennifer Sciortino</p>	<p>CR 545 (Farnsworth Avenue) , Bridge over Robbinsville Secondary Branch (Conrail)</p>	<p>17411</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern -</p> <p>Attached is a formal resolution that was unanimously approved by the Bordentown City Board of Commissioners on Monday, August 14, 2023, which we would like to submit as official public comment, along with the information contained herein, regarding DB# 17411 in the DVRPC's FY 2024 TIP for New Jersey.</p> <p>The resolution was promulgated and approved based on the thorough professional analysis conducted by several independent Bordentown City-based engineers who concluded that the historic Farnsworth Avenue Stone Arch Bridge poses "no imminent or short-term danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the community exists."</p> <p>In fact, the bridge holds significant historical value at both the state and national level. In a densely populated, one-square-mile city, any substantial alterations to this bridge will almost certainly have a profound impact on nearly every resident and visitor of Bordentown City.</p> <p>As such, we urge all parties involved to exercise extreme due diligence before reaching any decision that would require long-term closure of Farnsworth Avenue when no imminent or short-term danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the community exists.</p> <p>The city, our business community, numerous stakeholders, and volunteer organizations have all expressed critical concerns when it comes to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The project is still in the Concept Development phase. It has yet to be determined if the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. When the project enters Preliminary Engineering, public outreach will begin.</p>
---------------------------	---	--------------	--	---

			<p>the future direction of this project and its impact on the vitality of our business district, the fate of prominent landmarks, including the Bordentown Veterans Memorial which sits atop the bridge, and the overall quality of life in our city.</p> <p>Built in 1831, the bridge is not only recognized as the oldest masonry arch bridge in the U.S. that spans an iron railway, it also bore witness to the first steam-powered locomotive, which traversed that railway – the John Bull, now in the Smithsonian.</p> <p>However, the bridge’s significant historical qualifications are barely mentioned in the NJDOT’s Concept Development Report prepared by the engineering firm WSP in 2019. The most troubling – and unfounded – statement is the final report’s conclusion (Section V.C, page 16) that “Due to the location of the bridge in the downtown Bordentown city area, minimal socioeconomic impacts are expected.”</p> <p>This statement is wholly unsupported, suggesting a lack of due diligence on the part of WSP.</p> <p>While Conrail, which operates the nearly defunct rail line that passes under the bridge, was consulted early in the process, their blanket assertion on the financial impact of the rail line’s closure was reported without question or analysis.</p> <p>However, the true socioeconomic impact can only be determined by engaging the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>stakeholders that will be impacted by the bridge's replacement: Bordentown's business community, which is comprised of a thriving network of small businesses primarily located along Farnsworth Avenue; the Bordentown Historical Society, which is presently arguing for inclusion of the bridge on the State and National Register of Historic Places; and the Bordentown Veterans Memorial Committee, which has spent countless hours securing donations to construct a fitting tribute to every veteran who has called Bordentown home, a memorial which presently sits atop the bridge slated for replacement.</p> <p>These businesses and stakeholders are the lifeblood of the city and overwhelmingly and understandably opposed to any rehabilitation of the bridge that would require extended closure of the City's main artery, which would effectively cut off access for deliveries, street and foot traffic, public transportation, and the two public parking lots that service visitors.</p> <p>Two local residents and professionals in this field, Pierre Lacombe and Matt Pey, each sent the NJ Department of Transportation (NJDOT) thorough point-by-point critiques of both the WSP document and previous NJDOT biannual inspections, addressing the historical and technical aspects of the bridge and questioning the need for its replacement. They were submitted to the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Route 47, Grove St. to Route 130, Pavement	12305	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	Thank you for your comment. All NJDOT projects must comply with the New Jersey Complete Streets policy, where applicable.
------------	--	-------	--	---

