

MINUTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: ROUTE 18 - Section 2F, 7E, and 11H

City of New Brunswick

Middlesex County, New Jersey

PLACE: Middlesex County Planning Conference Room in the

New Brunswick Elks Building

New Street

New Brunswick, New Jersey

DATE: May 22, 2002

DATE OF REPORT: May 31, 2002

SUBJECT: Boyd Park Enhancements Group - Meeting No. 4

ATTENDEES:

New Brunswick-Parks	732-745-5112
Middlesex County Planning Dept.	732-745-3013
Rutgers University	732-445-2430, X604
NJDEP-Historic Preservation Office	609-984-0141
Newell Avenue Neighborhood	732-828-7458
NJDOT-Landscape & Urban Design	609-530-5672
NJDOT-Landscape & Urban Design	609-530-5676
NJDOT-Environmental Services	609-530-2721
NJDOT-Environmental Services	609-530-2835
Gannett Fleming, Inc.	908-755-0040
Gannett Fleming, Inc.	908-755-0040
Vollmer Associates	212-366-5600
Vollmer Associates	212-366-5600
Schlesinger Associate	609-924-1818
MA Culbertson, LLC	856-795-0524
	Middlesex County Planning Dept. Rutgers University NJDEP-Historic Preservation Office Newell Avenue Neighborhood NJDOT-Landscape & Urban Design NJDOT-Landscape & Urban Design NJDOT-Environmental Services NJDOT-Environmental Services Gannett Fleming, Inc. Gannett Fleming, Inc. Vollmer Associates Vollmer Associates Schlesinger Associate



SUMMARY:

The main objective of this meeting was to prioritize the issues to be addressed by the Group, to review the retaining walls and to discuss the proposed facilities and enhancements in the City Docks area of Boyd Park.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION:

- Paul Nowicki opened the meeting at approximately 10:05 AM by welcoming everyone and having all attendees introduce themselves. He reviewed the meeting objectives and the agenda (attached). Minutes from Boyd Park Meeting No. 3 and the Steering Committee Meeting Report No. 4 were provided to all.
- Mike Morgan led the group in discussing and prioritizing the issues identified as those that should be considered by the Boyd Park Group so that design direction could be provided to the Design Team. The prioritization was determined to be the following:
 - High Priority (design direction required prior to design)
 - Safety and security considerations for the design features
 - Gateway concepts encourage community feeling
 - Lighting & streetscape elements
 - · Access to old Police site for development
 - Boyd Park impacts acceptable w/ enhancements at city docks
 - Richmond St. ped access, city side to Boyd Park & development of park site area
 - Demolish police station site: accelerate right-of-way acquisition process if possible
 - Identify architectural features
 - Noise Barriers, Bridges & Retaining Walls
 - Impact to existing park infrastructure

Medium Priority (design direction can be provided after design is initiated)

- Aesthetic lighting will it require subtle lighting or have more lights at night
- Structures to be as graffiti-proof as possible (flyers/bulletins considered graffiti too)
- Commercial Ave, Neilsen & George intersection improvements: pedestrian safety
- Pedestrian access at bus stops

Low Priority (design direction can be provided later in design)

- Replacement of trees analysis of amount in order to determine impacts
- Signs need to be designed to minimize graffiti and maintenance
- Sidewalks and bikes how close to traffic/aesthetics
- Utilities city water main/sewer pipe system improvements
- Regional switching station for public utilities New St. overpass
- Maintenance issue w/existing landscaping
- City utilities to consider improvement, upgrade water main, need to coordinate
- Enhanced signage on Rt. 18 corridor aesthetics

