

**June 15, 2016 Minutes of the Meeting  
Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission**

TIME: 10:10 a.m.  
DATE: June 15, 2016  
PLACE: D&R Canal Commission Office, Stockton, New Jersey

**ATTENDING COMMISSIONERS:**

Vice Chairman John Loos, Commissioner Julia Allen, Commissioner Phil Lubitz,  
Director Lynn Fleming, Commissioner Douglas Palmer by phone.

STAFF: Executive Director Marlene Dooley, Mr. Joseph Ruggeri,  
Deputy Attorney General Melissa Abatemarco, Ms. Colleen Christie Maloney

**GUESTS:**

D&R Canal State Park Superintendent Patricia Kalleser  
Mr. Michael Sellar , NJWSA  
Mr. Paul McKeon, NJWSA  
Mr. Robert Barth, D&R Canal Watch  
Mr. Robert von Zumbusch, D&R Canal Commission Advisory Committee  
Ms. Tina Shutz, NJDOT, Environmental Specialist  
Mr. Robert Bird, NJDOT, Environmental Specialist  
Mr. Charles Henry, NJDOT, Division of Project Management  
Mr. Richard Jaffe, NJDOT, Director, Capital Program Support  
Ms. Dana Hecht, NJDOT, Director, Project Management  
Mr. Robert Parker, NJDOT, Director, Regional Construction Engineer, Central Region  
Mr. Chris Barretts, NJDOT, Executive Manager Traffic Engineering  
Mr. Warren Howard, NJDOT, Supervising Engineer for Design Standards and Program Standards  
Mr. Hung Tang, NJDOT, Assistant Engineer  
Mr. Bill Birch, NJDOT, Executive Regional Manager/Project Manager  
Mr. Scott Stephens, NJDOT, Director of Community Relations  
Ms. Sophia Azam, NJDOT, Manager, Bureau of Transportation Management Data and Safety  
Ms. Rosa Yoo, NJ Forest Service  
Ms. Samantha Hensen, NJ Forest Service  
Dr. Michael Ehrenreich  
Mr. Rich Tice

At 10:10 a.m., the following commissioners were present: Vice Chairman John Loos, Commissioner Julia Allen, Commissioner Phil Lubitz, and Director Lynn Fleming. Commissioner Douglas Palmer participated by telephone.

Vice Chairman Loos announced that this was a regularly scheduled meeting of the D&R Canal Commission and that all provisions of the Open Public Meeting Law of 1976 had been met in the scheduling of the meeting.

### Administrative Items

The Commission confirmed the July 20, 2016 Commission meeting date.

### Minutes

#### May 18, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chairman Loos called for a motion on the May 18, 2016 meeting minutes. Commissioner Lubitz made a motion to approve the minutes and Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked for corrections on the minutes. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The minutes were approved.

#### May 18, 2016 Executive Session Minutes

Vice Chairman Loos called for a motion on the May 18, 2016 executive session minutes. Commissioner Lubitz made a motion to approve the minutes and Director Fleming seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked for corrections on the minutes. Hearing none, he called for a vote. They were approved unanimously.

### Review Zone Projects

#### Zone A Projects

Vice Chairman Loos stated that there were two Review Zone A projects: 16-4871 Ferry Street Windows and 16-1794A 1 Risler Street Demolition. Vice Chairman Loos asked for a motion on the two projects. Commissioner Lubitz made a motion to approve the projects and Director Fleming seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked for comment and, hearing none, he called for a vote. The projects were approved unanimously.

#### Zone B Projects

Vice Chairman Loos stated that there were seven Review Zone B projects. Commissioner Lubitz noted that he had a question on the 16-4827 High Point Residential and Mixed Use Development in Cranbury. Commissioner Lubitz raised a concern that the recharge section of the staff report noted that roof runoff from the commercial buildings would drain to the infiltration basin but the commercial buildings would not be built until Phase II. Commissioner Lubitz, Vice Chairman Loos, and Mr. Ruggeri discussed when the infiltration basin would be built, whether the project could meet recharge without the roof runoff from the commercial buildings and the phasing of the project. Vice Chairman Loos recommended that approval be conditioned upon Phase I including construction of the infiltration basin and recharge being met as part of Phase I. Commissioner Lubitz made a motion to approve the project with the condition. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked for additional comment from the commissioners and public. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The project was approved with the condition unanimously.