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Route 73, Dutch Road to Rt 70	13319	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The initial problem statement was to address operational, safety, capacity and delay problems with the intersection of Route 73 and Evesham Road (CR544). Upon investigation of this intersection, it was determined that congestion within the corridor was not strictly limited to the CR 544 intersection, but also the Brick Road intersection. Any concepts to address congestion only at CR544 would have limited effect due to operational issues at Brick Road. During the alternatives analysis NJDOT investigated no build, upgrading Brick Road and CR544 intersection approaches, widening Route 73 and a corridor widening approach. Initial evaluation of concepts determined that improvements at only the intersections of CR 544 (Evesham Road) and Brick Road, while addressing the needs, would result in congestion and possible safety issues at other locations. The result was a focus on system wide improvements based on traffic analysis results indicating that non system-wide solutions would simply shift the problem to other intersections. The proposed improvements include enhancements to the existing pedestrian amenities by adding sidewalks to complete gaps in the existing network and providing ADA compliant ramps and push buttons. Consideration for the length of crossing will be considered as the design is developed. Multiple local officials meetings were held with representatives of Evesham Township, Burlington County and DVRPC during concept development and will continue as the project proceeds through design to construction.</p>
------------	-------------------------------	-------	---	--

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Route 130, Union Landing Road to Wharf Street	22336	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This project is in the Study and Development Program. All NJDOT projects are reviewed for compliance with the NJ Complete Streets Policy.</p>
------------	---	-------	--	--

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Route 130, CR 543 (Beverly Road) to Lagorce Blvd	20337	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This project is in the Study and Development Program. All NJDOT projects are reviewed for compliance with the NJ Complete Streets Policy.</p>
------------	--	-------	--	--

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle		99632	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	<p>This program is administered by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Green Acres program. This office can provide further information.</p>
------------	--	-------	---	---

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Trenton Amtrak Bridges	99362	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The correct project description for DB 99362 is:</p> <p>The three Orphan Bridges carrying Chestnut Avenue, East State and Monmouth Streets over Amtrak are in poor condition. All of the bridges are structurally deficient and functionally obsolete. The bridges and approach roadways include a variety of substandard design elements, including substandard vertical and horizontal clearances, intersection sight distances and unprotected bridge girders. The City of Trenton supports the current two bridge option, which replaces East State Street and Monmouth Street Bridges. Chestnut Avenue Bridge will be removed/demolished. The two bridges will be replaced with single-span, ABC (Accelerated Bridge Construction) systems. Retaining walls are included in the project to minimize impacts to properties. Catenaries will be removed from the existing bridges and up to six new catenary structures will be constructed to re-profile the electric traction facilities.</p>
------------	------------------------	-------	--	---

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

John Boyle	Route 73, Church Road (CR 616) and Fellows hip Road (CR 673) Intersections	12380	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our comments on the Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey are attached</p> <p>Best Regards</p> <p>John Boyle Research Director The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1500 Walnut St, Ste 1107 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215.BICYCLE (242-9253) X302 Cell/Text 609.234.6596 http://www.bicyclecoalition.org Facebook <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/facebook-com-bicycle-coalition> Twitter <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/twitter-com-bcgp> Instagram <https://tracking.cirrusinsight.com/a20df494-058d-4bad-b7ba-274d91bf5380/instagram-com-bicyclecoalition> August 17, 2023 Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission 190 North Independence Mall West, 8th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520</p> <p>RE: Draft FY2024 TIP for New Jersey (FY24-27) Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia respectfully submits its comments on the Draft</p>	Thank you for your comment. Sidewalk will be added on Route 73 within the project limits. The project will be designed in compliance with the NJDOT Complete Streets policy.
------------	--	-------	--	--

