



**SOUTH JERSEY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 31, 2016- 6:30 PM
Vineland City Hall—Caucus Room
640 E. Wood Street, Vineland, NJ

Attendees:

- Rodney Guishard, Chair
- Mike Hajek, Co-Chair
- Pat Bomba
- Bob Campbell
- Kevin Dixon
- Linda DuBois
- Tom Garrett
- John Hall
- Harry Moore
- Nancy Ridgway
- Jackie Amado-Belton (via phone)
- David Heller, Alan Huff; SJTPO

1. Flag Salute

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Minutes from February 29, 2016

These were approved after item #4.

4. Report from Chair (6:35 PM)

RG remarked about the Plan, which was a comprehensive effort. RG expressed his interest in how the CAC can have an impact on the transportation planning process. He noted that they have solicited input from people on the outside, but in many cases, when the inputs have come, we need to hear from the person's municipality, or has to come up with more detail, which is not very satisfying. He remarked about the small percentage of funds (4.7%) of the funds in relation to the area the region covers. He suggested this as a possible area in which the CAC can help to improve. He also commented on the general lack of responsiveness of the transportation system, citing as an example an intersection near one of the biggest elementary schools in New Jersey. He commented on the length of time to install a traffic signal at this location, taking four 4 years. He continued about the length of time to get bridges built, citing China as a good example of getting good infrastructure built rapidly.

DH suggested that the discussion related to SJTPO's role and future direction (Item #8) be tabled until the next meeting as Jennifer Marandino was not able to attend this meeting. DH reiterated the CAC's role as a

conduit to SJTPO's Transportation Advisory Committee. RG reiterated that we need to find an effective way to address citizens' concerns while staying within the constraints of the SJTPO transportation planning guidelines. RG brought up the \$1M of unspent earmarked funds (raised at the last TAC meeting) to use money. DH noted that the \$1.3 M is going to go towards a project in Cape May County but again stipulated that this was not really the direct role of the CAC.

BC expressed his frustration with respect to projects that Hamilton Township has sent in, as well as other projects (e.g. Oldmans Township), following the protocols, etc.

In response to a comment from NR, DH noted that SJTPO's activity is 100% Federally-funded, with some state-funded projects in our TIP. DH noted the fact that the public doesn't know if a road is a State road, county, or municipal road, etc., is causing a problem. LD noted that the jurisdiction of each roadway could be easily determined, but redirecting the public to all these different entities is not encouraged.

BC brought up speed bumps—asked if safety problem needed to be on a Federal highway, or can it be on a local highway, etc. BC wanted to know the laws regulating speed bumps within a Federal, State, local highway—e.g. permissible, size, etc. PB noted that it all comes down to who is financially responsible for the road. RG noted that we need to establish some guidelines as to how we treat problems like this. KD cited Title 39—Speed Hump Law, enacted in 2004. A municipality or county may construct on two-way residential streets (under county or municipality) with posted speed of 30 MPH, and less than 3,000 vehicles per day. BC asked if SJTPO is supposed to look at potential safety problems. KD noted that it is under the jurisdiction of whatever political subdivision that road falls under—e.g. State DOT, municipality, etc to handle the problem. But KD also noted that it would seem to make sense that SJTPO would take the initiative to forward the problem to the appropriate organization, rather than kick it back. SJTPO should not only copy to the appropriate jurisdiction, but also the original citizen who originated the complaint.

5. Presentation on Transportation Matters-A Plan for South Jersey; Alan Huff (6:40 PM)

AH made a formal presentation on the current regional transportation plan (RTP), noting that SJTPO serves as a technical resource for our jurisdictions, providing access to some Federal funding sources. An RTP is required by the Federal government. Any project that receives Federal funds must be included in the RTP and TIP.

RG asked who put the Plan together. AH responded that the plan was mostly written by David Heller and Bill Schiavi, but in terms of looking at goals, strategies, it was all hands on deck. The plan itself is the latest update to a planning process that has gone on for years. AH noted that the last two goals of the plan are new, relating to tourism and resiliency. As part of a consultant-led public input process, the goals were arrayed in order of importance as input by the public via online survey. TG asked if we had anything pertaining to Complete Streets in the Plan. AH addressed the question noting while there is no Complete Streets funding source that goes through SJTPO, but there is Safe Routes to School, Transportation Alternatives, for which staff is on the project selection committee with the State DOT. TG asked if we work with CCCTMA, to which AH responded that we do work with them a little. AH noted that we want to start evaluating all of the projects, which is a big step in NJ.

JH asked about increasing Federal funding for these projects to which it was pointed out that there was discussion within the Financial chapter of the plan.

AH cited the regional projections, which are estimated in five year increments through 2040. JH asked how we quantitate the numbers. DH replied that we hired an outside contractor who developed a population and employment model, based on a variety of different factors (e.g. mortality rates, cohort-survival rates, etc.). DH noted that the methodology report for these calculations is part of Appendix C.

AH continued his discussion related to the bicycle facilities within the plan, which included both on- and off-road facilities, as well as existing and proposed facilities. On-road facilities, especially in Cumberland County, are predominately bikeways--which consist of shoulders on roadways. TG brought up CCCTMA Complete Streets webinar he attended, noting that Salem County has no Complete Streets adopted policies. RG questioned what Complete Streets is to which TG noted that, when a road is repaved, a Complete Street project would enable a cyclist to ride along the road, (as comfortably as possible), as well as a pedestrian to be able to walk on it, etc. AH noted that the State has a Complete Streets policy, which indicates all projects must "consider" Complete Streets principles.