Vice Chairman Loos asked for a motion on the remaining six projects: 16-3681A Conover Rd Subdivision (E. Windsor), 15-4748 Belle Mead Development Phase I and II (Montgomery), 15-4758 Applewood Court (Cranbury), 15-4813 Wawa at Silvia St and Parkway Ave (Ewing), 16-0492B Valley Solar (Hillsborough), and 16-4862 Melvin H. Kreps Middle School (Hillsborough). Director Fleming made a motion to approve the six projects and Commissioner Lubitz seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked for comment and hearing none, he called for a vote. The six projects were approved unanimously.

**Department of Transportation Rumble Strip Projects**

16-3183B Rte 29 Maintenance, Repair and Rumble Strips (M.P. 17.16 -18.10) (West Amwell Twp and City of Lambertville)

16-3183A DOT Rte 29 and Rte 175 Rumble Strips (Ewing, Hopewell, W. Amwell, Lambertville, Stockton, Delaware, Kingwood)

Vice Chairman Loos asked Director Dooley to outline the projects. Director Dooley outlined the matter including that it was two projects, both are for retroactive approval, that the projects were for center line rumble strips from Ewing to Frenchtown, that the project area is predominantly in a Transportation Zone but is within a Natural area near Bulls Island, that staff found the projects to be minor, the traffic standards not to apply, the design standards to be met, that the review was whether the project was in accordance with the Master Plan, and that the Commission could ask for mitigation for a minor project. She also noted the inspections conducted by staff, and that staff found the project met the standards and was eligible for a waiver based on compelling need. Director Dooley further noted that the projects were not approved at the last meeting, and the Commission asked the DOT to examine flexible delineators, configuration of rumble strips, quieter rumbles strips, the issue of incidental contact, to conduct testing in the field, and to return to the Commission. Lastly, she noted that a meeting was held with representatives of DOT, and Commission and Parks staff.

Vice Chairman Loos asked the members present from DOT to introduce themselves and twelve representatives from DOT introduced themselves.

Vice Chairman Loos stated that he had read about “mumble strips” which make similar noise and vibration within vehicles that come in contact with the mumble strip, but generate significantly less noise external to the vehicle. He asked DOT to outline their knowledge of mumble strips and whether they were considered in New Jersey.

Mr. Parker asked to make introductory remarks. He thanked the Commission for allowing the DOT to attend the meeting. He apologized for the placement of the rumble strips prior to the Commission meeting and the obtaining of a permit. He was aware of the construction after it occurred and was not happy. He noted that he discussed the issue with his staff and instituted policies internally so it would not happen again. Mr. Parker noted that he has worked with DOT and the Commission for over 30 years and has had a positive relationship that has grown over the years and hopes this incident does not erode that relationship. He noted he works with many agencies and his role is to embrace agencies and the public and that he attempts to meet all needs in addition to safety. He noted that the resident engineer for the project has stepped down and it has affected 130 people in his unit. His people are aware that permits are needed and work cannot be done without them. He stated that the issue was a miscommunication but that is not an excuse. Vice Chairman Loos stated that he appreciated the apology. Director Hecht also apologized and noted that there is no excuse for this occurring twice. She noted that there was no mal-intent. She noted that policies and checklists are in place and that managers have spoken with staff and field managers. She noted that the Commissioner is aware of the situation. Director Hecht also noted why the managers were not able to attend the June meeting. Commissioner Lubitz asked about the process for notifying municipalities of a project. Mr. Parker and Mr. Stephens noted the internal process and there was discussion as to whether police rather than municipalities may have been notified. Mr. Stephens will follow up on the process that occurred for this permit specific to Kingwood Township.

Mr. Jaffe provided some background prior to discussing mumble strips. Mr. Jaffe discussed the systematic approach to rumble strips including lane departures and distracted driving and targeting that type of issue, national studies indicating rumbles strips as the method to address it, and related crashes in New Jersey in 2007 versus 2014. Mr. Jaffe also discussed higher fatality rates associated with six-foot shoulder roads with medians versus two lane roads with no shoulder (less than six-feet) such as Route 29. He discussed the need to retain the rural nature of the road but to make it safer.