			<p>2024 Transportation Improvement Program for New Jersey (FY24-27). In addition to this letter we have also attached a spreadsheet providing a more detailed description of comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Bicycle Coalition opposes “New Roadway Capacity” projects that do not address major bicycle and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>The Glassboro-Elk Trail is a Circuit Trail that has been removed from the Draft TIP. This project has been on various TIPs since 2016 and should advance in terms of project development. We request more clarity from County regarding its current status and the expected timeline of the project.</p> <p>Program Circuit Trails Project onto the TIP with federal funds. We ask the Board to program the following 4 Circuit Trails projects into the TIP to ensure they receive the necessary funding to accelerate their development. These projects can be funded with the Carbon Reduction Program and other flexible highway fund programs, such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -The Camden County LINK Trail 2 - The Johnson Trolley Line Trail from Trenton to Ewing and Lawrence, including the trail bridge over I-295 3 - The Burlington-Camden Trail (currently known as the Merchantville Trail) from Camden to Maple Shade. 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>4 - Rancocas Creek Greenway Trail Bridge over Route 130 in Delanco and Willingboro</p> <p>We request that NJDOT and County Project managers retire the term “Bicycle Compatible Shoulders” in project descriptions. This term was created in the 1997 NJ Bicycle Plan. There is a general consensus that roads with a speed limit that is greater than 39 miles per hour are classified as having a high level of traffic stress (LTS4) regardless of the presence of striped road shoulders. We recommend that project managers select bicycle facilities that are recommended in the NJDOT Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p>Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding Levels. The Connections 2050 Long Range Plan committed to allocating 5% of highway funds for bicycle-pedestrian projects. Based on that Long Range Plan commitment, the Final NJ TIP should reflect spending roughly at a level of \$131 Million over 4 years, which is 5% of what the Draft TIP states it will be spending on highway projects (Statewide Highway for DVRPC plus DVRPC Region Highway, \$2.636 billion over 4 years). However, the Draft NJTIP commits only \$62.1 million over 4 years for 7 bicycle/pedestrian projects and 4 grant programs, which is 2.36% of the total budget. We ask the Board to commit an additional \$69 million to match the 2050 Connections Long Range Plan allocation for Circuit Trails projects and other bicycle/pedestrian projects in the TIP so that more Circuit Trails projects can be programmed, helping to reach the goal of completing 500 miles of trails by 2025.</p> <p>Finally we oppose the widening of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Atlantic City</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				Expressway. While we fully understand that these expressways are toll supported and not subjected to the constraints of the TIP, the \$	
--	--	--	--	---	--

FHWA	All			AQ Codes are not listed for projects or programs throughout the draft	AQ codes will be included for the final STIP. The Draft STIP will be updated on the web and codes will be included in the final document.
FHWA	Table Section		13	Provide a space between "Subtotal" and % sign as well as for "Total"	This change would require recoding of the project reports. NJDOT will consider making this change for the FY2026 STIP.
FHWA	Table of Contents		2	Table is not linked to sections and no page numbers are provided, making it very difficult to navigate especially for the public. Please link	When viewed from the NJDOT website, the TOC is linked to each section.

				the sections to the table of contents and add page ranges in the table of contents.	
FHWA	Section V			There are no page numbers for this section.	Reformatting the sections of the STIP would require extensive recoding of project reports. NJDOT will consider make change for the FY2026 STIP.
FHWA	General Comment			There are a large number of MPO projects in this section. This includes DBNUMs N2308, D2018, D1510, S1403, D0302, S2102, D0601, D0410, N1805, D2023, N1402, S2111, N1803, N1604, and many others.	MPO projects have always been included in this section, and in other NJDOT sections. MPO Funding is included in NJDOT overall program totals.
FHWA	General Comment			There are a number of projects that have virtually no project description such as DBNUM S2305, 22319, 18353, and 17504 while others such as 11307 and 11326C have very good detail. Please review all project descriptions and ensure there is a clear scope of work outlined. Other examples are called out in the comments below.	Project descriptions for NJDOT projects have been updated and we are working with MPOs to update descriptions for local projects for the Final STIP.
FHWA			12	Consider using bullet points to list the allocated funds for specific geographic areas. It is difficult to read	Suballocated funds are now listed in bullet format.
FHWA	Various links			Formating of the PDF does not allow for the selection of text or access to any of the hyperlinks provided throughout the introduction	NJDOT will investigate and correct on pdf. The document that is availalbe on the Dept webiste for public view does have working links.
FHWA	General Comment			The document is very difficult for the public and stakeholders to review. Consider grouping programs and projects within their own sections and provide an overview of what a program is vs a project. Another way to better organize the document would be by type of work. For example bridge projects, programs, safety, congestion, etc.. This would enhance the over all document	Reformatting the sections of the STIP would require extensive recoding of project reports. NJDOT will consider making this change for the FY2026 STIP.