JA noted that Pleasantville is Complete Streets city, nothing that. Complete Streets is an initiative that comes through a State and Federal funding program, and it is a grant that the municipality usually applies for. It has to have a certain amount of streets on Federal and State and County highways that are complete—for which the municipality gets points. With this funding, the municipality can do sidewalks, curves, bike lanes, different street alignments, etc. RG asked if SJTPO would be involved with this? AH noted that it is not a program that goes through the SJTPO.

MH noted that the rail line coming through Cape May County is obsolete. [DH Note: He is referring to the Cape May County Seashore Line, which has a line that goes from Rio Grande to Cape May.] Referencing the Glassboro-Camden Rail Line, PB noted that the ROW is still there and usable, and is being studied by the State for funding. PB noted that the line will be used as a combination light-rail/cable type mover.

AH continued his presentation talking about environmental constraints, e.g. CAFRA, noting that much of the SJTPO region is in CAFRA or Pinelands. LD asked what is difference between "Environmentally Sensitive" and "Environmental Constraints." AH explained that environmental constraints are constraints to the transportation system.

AH touched briefly upon three different scenarios in the plan; Business-As-Usual, Critical Needs, Bridge Closures.

AH discussed three major issues in the Financial Section:

- (1) SJTPO's share of State's dollar allocation is lower than share of population, based on year-round residents. MH brought up the seasonal influx the region experiences. RG noted that we have more roads per person, and should get a much higher share of the statewide allocation. AH noted that this translates into more than \$391M lost since 2004.
- (2) SJTPO experiences a 177% spike in population during the summer months. This translates into about 1M extra people (much of which from out-of-state), coming into our region on any given summer weekend.
- (3) The cost of critical needs outweighs the amount of funding received. Included within the plan, SJTPO lists \$660M in unfunded critical needs projects.

JH requested that the PPT presentation be transmitted to the CAC.

In closing his presentation, AH mentioned four public meetings coming up, noting all public comments are due by Friday, June 24, 2016. The schedule for the public meeting is up on the website; all meetings start at 6:00 PM, and go to 7:30 PM. MH recommended that CAC members attend that meeting that is within their respective jurisdiction. AH also noted that we put out press releases advertising these meetings as well. AH stated that the presentation made this evening at the CAC meeting was largely similar to what will be presented at the upcoming public meetings.

BC put forward a motion; CAC recommends to Policy Board that when applications come in for review of problem in a municipality, that SJTPO staff reviews it, determines if within their purview or not. If the problem

is not, staff would notify the applicant and the proper authorities that would handle that problem as to the request for consideration. The TAC and/or the Policy Board should review the scenario. The applicant will get notice from the CAC Board directly, and the problem will get forwarded to the proper authority (which would handle the problem), with the applicant also getting notice of where this problem was forwarded to. The applicant should be notified of the decision of the Board and/or staff, and staff direct application to proper person and notify applicant of where the problem being directed. The “applicant” is person who goes online (or presents via other medium) and requests a project for that specific municipality. The motion passed by an all in favor vote.

6. SJTPO Updates; Jennifer Marandino (7:15 PM)

- FY 2016-2025 TIP Project List
- FY 2016 Local Lead Project Status
- Repurposing Federal earmarks
- Local Safety Program

There was no discussion related to this agenda due to the unexpected absence of JM, due to a personal emergency.

7. Road Diet Workshop—NJDOT--Michael Hajek, Jr. (7:25 PM)

MH attending a workshop at NJDOT discussing Road Diets. MH provided an overview of the workshop, nothing that reducing lanes as part of a diet could reap roadway benefits akin to health benefits from losing weight. MH couldn't understand how numbers are better, recognizing there are pro's and con's with diets. MH shared handouts that he brought with him from the workshop.

8. CAC Roundtable, Member Discussion (7:30 PM)

RG noted that one of the reasons for this was to find out more about each of the members, asking if members had shared resumes. DH indicated that providing a resume was not a formal requirement. RG also asked if we had a list of all the members, to which DH noted that he does maintain a list of CAC members. RG asked people to send him their resumes. He also wanted to keep track of CAC inputs and the results of what happens to those.

BC recommend that DH as the secretary inquire about any application that comes in, by any method, that at the meeting, that a copy of those particular requests be brought to the meeting, and presented. DH noted that we do have a record of all the different concerns that have come in.

*RG liked the recommendation from BC. DH said he would craft and send it out in writing to the CAC members. RG also said he would be working on guidelines, and more precisely how the CAC should work. **

BC saluted all the veterans on the CAC and offered to help municipalities form a veterans' advisory board.

NR asked that SJTPO contact NJDOT and ask them to update their road opening permits that they issue to contractors.

MH also announced that as of June 6, he is going to be part of the Middle Twp. Traffic Advisory Committee.

*DH noted that the next CAC meeting is the 5th Monday in August—August 29, 2016. ***

9. Upcoming SJTPO Meetings (7:55 PM)

- **Technical Advisory Committee**, July 11, 2016, 10:00 AM, Vineland City Hall
- **Policy Board**, July 25, 2016, 10:00 AM, Vineland City Hall

10. Adjournment (8:00 PM)

Notes:

- * It was decided after this meeting that because of the different direction that SJTPO staff has in mind for the CAC, we will not be proceeding with drafting this motion at this time.
- ** This meeting was postponed to Thursday, November 3, 2016, at 6:30 PM.