Mr. Jaffe noted that the National Highway System (NHS) has a limited number of roadways identified as important for defense, economy, and transporting people and that Route 29 is on the NHS. Mr. Jaffe listed and described cross-over accidents on Route 29 from Washington Crossing to north of Old River Road including one since the February meeting. DOT believes cross-over accidents and distracted driving are a serious problem and that DOT is responsible for addressing safety on this well traveled roadway.

Mr. Jaffe then discussed why DOT selected the present configuration of rumble strips. He noted that DOT uses best practices based over time and experience. He discussed the history of striping roads, raised markers that reflect light, and now rumble strips. He noted that cross-over accidents are random in nature and that rumble strips change driver behavior. Cars will no longer simply use the yellow line as a guide and, over time, traffic will be slowed. Regarding noise from rumble strips, he stated that motorcycles and trucks are noisier but acknowledged that rumble strips add a noise that was not previously there. He stated that DOT balanced noise and safety by not placing rumble strips on every road. Rumble strips were not placed on roads below 35 miles per hour or on every shoulder which would increase noise. He noted that other states have rumble strips on roads below 35 miles per hour. Mr. Jaffe noted that mumble strips are being tested and DOT will examine them. DOT embraces new technology and will pay attention to new studies because noise is a concern to DOT's constituents.

Vice Chairman Loos asked about studies of mumble strips and noted that it was his understanding that the noise level and vibration in a vehicle were similar but the noise outside the vehicle was less. Vice Chairman Loos noted if DOT's issue is alerting a driver, then DOT should not be concerned if it is less noisy outside the vehicle. He asked why DOT cannot mitigate noise in the park in high incidental contact areas by placing mumble strips at the present time and what data DOT has collected and examined to show that DOT can not use mumble strips in certain areas.

Commissioner Lubitz noted that Pennsylvania is more conservative than New Jersey in that they place rumble strips on roads under 25 mph and on the shoulder. Yet Pennsylvania is able to use mumble strips. Mr. Howard stated that there was a misconception. Pennsylvania is not using mumble strips. Mumble strips are the sinusoidal wave type of rumble strip and the effectiveness of those are still being reviewed. Pennsylvania uses rumble strips just as New Jersey does. Rumble strips are 1/2-inch deep, 14-18 inches wide (New Jersey uses 16 inch), and 7-inch width. Pennsylvania does use a 3/8-inch depth rumble strips in certain areas such as passing zones. Otherwise, the Pennsylvania standard is identical to New Jersey.

Vice Chairman Loos asked where mumble strips are used. It was noted that California and Minnesota are doing studies on the effectiveness of mumbles strips. Mr. Tang stated that Minnesota has placed mumble strips on roadways in order to test them. He noted that European nations have also examined mumble strips. He stated that the existing research is inconclusive on the effectiveness for safety. Mumble strips are not as deep and a wave pattern. He stated that the inconclusive results may be due to

different types of vehicles. Some studies show mumble strips effective for a passenger vehicle. However, with pickup trucks or larger vehicles with bigger tires, the noise level inside the vehicle may not be effective to alert the driver. Lastly, he noted that the specification for New Jersey rumble strips is what most states are using. The spacing that Pennsylvania is using is used in approximately four or five states.

Commissioner Lubitz noted that there is a truck ban on Route 29. There was discussion of the truck ban on Route 29 and a question as to whether mumble strips may be appropriate for Route 29 due to the truck ban.

Vice Chairman Loos noted his drive included Route 202 and Route 29 and that for most of the drive, he did not have any incidental contact because the roadway was straight. But he noted that areas near the park have curves and the noise would invade the park not due to distracted driving but due to incidental contact. He questioned why DOT does not perform its own test by adding a mumble strip. He noted that DOT has not convinced him that mumble strips could not be used in these incidental areas. He noted that motorcycles are noisy but not a constant noise. If a person is fishing in an area where there is incidental contact, the noise would be constant. Mr. Jaffe stated that he has been to the areas identified and that his observations did not indicate great incidental contact. Mr. Jaffe feels rumble strips will improve driver behavior and will promote drivers to stay in the lane. He noted that if drivers do not, it would be an enforcement issue. DOT must wait until data shows mumble strips are proven to be effective. DOT is aware of studies and is examining them but when the New Jersey policies were developed, mumble strip studies were not done and DOT could not wait to establish a policy. DOT believes there is a serious safety problem and that current technology can address it, but DOT is looking at the studies.