FHWA	Boylan Terrace Neighborhood Pedestrian Connection	N2308	41	No assest management category selected	The Asset management category has been updated.
FHWA	California Avenue (CR 663)	S2102	57	Pavement is misspelled in project description.	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Carteret Ferry Service Terminal	06316	62	This appears to be an Earmark, should it be in section IX?	This project is not included in the earmark section of the STIP because it is funded in the STIP during specific fiscal years. Projects listed in the Earmark section are not yet programmed for specific fiscal years in the STIP.
FHWA	CR 508 (Central Avenue) , Bridge over City Subway	N1605		Cantilever, Abutment, and Trusses misspelled in description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Circulation Improvements Around Trenton Transit Center	D2023	64	No sponsor is listed. Description says closure of bridge, but no structure number is indicated. Also, there are no mileposts listed.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to include an updated description and sponsor for the Final STIP.
FHWA	CR 544 (Evesham Rd), NJ 41 to	D2208	78	CRRSAA-PHILA funds have been removed from this project	DVRPC intends to remove the CRRSAA-PHILA funds for the final STIP.

	Schubert Ave				
FHWA	CR 616 (Mill Street) Bridge over South Branch Rancocas Creek Rehabilitation/Replacement	D2202	81	No Structure Number is provided for the bridge or MP. Project description states this is a Study, but is programmed for engineering and construction.	MP, Structure number and project description will be updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	CR 622 (North Olden Ave), NJ 31 (Pennington Rd) to New York Ave	D2014	82	No sponsor is listed. Visibility is misspelled.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to include an updated description and sponsor for the Final STIP.
FHWA	CR 706 (Cooper Street) Bridge over Almone sson Creek (Bridge 3-K-3)	D2017	83	Sponsor is DVRPC which appears to be incorrect. No structure number is provided. This also appears to be in the wrong section of the document.	MPO projects have always been included in this section, and in other NJDOT sections. MPO Funding is included in NJDOT overall program totals. NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the sponsor, structure number and project description.

FHWA	Garden State Parkway Interchange 83 Improvements	N1405	110	intersection misspelled in project description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Kings Highway (CR 608) Route 83 to CR 628	S2310	128	Connection and existing is misspelled in project description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Kingsland Avenue, Bridge over Passaic River	N1601	130	reconstructed misspelled in project description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Ohio Avenue, Bacharach Boulevard to Atlantic Avenue	S2113	181	Project Title seems to have an error. Ohio is listed twice	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Welchville Road (CR 540)	S9912	271	Signage and deteriorated misspelled in description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Route 9, Chapman Blvd	19369	287	"fr" in project description appears to be a typo	The typo has been corrected.

	to Route 30 (Whitehorse Pike)				
FHWA	Route 35, Osborne Avenue to Manasquan River & Old Bridge Road to Route 34 & Route 70	15389	328	Reconstruct is misspelled in project description	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Route 38 and Lenola Road (CR 608)	15353	334	Including misspelled in project description	This project is removed from the STIP, as per CPC action on 7/26/2023.
FHWA	Route 46, Pequannock Street to CR 513 (West Main Street)	16318	346	"This" is misspelled in project description	The typo has been corrected.

FHWA	Route 47, Henders on Avenue to High Street	15340	351	Sponsor is listed as City of Millville (which is misspelled). Funding is NHPP on a state highway. Is this a City project or a NJDOT project?	Sponsor changed to NJDOT.
FHWA	Route 79, Route 9 to Route 34 (Middle sex Street)	15380	375	in the list of municipalities, Matawan appears to be misspelled	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Route 88, Bridge over Beaver Dam Creek	09322	381	Functionally is misspelled	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Ocean Drive (CR 619), 99th Street South to Great Channel Bridge (0500-028)	S2311	478	several typo's. existing, serviceable, reducing, economy. As with many of the MPO/Local projects in section III, they are also listed in section V.	The typo has been corrected.

FHWA	Ohio Avenue (CR 630)	S2105	478	Pavement is misspelled	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Pedestrian Bridge and Tunnel Rehabilitation	D1305	495	coatins? Looks to be coatings misspelled	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Main Avenue Corridor Improvements	N1806	149	Given the PE is scheduled for FY 2024 it is very likely a CD has been completed; Update the description to include the roadway name (CR 601) and include more details for design (Complete Streets) and project limits (Monroe to Gregory)	NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	New or Upgraded Traffic Signal Systems at Intersections, Phase 2	D2021	172	During the 2022-2031 STIP Review, the NJDOT indicated working with DVRPC to eliminate the "Modern Industry Requirements (MUTCD)" reference; however, the statement remains. Consider revising the description either "comply with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices" or "upgrade to modern industry requirements".	NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	New or Upgraded Traffic Signal Systems at Intersections, Phase 3	D2022	173	During the 2022-2031 STIP Review, the NJDOT indicated working with DVRPC to eliminate the "Modern Industry Requirements (MUTCD)" reference; however, the statement remains. Consider revising the description either "comply with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices" or "upgrade to modern industry requirements".	NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.

