

COMMUNITY PARTNERING TEAM MEETING NO. 2 REPORT

June 25, 1999

DATE:June 18, 1999TIME:10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.LOCATION:Conference Room, Middlesex County Planning Dept.,
Elks Building, City of New Brunswick, NJ

ATTENDEES:

REPRESENTING:

Members Herb August Robert Grimm Linda Hunter Thomas Loughlin **Glenn Patterson** Robert Spear Mona Terrell George Ververides Frank Wong Alternates John Bogar Helen Erdey Vincent Martinez Jose Sosa Invited Guests Anna Ashkenes James Baisley John Donnelly Mike Heenehan Douglas Joyce Linda LaSut Carl Nittinger

Keep Middlesex Moving, Inc. New Jersey Turnpike Authority University Mews Homeowners Assoc. City of New Brunswick, Administration City of New Brunswick, Planning Rutgers, The State University of NJ NJ TRANSIT Middlesex County Planning Dept. Rutgers, The State Univ. of NJ

City of New Brunswick, Engineering Carpender Road Area Neighborhood Middlesex County Engineering Johnson & Johnson

Middlesex County Cultural & Heritage Com. New Brunswick Development Corporation Piscataway Township NJ DEP, Green Acres Program East Brunswick Township NJTPA NJ DEP, State Historic Preservation Office



Division of Project Management

Steering Committee	
Bill Birch NJDOT, Division of Project Manageme	ent
Elkins Green NJDOT, Division of Project Manageme	ent
Michael Morgan Gannett Fleming	
Paul Nowicki Gannett Fleming	
Martine Culbertson M. A. Culbertson	
Visitors	
Ben Gindville Gannett Fleming	
Mike Sheehan Gannett Fleming	
Glenn Stevens Gannett Fleming	
Al Tavares NJDOT, Bureau of Mobility Strategies	
John Wenerl Carpender Road Area Neighborhood	

1. PURPOSE OF MEETING

To gain a clear understanding of the specific transportation needs in the Route 18 corridor and obtain agreement on the purpose and need. To review alternatives previously studied and to begin to examine the initially preferred alternative. (Agenda attached).

2. MEETING SUMMARY

Martine Culbertson, facilitator for the CPT, opened the meeting, welcomed everyone and reviewed the meeting agenda. The CPT Meeting No. 1 Report was then approved. After reviewing the agenda and meeting goals, Martine discussed the revised materials and press articles to be placed in the CPT handbook. She then asked each member to state a need they believe the project should address. Martine reviewed the list of key CPT issues and turned the meeting over to Bill Birch, the NJDOT Project Manager, to discuss the Transportation Improvement Program Process.

Bill distributed a chart illustrating the transportation project development stages used internally by NJDOT. He explained that this project has an extensive history and is now in the process of being worked into the Final Scope Development Stage. A second chart was distributed to show the Project Delivery Process and the number of steps which must be conducted to move a transportation project forward in Final Scope Development. Bill concluded by explaining that previous studies were not successful in moving this project forward due to community concerns and opposition to the proposed transportation improvements. The purpose of this community partnering team effort is to address community issues and refinements to the preferred alternative. Most likely, a public hearing will be held to obtain formal comments and public agencies review the environmental document which contains the formal comments. A part of this review is to look to see if there is public support. Before having a public information center, the NJDOT would like to obtain from this community partnering team reasonable and probable acceptance of the preferred alternative. A concern was shared regarding the excessive length of time for the process and how land use regulations change in a different time frame affecting the design for transportation improvements.

Paul Nowicki, the Project Manager from Gannett Fleming, then presented the purpose and need for Route 18 corridor improvements by first reading the problem statement and then displaying the list of project needs. A draft of the Project Purpose and Need was distributed. He asked all members to review this document with their constituents and fax comments to Martine Culbertson or to Gannett Fleming. The transcribed list of the CPT issues written by the members and invited guests was also distributed for review. Paul then presented the previous alternatives studied in the corridor (Alternative No. 4, 3, and 2) and described the features which did not satisfy design criteria. He also explained that while some elements of these alternatives were beneficial, they did not meet the purpose and needs as defined by the project problem statement and list of needs. Paul concluded the presentation with the Initially Preferred Alternative and distributed a handout which included a map of the Initially Preferred Alternative. He explained the collector distributor road concept. Members began to ask questions concerning consideration for bike and pedestrian enhancements. Martine asked that the members hold those questions for the discussion in the break out groups where it would be more effective.

After a five minute break, the CPT broke into five groups. Each group was given a large map to work with, a writing tablet, asked to select someone to scribe, indicate the group participants, and identify the issues of the Initially Preferred Alternative. They were asked to mark up the map to identify what they liked and what needed further refinement or design consideration.

After 20 minutes, Martine asked the five groups to end their discussions and that the information generated by each group would be shared at the next CPT meeting to be held Tuesday, July 13th. To summarize the meeting, the meeting goals were reviewed and then members provided feedback and action items for the next CPT meeting. The following comments were noted: liked the small breakout groups and to continue them at the next meeting; liked the meeting process, can see progress, request for status report on the Route 18 extension project, would like to get right into the information generated from each group at the next meeting.

Regarding the text on the Initially Preferred Alternative, Mike Morgan of Gannett Fleming noted that the traffic volumes should state "in both directions" and to keep in mind that this handout is dated material from an Officials Briefing in 1998, so the project schedule on the back page is outdated. Paul Nowicki reminded members to review the draft Project Purpose and Need document and to share the information from this meeting with their constituents for additional comments. The members were thanked for their participation and the meeting was adjourned at noon.

3. ACTION ITEMS

- Members and Guests review the draft Purpose and Need document and the CPT issues. Provide any comments to Martine Culbertson via phone, fax, or email. Fax number: 856-795-5254.
- Members and Guests replace revised information materials in the CPT Handbook as indicated by the date and section on the bottom of each page. Project handouts go in Section 3 and press articles go in Section 7.
- Martine Culbertson obtain comments on the draft document and CPT issues, prepare agenda and materials for next meeting, write and distribute meeting report.
- Paul Nowicki review comments marked on the maps and tablets, continue Final Scope Development studies, and coordinate with the Steering Committee on action items for the next CPT meeting.

4. NEXT MEETING

Date:	Tuesday, July 13, 1999
Time:	9:00 a.m 1:00 p.m. Note: Next meeting extended to 4 hrs
Location:	Middlesex County Planning Dept. Conference Room
	Elks Building, City of New Brunswick

Report prepared by:

Martine Culbertson, CPT Facilitator



AGENDA

June 18, 1999

- Objective: To gain a clear understanding of the specific transportation needs in the Route 18 corridor and obtain agreement on the problem statement. To review alternatives previously studied and to begin examining the community issues.
 - I. Welcome and Introductions
 - Approval of Meeting Report No. 1
 - Community Partnering Team Review
 - II. Transportation Improvement Program Process
 - Project Development Stages
 - Project Schedule Where We Are
 - III. RT. 18 Corridor Improvements
 - Purpose and Need
 - Feasibility Study Alternatives
 - Initially Preferred Alternative

Break

- Breakout Groups Alternatives/Issues
- Present Results
- IV. Summary and Close
 - Meeting Schedule / Action Items
 - Feedback and Closing Comments



Division of Project Management