Commissioner Lubitz asked how many other roads along the park could be affected. There was discussion that most remaining roadways along the canal were not State roads and are narrow roads with lower speed limits that would not be affected by the DOT policy.

Vice Chairman Loos opened the comment period to the public.

Mr. von Zumbusch discussed stanchion markers in addition to rumble strips at curves to reduce noise. Vice Chairman Loos noted that delineators were discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Barrett noted two areas for which he was aware that delineators were used. Those areas were in work zones in urban settings with wider cross sections of roadway in order to prevent turning movements such as not prematurely entering a left turn lane. They have not been used for a higher speed road at a curve with a smaller cross section of roadway. Mr. Barrett noted that the federal highway standard for use of delineators is that they are predominantly used on the sides of the roads to guide motorists through curves in the road. They can be used in the centerline but only on top of a raised median. He noted that the median did not need to be a Jersey barrier but perhaps four inches. Mr. von Zumbusch suggested that DOT should try something new as an experiment if interested in addressing the noise issue. Mr. Barrett said he was not dismissing it.

Dr. Ehrenreich noted that he submitted a letter to DOT with information regarding a flexible post delineator that can withstand an impact up to 60 miles per hour and a flexible metal rope used in highways in Europe which has a low visual profile but essentially creates a divided road. He stated that

rumble strips are a great, cheap system-wide solution, but they are not the only solution. There are more expensive solutions which can be implemented road-wide for a specific curve location such as a delineators or the metal rope which would not have a visual impact on the park. Also, Dr Ehrenreich questioned the use of statistics and studies as a basis for the policies and suggested that DOT should look at the situation and find a solution specific to the area under discussion.

Mr. Barth stated that Route 29 is not comparable to Route 202, Route 206, Route 31 or Route 78 as stated by DOT. It is a special road because it is along the canal, which is on the National Historic Register, it is part of a national scenic byway, and the Governor identified it for a truck ban. It should be treated differently. He suggested reducing the speed on this road because it should not be treated like these national highway roads.

Commissioner Lubitz raised pedestrian safety. In Kingwood Township, there is a park that straddles Route 29 and there will be pedestrians crossing Route 29. As the current discussion is about safety, he suggested that it is an appropriate time to discuss the safety of those pedestrians and perhaps having a pedestrian crosswalk on that section of Route 29. Mr. Barrett responded that the DOT is open to that discussion and, to begin a review, there should be a written request to the Commissioner and then his office will conduct a review including pedestrian traffic and Federal Highway Administration standards and what electronic mechanisms may be needed. Superintendent Kalleser noted that the site is slated for a future campground, thus increasing pedestrian traffic. Mr. Barrett requested the location in order to visit with his staff or to meet Commission or park representatives on the site.

Director Fleming thanked the DOT for attending. She noted that at the last meeting she made it clear that she was very concerned with safety but did not feel questions were answered. She feels there was more information provided today. She noted that she visited Fireman's Eddy after the last meeting. She found it be noisy and a Transportation Environment. She heard a rumble strip occasionally but it was not louder than the regular traffic noise. She spoke with several fishermen who regularly fish the canal in that area who reported they did not hear the rumble strip. She felt that if one heard the rumble strip beyond that traffic noise, it would be outside park hours.

Commissioner Allen stated that, with all the expertise in the room, there is probably a creative solution for the intermittent hitting of the rumble strip. Rumble strips provide a measure of safety but perhaps there is a better solution.

Vice Chairman Loos stated that he is convinced that rumble strips are needed along Route 29. He appreciates the information provided today. Vice Chairman Loos stated he is prepared to vote in favor of the application with the condition that in areas that the Commission identifies as high incidental contact areas, flexible delineators are placed and that would be an ongoing project. A small number of areas may be identified now but there may be additional areas in the future.