FHWA	Protect	22353	204	Amend project title to PROTECT (capitalized); it's an acronym for the Program	Project title changed to PROTECT.
FHWA	Regional Action Program	X144	211	Ensure no overlap/duplication of DB# 19332 Vegetation Safety Management Program	This is not a duplicate effort. Program description will be updated to clarify.
FHWA	Staff Augmentation	X10A	243	Ensure no overlap/duplication with 09388 HSIP Planning "staff augmentation"	This is not a duplicate effort. Program description will be updated to clarify.
FHWA	Systemic Backplate Pilot Program Central	22326	247	Amend the description to more clearly identify this is related to traffic signal enhancements; consider also including retroreflective border tape on backplates for additional safety improvement.	This project will be funded under safety programs and will not display individually in the STIP. CPD will work with the Safety group to update the project description.
FHWA	Systemic Backplate Pilot Program South	22320	248	Amend the description to more clearly identify this is related to traffic signal enhancements; consider also including retroreflective border tape on backplates for additional safety improvement.	This project will be funded under safety programs and will not display individually in the STIP. CPD will work with the Safety group to update the project description.
FHWA	Tennessee Avenue, Atlantic Avenue to Pacific Avenue	S2115	250	Amend description "that could result in safety problems."	NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Townbank Road (CR 648), Clubhouse Drive to	S2314	252	Consider amending the description to eliminate the use of "mixed race"; multiethnic, multiracial, multicultural, diverse are just a few adjectives to consider.	NJDOT is working with the MPO to update the project description.

	Bayshore Road (CR 603)				
FHWA	Vegetation Safety Management Program	19332	268	Ensure this is not a duplicative effort of X144 Regional Action Program	This is not a duplicate effort. Program description will be updated to clarify.
FHWA	Route 30, Somerdale Road (CR 678)	17504	317	Provide additional details in the description; i.e., what the safety concerns are and what improvements are proposed (if known).	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 35, CR 18 (Belmar Ave/16th Ave) to Route 71/8th Avenue	17402	326	Provide additional details in the description; i.e., what the safety concerns are and what improvements are proposed (if known).	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 35, Route 66 to White Street/Obre Place	17420	329	Provide additional details in the description; i.e., what the safety concerns are and what improvements are proposed (if known).	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 38, South Church Street	12307	336	Confirm this is not a safety project as opposed to a Mobility/Congestion Relief project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a mobility/congestion relief project.

	(CR 607) to Fellows hip Road (CR 673), Operational and Safety				
FHWA	Route 46, Main Street/ Woodstone Road (CR 644) to Route 80	06366D	345	Appears originated from Bureau of ITS Engineering; verify Mobility/Congestion project as opposed to a breakout Safety project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a mobility/congestion relief project.
FHWA	Route 47, Henders on Avenue to High Street	15340	351	Provide additional details in the description; i.e., what the safety concerns are and what improvements are proposed (if known).	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 57, CR 519 Intersection Improvement	97062B	359	Confirm this is not a safety project as opposed to a Mobility/Congestion Relief project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a mobility/congestion relief project.
FHWA	Route 66,	14357	362	Project is noted for construction in FY24 for \$32M and does not provide much detail.	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.

	Jumping Brook Road to Bowne Road/Wayside Road			Include additional details in the description; i.e., what the safety concerns are and what improvements are proposed.	
FHWA	Route 73, Granite Avenue to Route 41	18383	369	Provide additional details in the description; i.e., what are the safety concerns and what improvements are proposed (if known).	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 78, Route 22 to Drift Road/Dale Road	18601	374	Description notes "high crash rates"; Confirm this is not a safety project as opposed to a Mobility/Congestion Relief project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a mobility/congestion relief project.
FHWA	Route 80, Riverview Drive (CR 640) to Polify Road (CR 55)	11415	376	The road is Polify Road; not Polify Road. Also, verify the project need/purpose and update the project title/description as needed.	Changed the project name to Polify and updated project description to include the need/purpose of the project.
FHWA	Route 202, Old York Road (CR 637) Intersection	12332	398	Confirm this is not a safety project as opposed to a Mobility/Congestion Relief project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a safety project.