- Jeff Grob then presented several renderings of cross sections through Boyd Park to show northbound C-D Road wall and landscaped berm options (full height wall, stepped wall, berming and combinations), the relationship of the horizontal park area occupied by fill placed to reduce vertical wall height, and the impact of the fill on the existing park. The following issues were discussed and recommendations were made:
 - 1. Use a combination of walls and sloped landscaped areas as appropriate or as necessary to reduce visible wall height, to address specific needs of discrete park areas and to aid in the park's functionality.
 - 2. The final wall/slope design selection must ensure that the project features do not adversely affect primary park features relevant to its award-winning design.
 - 3. The final wall/slope design selection must balance the use of fill in the floodplain.
 - 4. Jim Campbell stated that the City supports multiple pedestrian access points from the C-D Road sidewalk and the Park, and thus supports use of a landscaped slope as much as possible. However, there should not be unrestricted access along the entire length of the C-D Road sidewalk; multiple entry points at various locations along the parapet wall should be provided.
 - 5. The retaining wall design should be integrated with the Pavillion to eliminate undesirable minimal clearance distance between the two structures. A combination wall and sloped berm design should be investigated to enhance and expand the functionality of the Pavillion area under the project design. Jim Campbell said the City was not opposed to reconfiguring the Pavillion area if necessary.
 - 6. Jim Campbell indicated that the City desires a third vehicular access point into the Park. The use of sloped berm and the descending C-D Road roadway profile makes this access potentially feasible south of New Street, east across the Route 18 alignment at the approximate mid-point of the New Brunswick Apartment complex at the Vollmer rendering location Section D-D. A depressed curb along the northbound C-D Road, a gap in the parapet wall, and a vehicle-accommodating surface (pavers or asphalt) would be needed for authorized vehicles to enter the park.
- The noise study results and noise mitigation wall warrants were then discussed where the northbound C-D Road would descend to run adjacent to the other Route 18 roadways. Jeff Grob passed around a clear noise wall material sample for review, and it was decided that if noise walls were determined to be desired by the City along the northbound C-D Road, they should be clear and designed in conjunction with the parapet wall and fence along the section.
- Paul Nowicki reminded the Group that the specific noise wall recommendations in the Park area had
 to be generated and formalized by the Group at the next meeting; this was identified as a High
 Priority design issue.
- Jeff Grob then reviewed the Boyd Park/City Docks expansion options in the George Street interchange area. He stated that NJDOT-Bureau of Structures Design had been contacted, and their main requirement was that parking would not be permitted under the structure. Given these use constraints, Jeff Grob stated that City Docks area options would involve either full length, full height wall from ground level up to an elevation where individuals could not gain access to the top or the area behind the wall, or a design in which walls would be used to the beginning of a fenced boat launch area with a gated boat launch access road aligned under the overhanging northbound C-D Road above. He presented three options showing City Docks design concepts displaying these issues. The following issues were discussed and recommendations were made:
 - 1. Jim Campbell stated that the City also prefers that there be no proposed park uses under the structure. The City has expressed concern for security in the area, and requested that the City Docks area be designed to avoid security problems such as easily accessible hidden spaces requiring constant physical police patrolling and enforcement.

- 2. It was recognized that potentially useable City Docks park space would have to be utilized as vehicular parking area with the NJDOT requirement to not allow parking under the structure and the City request to not provide open, public, useable recreation space under the structure.
- 3. The Group favored the presented Option 3 concept rendering, which showed a City Docks area design providing for the boat launch access road under the George Street structure. It appeared to maximize the available park/recreation space along the waterfront, provided parking outside of the structure, and supported the boat launch.
- Most Group members prepared to retreat to a boxed lunch/field visit to Boyd Park to review the Park features and existing layout in light of the discussions at this and the previous meetings.
- Prior to the field visit, the following agenda items for the next meeting were established for all to consider prior to the meeting:
 - 1. Refine and develop final direction concepts for the application of walls and landscaped slope areas and determine the affects on Park uses.
 - 2. Develop a final wall/Pavillion area treatment concept.
 - 3. Determine a final noise mitigation barrier recommendation along the Boyd Park limits where warrants indicate a wall is appropriate (an "IMPLEMENT" or "DO NOT IMPLEMENT" decision is needed), and develop final design features as necessary. [Action Item-Vollmer to have elevations for consideration.]
- It was agreed that the next meeting of the Group would be on June 12, with the time and location to be determined based on coordination with the next Corridor Aesthetics meeting.

We believe the foregoing to be an accurate summary of discussions and related decisions. We would appreciate notification of exceptions or corrections to the minutes within three (3) working days of receipt. Without notification, we will consider these minutes to be record of fact.

Michael A. Morgan, P.E., P.P. Project Engineer/Planner

C: Attendees Steering Committee Boyd Park Group Members



BOYD PARK ENHANCEMENTS MEETING NO. 4

AGENDA

May 22, 2002 Middlesex County Planning Conference Room, Elks Bldg., New Brunswick, NJ 10:00 a.m.-Noon

Objective:

To prioritize the issues to be addressed by this Group, to review the retaining walls, and to discuss the proposed facilities and enhancements in the City Docks area of Boyd Park.

- I. Welcome and Introductions
 - · Agenda and Goals
 - · CPT Group Update
- II. Boyd Park Enhancements Discussion
 - Prioritize Group Issues
 - Review Retaining Walls
 - Discuss Proposed Facilities
- III. Summary and Close
 - Action Items / Next Meeting
 - Feedback / Closing Comments