Dr Ehrenreich argued against anecdotal information and stressed the need for a study. He noted a study by another agency that examined the number of times a rumble strip was hit and determined the level of noise.

Director Dooley noted that the Commission can not apply the state Noise Standard. The Commission regulations do not have a decibel level standard and the standard in its rules is whether the project is "in

accordance with the Master Plan” and is not harmful to the environ of the park which is a general standard.

Vice Chairman Loos noted that his condition requiring delineators would be as mitigation which the Commission may require under the rules for potential harmful impacts.

Mr. von Zumbusch stated that he would support such a condition. Mr. von Zumbusch stated that he spent time at the area and the level of noise is high as is the traffic noise.

Mr. Parker stated that he read all Dr. Ehrenreich’s letters and editorials and watched the YouTube video. He assured Dr. Ehrenreich that DOT takes the issue seriously and will continue to review.

Director Fleming asked Superintendent Kalleser what concerns have been raised by visitors to the park and she stated that no concerns have been raised. Dr Ehrenreich noted that the average, casual visitor to the park does not and cannot be expected to raise a complaint. Persons like himself will complain because they live in the area and have more constant interaction in the park. Mr. Parker noted that his section of DOT has worked on 18 highways with 228 miles of rumble strips and that Dr. Ehrenreich is the only citizen complaint. Director Dooley noted that Parks and commission staff receive frequent calls and complaints from park visitors related to a wide variety of concerns.

Commissioner Lubitz asked DOT to comment on visual delineators and high incident areas. Mr. Barrett stated that related to delineators, the FHWA standard is that there needs to be a raised portion. He noted that there is a limited travel way on Route 29, and even though delineators are tested and do not scratch cars and can bounce back up, people shy away from them. On Route 29, delineators may push drivers into an area that is less forgiving area, creating secondary issue. Ms. Azam raised concern that there is not a definition of “high incidental contact” and it would be difficult to develop such a definition. She stated that one cannot truly identify what is “incidental” versus what is “distracted.” We cannot know what is going on in the mind of the driver or within a vehicle such as someone is day dreaming.

Mr. von Zumbusch questioned the policies requiring medians for stanchions, noted there are stanchions without a raised platform on Route 27 at pedestrian crossings. Mr. Barrett stated that the ones used at crosswalks are not stanchions. Mr. von Zumbusch noted that he was in favor of rumble strips and that they were in the area of his home. However, those did not create unreasonable noise. He stressed the need to be creative and investigate alternatives to mitigate noise where noise is a problem.

Commissioner Lubitz stated that he will not vote in favor of delineators.

Commissioner Lubitz made a motion to approve the project with the condition that in the event that the Department of Transportation comes to the conclusion that mumble strips are an appropriate remedy to road crossing that they come back and at the Fireman’s Eddy location replace the current rumble strip with a mumble strip. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Loos asked for clarification and Commissioner Lubitz clarified that if DOT finds that the mumble strip makes less noise, DOT would come back to Fireman’s Eddy and replace the rumble strip. Commissioner Lubitz noted that Fireman’s Eddy had been the one area that commissioners identified as problematic.

Vice Chairman Loos clarified the motion asking if the motion is to approve the project with the condition that if DOT identifies a mumble strip that achieves the same level of safety that they will replace that particular crossing. Commissioner Lubitz said "yes." He noted that it is not 0.99% or .05%, but analogous safety, ie, if DOT finds that a mumble strip can give appropriate safety, it is an acceptable alternative. He noted that, separate from the motion, he encouraged DOT to use Fireman's Eddy as a test site. Director Hecht said that she believed something will be found and could agree to that condition.

The Commission confirmed that Mayor Palmer heard the motion.

Vice Chairman Loos stated that he will not vote for the motion. He noted that if the motion was defeated, he will offer an alternative motion.

There was discussion regarding placing a sign before the curve. Mr. Barrett outlined the general standards and concerns for signs and will examine whether a sign is appropriate.

Vice Chairman Loos asked if any Commissioner had a comment on the motion. Director Fleming asked for the motion to be clarified.