	Improve ments				
FHWA	Route 206, Valley Road to Brown Avenue	780A	404	Confirm this is not a safety project as opposed to a Mobility/Congestion Relief project	NJDOT confirms that this project is properly classified as a safety project.
FHWA	Multiple projects	D2018, D2023, N1602, D2014, D2017, D2204, D1709, D1710, NS9603, D1914, D1910,	51, 64, 72, 82, 108, etc...	There are a lot of projects that appear to be multi year funded projects that are not shown in Table 11. Some are over 100 million while others are very small.	Multi-year funded MPO projects are not shown in the table
FHWA	Table 2 NJDOT Resourc es		7, 17, 20	BFP-OS Bridge Funds will not be distributed in FY2027 and the \$36.9M programmed seems to be a mistake? Additionally the FY27 BFP-OS Bridge resources programmed in tables 8 & 10 should also be revised since FY26 will be the last year BFP-OS Bridge funds are distributed.	BFP-OS funds were provided from the general fund, with specified obligated and expended dates. NJDOT chose to program those funds in accordance with project and program schedules.
FHWA	Table 2 NJDOT Resourc es & DB2235 0		7, 100	The future NEVIFP resources (for FY24, 25, 26) seem to be too low (\$52.2M) - NJ should expect \$104M from BIL (over the 5 years); and \$37.6 has been distributed thusfar. The \$52M programmed seems to be low; NJDOT should expect to receive ~\$22M for each of the next three FY's based on estimates.	Data received by NJDOT indicated \$52.2M. Please provide source for additional funding described.

FHWA	Table 2, NJDOT Resources & DB22353	22353	7, 204	PROTECT program is a new program currently authorized under BIL through FY2026. Should these funds be programmed beyond the expected apportionments through FY33? We do not know if this program will/will not continue in the new authorization after BIL.	NJDOT is hopeful that PROTECT funds will continue after FY2026. If it is determined that PROTECT funds will not continue, funds will be removed from FY2027 through FY2033, either during the FY2026 STIP update or through the STIP modification process.
FHWA	Drainage Rehabilitation & Improvements	X154D	91	same comment as above.	NJDOT is hopeful that PROTECT funds will continue after FY2026. If it is determined that PROTECT funds will not continue, funds will be removed from FY2027 through FY2033, either during the FY2026 STIP update or through the STIP modification process.
FHWA	Easton Avenue (CR 527) Safety Improvements	N2306	3	The description clearly identifies this project as a safety project; however, the Asset Management Category is Infrastructure Preservation; Consider amending this to Safety	The asset management category has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route130, CR 543 (Beverly Road) to Lagorce Blvd	20337	7	Description: The 1st sentence ending in "and respect the environment [sic] needed at Route 130" doesn't make sense. Consider revising the sentence to more clearly identify the purpose of the project; in addition, environment is misspelled. The last sentence in the description "Safety concerns" may need to be deleted as the phrase/sentence is incomplete.	Project description has been updated. However, projects in Study and Development are still considering options and feasibility.
FHWA	Route 9, CR 528/CR 547 (Central Avenue/Hurley Avenue) to	21345	10	Description: The 1st sentence ending in "and respect the environment" doesn't make sense. Consider revising the sentence to more clearly identify the purpose of the project.	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.