Commissioner Lubitz stated that the project would be approved with the condition that if DOT at some future date determines that mumble strips or the equivalent is found to be an appropriate remedy for the lane crossing that DOT will come back and apply that to Fireman's Eddy.

Director Fleming stated the need to modify the motion by including language, "in the park." She might be able to support the motion if the jurisdiction is within the park boundaries and not a specific area. She wanted to be clear that the Commission was acting within its jurisdiction.

Commissioner Lubitz stated that he appreciates Director Fleming's concern but noted that at earlier meetings at which Director Fleming may not have attended Commissioner Stout discussed his on-site visits. Vice Chairman Loos noted that he and Commissioner Stout visited the site on the same day and he heard repeated crossings particularly by large trucks and the noise was quite loud, intrusive into the park and jolting. He agreed that the Commission's jurisdiction was not from residences but only from the park.

It was clarified that the motion was related to both DOT projects and that the motion did not include delineators. Vice Chairman Loos noted that if the motion fails, he would entertain a motion that included delineators.

Commissioner Lubitz stated that it would be hard for him to vote for a motion including delineators when DOT is saying delineators would not be within federally accepted standards. Vice Chairman Loos stated that he did not hear that. Commissioner Lubitz stated that the delineators had to be elevated. Vice Chairman Loos stated the delineators could be elevated. Mr. Barrett reiterated the standards including a four-inch raised island or higher in the center line. It was noted that the width was of concern also. Commissioner Lubitz stated that there is little shoulder on Route 29 and most of the Route 29 shoulder is in disrepair and hazardous. He is concerned with forcing people to an area where there is little or no



shoulder and the roadside is in disrepair or nonexistent. Commissioner Allen discussed it might be worthy of fixing the shoulder and Commissioner Lubitz stated that he agreed with Director Fleming's concerns regarding jurisdiction and that telling DOT to fix the roadway is not within Commission's purview. Vice Chairman Loos stated that the elevation may only take a couple of inches off a lane and if that results in an unsafe condition on the other side, any motion that he would support would have language stating that DOT would have authority not to put delineators if the road became too narrow due to the center riser. He thought that a couple of inches would not radically change the roadway.

Vice Chairman Loos noted the rules for passing of a motion including that the motion required three votes to pass.

Vice Chairman Loos asked for any further comment on the motion. Hearing none he called for a vote on the motion. He noted that the motion was for both DOT projects. Commissioner Palmer, Lubitz, and Director Fleming voted "yes" and Vice Chairman Loos and Commissioner Allen voted "no."

The motion passed three to two but there was a request for clarification of the votes and motion. Director Dooley restated that the motion and that it was related to potential replacement of the rumble strip with a mumble strip or equivalent at Fireman's Eddy. It was clarified that Commissioner Lubitz and Palmer voted for the motion and Commissioners Loos and Allen voted against the motion. Director Fleming stated that she believed the motion had been modified to be along all roadways adjacent to the D&R Canal Park and not solely regarding Fireman's Eddy. She retracted her vote and the motion failed.

Director Fleming made a motion that if DOT determines that mumble strips are an alternative to the existing rumble strips along all roadways adjacent to the D&R Canal Park, they will come back to the Canal Commission. Vice Chairman Loos asked if there was a second, and hearing none, he noted the motion failed.

Vice Chairman Loos asked Director Fleming if she would accept the following motion:

In the event that DOT identifies either mumble strips or delineator posts as an acceptable way to mitigate the noise they would install those in places in the entire park where it is appropriate due to incidental contact.

Director Fleming asked if the motion was if DOT determines that they are satisfactorily equivalents. Vice Chairman Loos clarified that it would be either replace rumble strips with mumble strips or add delineator posts on top of the existing rumble strips if DOT determined that was appropriate and found that it could be done in a safe way without causing people to move to the shoulder.

Director Dooley asked if it was where DOT identified "incidental contact." Vice Chairman Loos stated it was.

Vice Chairman Loos noted that he shared Director Fleming's concern that the motion be for the whole park.

Commissioner Lubitz asked if it was DOT's determination. Vice Chairman Loos agreed it was but that he hoped DOT would consult the Commission. DOT stated they would confer with the Commission.