	Estelle Lane				
FHWA	Rt 22, Exxon Access Road to Station Road (CR 679)	19364	11	Description: Consider rewording the purpose to more clearly identify the purpose. "This project will provide for the Safety improvements are needed on Route, Safety concerns" is unclear, awkward and does not clearly identify the purpose.	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 27, Eighth Avenue to Brookhill Avenue	19311	11	Description: Include more information to clearly identify the purpose; the term "safety improvements" is vague.	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 33 and Route 34 Intersection	22363	12	Description: Include more information to clearly identify the purpose; the term "safety improvements" is vague.	Project description has been updated. However, projects in Study and Development are still considering options and feasibility.
FHWA	Route 34, CR 524 (Allaire Road) intersection	20326	12	Description: Include more information clearly identifying the purpose; the term "intersection and safety improvements" is vague.	Project description has been updated. However, projects in Study and Development are still considering options and feasibility.
FHWA	Route 49, Buckshutem Road,	95017	14	Description: Include more information to clearly identify the purpose; the term "safety and operational improvements" is vague.	Project description has been updated. However, projects in Study and Development are still considering options and feasibility.

	Intersec tion Improve ments (CR 670)				
FHWA	Route 130, Union Landing Road to Wharf Street	22336	16	Description: Consider rewording the purpose to more clearly define the project purpose and correct misspellings. "This project will provide for the mprovement [sic] of safety and operate efficiently is needed at Route 130, Union Landing Road to Wharf Street" is unclear, awkward and does not clearly identify the purpose.	Project description has been updated. However, projects in Study and Development are still considering options and feasibility.
FHWA	Route 168, I- 295 Intercha nge Improve ments	X227A2	16	Description: Consider rewording the purpose from "will address alternatives" to " will develop alternatives".	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Financia l Tables		5	Can this section start with a summary table of resources?	Reformatting the sections of the STIP would require extensive recoding of project reports. NJDOT will consider making this change for the FY2026 STIP.
FHWA	ADA Central, Contract 3	15419	28	Why does this Central contract have less funding than the other ADA contracts? The description and number of projects are similar to the others.	The programmed funding for this project reflects the current cost estimates provided by the project manager.
FHWA	ADA South, Contract 1 with ROW	15420A	30	Why does this project name include "ROW"? The description is the same as the other ADA contracts. If this project includes ROW acquisition then consider including it in the description.	Design and ROW for this project are provided by ADA Curb Ramp Impementation (DB 11344). Description will be updated.
FHWA	ADA Curb Ramp	11344	29	Provide the list of locations in the description	Projects that have been identified to receive funding from this program are: ADA North, Contracts 1 through 6; ADA South, Contract 1 w/o ROW, ADA; ADA South, Contract 1 w/ ROW; ADA South Contracts 2-5; and ADA Central, Contracts

	Implementation				1-3. Some of these projects have already advanced to construction or will advance during the FY2024 STIP. Because the locations will change for each fiscal year, NJDOT displays the program in a similar format as the Bridge Deck and Pavement Preservation programs.
FHWA	Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities /Accommodations	X185	39	Does this program fund staff or consultant planning efforts? Previous years show authorization of these funds have not been fully utilized. Is there a list of project locations or "sub" recipients?	The purpose of this program is to ensure the broadest implementation of the NJ Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the NJ Strategic Highway Safety Plan, NJDOT's Complete Streets policy, and FHWA's policies related to bicycle and pedestrian travel. This program funds both in-house and on-call planning consultations. Project locations are statewide, including an update to the NJ Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, development of statewide bicycle and pedestrian safety management system lists, development of a statewide bicycle compatibility map, review of NJDOT capital projects and local project, and planning assistance studies in various municipalities.
FHWA	CMAQ Initiatives, Statewide	22355	66	This appears to be a new program, please provide project locations	This program does not currently have any specific project locations. CMAQ funds from this program are available for potential projects which will be amended in the STIP at a later date.
FHWA	Intelligent Traffic Signal Systems	15343	120	This line item appears to contain more complex work and may need to be broken out into project specific work. The Transportation Mobility Engineering's Arterial Mobility Management program (Arterial Management Center) has been transferred to the CPM (BTE) office to administer/manage. What is the BTE's approach to continuing to fund the staffing costs of the Arterial Mobility Management program?	The program description has been updated for the Final STIP.

FHWA	Pedestrian Bridge over Route 440	17356	414	Project description notes this is Concept Development, but is programmed for PE, FD and CON. if CD has been completed, update project description and indicate environmental document needed to advance the project	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Route 322, Bridge over Great Egg Harbor River	15448	413	In the FY 2022 STIP, this project was programmed for ROW in 2023, now 2025. No Design phase is shown (current STIP or Draft FY 2024 STIP). Please show design phase.	Design phase was programmed with STATE funds in FY2021. STATE funds remain available for project authorization.
FHWA	Route 206, Hilltop Drive	15301	403	Project description notes this is a study that will explore drainage improvements. Can you please clarify what this project is? it is programmed for Design and Con so does not look like a study.	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Bridge Management System	X70	50	How is this project different from the SP&R Bridge Management System project? Please add more clarification in the project description to show that it is a different project than the one in SP&R work program.	This program is funded by both the SPR program (X30, Planning and Research) and with STPBG-FLEX funds which are displayed under X70.
FHWA	Mobility Systems Engineering Program	13306	163	The traffic signal optimization/Arterial Management Center operations activities have been transferred to the CPM (BTE) office to administer/manage. Consider updating/revising the program description.	The program description has been updated for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Carteret Ferry Service Terminal	06316	62	This project has multiple earmarks. Please provide clarification on specifics in the text, including the Demo ID # and as shown in the table for FY2024.	This project is not included in the earmark section of the STIP because it is funded in the STIP during specific fiscal years. Projects listed in the Earmark section are not yet programmed for specific fiscal years in the STIP. DEMO ID numbers have been added to the project description.

FHWA	Cumberland and County Federal Road Program	S1403	85	Please provide additional scope clarification. This appears to be a Local/MPO Project, yet is listed in NJDOT Projects	MPO projects have always been included in this section, and in other NJDOT sections. MPO Funding is included in NJDOT overall program totals. NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the description.
FHWA	Drainage Rehabilitation & Improvements	X154D	91	Please provide additional scope clarification in the text regarding relation to PFP funding.	NJDOT will utilize PFP funding to inspect and repair/replace corrugated metal pipe to improve drainage where needed in vulnerable areas of the state.
FHWA	Guidance Upgrade	X201	116	Why are the funding levels reduced from FY 25 through FY 31 as compared to the previous FY22 - FY31 STIP?	NJDOT made a decision to fund the program at the same amount each year of the STIP, rather than with an increase in later years.
FHWA	CR 551 (Broadway) Elevation, Little Timber Creek to Route 130	D2203	80	Is this a project or just a study? If it is a study then the CON funds should not be there. If it is a study then change the description to reflect that.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	CR 616 (Mill Street) Bridge over South Branch Rancocas Creek Rehabilitation/R	D2202	81	Same as above. Not sure if this is a project or just a study. Please change description accordingly.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP

	eplacement				
FHWA		D2204		Same as above.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	CR 706 (Cooper Street) Bridge over Almone sson Creek (Bridge 3-K-3)	D2017	83	This bridge project is showing that DES and ROW will be completed in the same year which is difficult. Please check with DVRPC that the timeline is a feasible one.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	Electrical Load Center Replacement	04324	102	Typo error in the first line of description section	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Manhattan Avenue Retaining Wall	N1603	150	Municipality: Union City spelling incorrect	The typo has been corrected.
FHWA	Ohio Ohio Avenue, Bacharach Boulevard to	S2113	181	Is the project name correct? Is it Ohio Ohio Avenue or just Ohio Avenue	The typo has been corrected.

	Atlantic Avenue				
FHWA	Quaker Neck Road (CR 657) Phase II	S2112	205	This project has no ROW phase. Is that correct? From the description it seems that some ROW work may be required. Please check.	NJDOT will work with the MPO to update the project description for the Final STIP.
FHWA	PANYNJ Project			There is just one project in here. Is that correct?	At the time of the Draft, there was only one project included in the section. For the Final, there will be two projects listed and the title of the section is renamed to PANYNJ-PATH and Gateway Development Commission
FHWA	North Bergen Tonnelle Avenue Project			Will this project be included via an amendment?	This project is included in Section VII, now titled PANYNJ-PATH and Gateway Development Commission.
FHWA	Rt 22, Exxon Access Road to Station Road (CR 679)		355	The funding does not match with the project's financial plan update#1	This project (DB: 19364) is listed in the Study and Development section of the STIP. A financial plan has not been submitted for the project.
FHWA	Route 24, EB Ramp to CR 510	15433	305	Description states this is a study to examine safety and congestion, but is programmed for engineering and construction. Please update project description	The project description has been updated for the Final STIP.