Director Dooley reread the motion and Commissioner Lubitz noted that the language “or their equivalent” should be placed after rumble strips and Vice Chairman Loos noted that delineators were not an alternative. Director Fleming clarified that the condition in her motion included “rumble strips or their equivalent” and that delineators were not an alternative but in addition to the existing rumble strips.

The motion was to approve projects 16-3183A and B with the condition that, in the event that DOT identifies either rumble strips or their equivalent or delineator posts in addition to the existing rumble strips as an acceptable way to mitigate noise, they would install those in places in the entire park where it is appropriate due to incidental contact.

Director Fleming confirmed the motion and Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Loos asked if there were any questions or comments on the motion. Hearing none he called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **Park Superintendent’s Report**

#### **Presentation on Emerald Ash Borer Management**

Superintendent Kalleser noted that NJDEP Assistant Regional Forester Rosa Yoo was present to discuss Emerald Ash Borer management. Ms. Yoo made a presentation on the non-native invasive emerald ash borer and its predicted impact upon the D&R Canal State Park. The larvae feed on the tree, and outward symptoms are not obvious. She described the difficulty of detecting infestation, pesticide options for light infestation, and a biocontrol option in the form of a nonstinging parasitoid wasp. She noted there is significant ash population in the D&R Canal State Park, including high use places, so there will be an impact to the park users’ recreation experience. Superintendent Kalleser noted staff did an inventory of the park and there are approximately 1,500 ash trees along the park path. Ms. Yoo and Vice Chairman Loos discussed tree removal, preemptive tree removal to prevent emerald ash borer population build up and progression of infestation, and cost of treatment and removal. Commissioner Allen and Ms. Yoo discussed other ash tree disease. Superintendent Kalleser discussed the importance of preparing for and managing the infestation and its impact on the ash trees and the park, including participation by the commission and the State Historic Preservation office.

Superintendent Kalleser noted a Historic Sites Council meeting she would attend regarding a proposed temporary repair to the sink hole at Prallsville Mills on June 16, 2016. Superintendent Kalleser noted a drone would film the Millstone Valley Scenic Valley on June 22, 2016 and appropriate permits were issued for the activity. She noted new playground equipment is installed at Bulls Island. She discussed a meeting with the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission regarding the pedestrian-bike connection from the Scudders Falls Bridge Replacement project. She discussed a potentially grant-funded project to resurface path areas, including DOT and Non-governmental Organization (NGO) participation, and the need to meet ASHTO and ADA standards.

#### **New Jersey Water Supply Authority (NJWSA) Report**

Mr. Sellar noted NJWSA repaired a sink hole on the path in Franklin Township. The weed harvesting is starting from Washington’s Crossing to Trenton and near Bakers Basin. Replacement of the Cherry Tree Lane Spillway is expected to begin in July.

**New Business and Old Business**

Vice Chairman requested that, due to the length of the meeting, old and new business be addressed next month, unless it was urgent. Vice Chairman Loos stated that both the Bulls Island discussion and the odor from the Lambertville sewerage treatment plant discussion would be postponed to the July meeting.

**Executive Director's Report**

Director Dooley discussed the work tally and fees. Director Dooley noted that she attended meetings on the Amwell Road bridge replacement and Scudder Falls/Route I-95 bridge replacement. There was discussion regarding the height of the Amwell Road Bridge, the gas pipe along the bridge, sidewalks, and the crosswalk. Director Dooley noted that a 2013 Commission decision that was challenged in court was recently upheld with a strong opinion. She noted that the applicant for 2999 Princeton Pike had met with staff to discuss further intrusions into the stream corridor at the site.

**Old Business**

Commissioner Lubitz noted that, with reference to the rumble strip discussion and Route 29, it was Governor DiFrancesco who banned trucks on Route 29, which were over 13 tons and did not have business within three miles of Route 29.

Mr. Barth spoke of the SPLASH steamboat boat ride fundraiser and the hike and bike schedule of D&R Canal Watch.

**Executive Session**

There was no executive session

**Adjournment**

Vice Chairman Loos called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Allen moved to adjourn and Commissioner Lubitz seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Marlene Dooley, Secretary

