

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Hunterdon County Transportation Plan Steering Committee Members

Matt Holt	Hunterdon County Board of Chosen Freeholders
John Glynn	Director, Hunterdon County Roads, Bridges & Engineering
Jim Martin	County Engineer, Hunterdon County Planning Board
Sue Dziamara	Director, Hunterdon County Planning Department
Tara Shepherd	HART Commuter Information Services
Robert Nargi	Union Township
Robert Hauck	Flemington Borough Mayor Transportation Advisory Committee Chairperson Hunterdon County Planning Board
Ken Bogen	Hunterdon County Planning Department
Crystal Barnes	Hunterdon County Planning Department
Kyle Zenlea	Hunterdon County Planning Department
Brian Appezzato	Hunterdon County Planning Department
Sharon Maclean	Former Hunterdon County Planning Department

APPENDIX B

Hunterdon County Transportation Plan Public Information Meeting, Flemington Public Comments February 26, 2008

Vehicular Travel and Traffic

Traffic Congestion / Volume

- Traffic going from Route 523 to Route 78 is extremely heavy
- Route 513 in Pittstown is extremely crowded during morning and evening rush hour
- Route 625 and Route 579 are crowded during the periods of extreme traffic or accidents on I-78. People use these roads to get around blockages on I-78.
- Exit 13 off route 78. There is an issue with trucks exiting the roadway and possibly tipping over. Better signage is needed.
- SR 173- Needs improved signage and better enforcement of weight limits
- Exit 12 on route 78. Problems with truck parking. Better enforcement and more signs to stop truck parking.
- Pattenburg Bridge near firehouse. Increased height as trucks cannot pass under bridge. Bridge is single lane and needs improvement.
- Route 523 in Delaware Twp. Please do not widen road as it is fine. Delaware Twp requests a constant 45mph speed zone on County Roads running thru town.
- Traffic is using CR 523 from Bucks, PA to enter into Flemington area. Speed is a problem.

Traffic Calming

- Reflector installed at entrance to New Hampton (CR 645) Center Island.
- Public doesn't realize what these traffic calming devices are used for
- Impervious surface issues on CR 645 as road was widened
- Traffic calming devices co-existing with bicycles is an issue
- Speed bumps cause a noise problem
- Speed humps cause more work when plowing snow
- Interest in roundabouts was expressed

Speed

- Route 512 off of route 517
- Speed limit is 45 MPH then it drops to 30 mph
- Issues with enforcement
- Lower speed limit needs to be extended to curb speeding in residential areas- Califon Borough

- County roads speeds signs need to be better posted
Speed limit changes

Questions rose about process to get speed limit changed on CR.

- Interested in use of electronic (MRS) signs to curb

Bicycle/Pedestrian

- Bike lanes and Bike paths were viewed with overall importance with regards to connecting citizens to open space as well as existing parks and trails within the county
- The head of Somerset Wheelman voiced the fact the County roads were not conducive to cyclists due to traffic volume, motorist speed, and lack of sweeping on County road shoulders. Shoulder debris was cited as an obstacle for cyclists. It was voiced that “back routes,” were preferable to cyclists, as opposed to County roads due to their scenic nature, less steep grades, and lower traffic volumes
- It was voiced that the implementation of delineated bike lanes on Route 513 (Union Township), would increase recreational biking. The question regarding if it was feasible to promote Route 513 as a bike lane in Union Township was asked
- Union Township cited the existence roads that are not conducive to pedestrian crossing to access an existing park
- Bike lanes were implemented on Cloverhill Road – Did not work, street sweeping was an issue, and essentially debris was a concern
- People who use Bikes for primary mode of transportation need to be addressed by the county more adequately
- Representatives from Califon cited the existence of disjointed sidewalks. The creation and maintenance of sidewalks within Califon was a topic of concern.
- The issue of homeowners against the creation of sidewalks despite the mayor’s sentiments
- The mayor would like to know the process regarding purchasing property for sidewalks from residents
- Safety of pedestrians using county roads was emphasized. Mothers and others use shoulders due to a lack of available sidewalks

Alexandria Toll Brothers (Development Company)

- Developer was initially against sidewalks, they were forced to put sidewalks in front of homes
- A lot of people are against sidewalks because it degrades the rural character of the county
- Toll Brothers Development: Walking path connects development to the school, this was viewed as a positive
- It was mentioned that putting a right of way in place allowing future development of sidewalks as connectors in developments throughout the county
- It was voiced that sidewalks that have been installed have in fact saved lives. Sidewalks separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic, and provides a necessary safety buffer

- Sidewalks are a municipal function, the burden is on the municipal to make side walk policies
- Mayor of Flemington agreed it is a municipal responsibility to require sidewalks, and Flemington does for retail or box store development. It was mentioned that County involvement and coordination would be beneficial to municipalities to coordinate adequate sidewalk development

Public Transportation

- Hunterdon County needs more rail stations
 - Possible site: Flemington (Unity Bank)
- Faster Service/Express Trains to NYC
- Saturday rail service into NYC
- Possible park and ride site: Alpha, NJ and Phillipsburg, PA
- Taxi Service from park and ride to home
- Buses should occupy the 3rd lane on Route 22
- There is no bus service to Trenton, NJ available
- Attendees were unsure of what exactly the LINK is
 - The Flemington Shuffle works well
 - Long travel time

**Hunterdon County Transportation Plan
Public Information Meeting, Town of Clinton
Public Comments
February 27, 2008**

Vehicular Travel and Traffic

- West Main Street in Clinton backs up as traffic tries to access I-78. This also causes serious pedestrian issues on the roadway.
- Serious pedestrian issues in front of Clinton Municipal building
- Route 579 is seriously congested.
- Problems with I-78 are regional in scope and cannot be addressed by Hunterdon County alone. Issues on this roadway need to be addressed by surrounding counties and states. Vehicle traffic originates in PA and continues to work centers in Central NJ and Hunterdon County.
- People are using County Roads to pass through Hunterdon on their way to work in Somerset, Union Counties. This allows them to bypass I-78 which gets frequently jammed due to accidents, sun glare, volume, ice and snow.
- People are getting off at Exit 11 and 12 to make their way on County Roads to get to Flemington. This is causing delays.
- Lack of viable transit alternatives is a problem. Alternatives to transit would alleviate traffic congestion by moving people off the roads.
- Issues with “filling in the gaps” for public transportation. What do you do after your train has dropped you off 2 miles from your office? A better suited means of addressing this would allow more people to use transit and reduce congestion.
- Noise pollution on I-78 is a problem. Hopefully rubberized asphalt repaving will address this problem.
- People looking for alternatives to I-78 are migrating to local and County Road’s. They are not aware of the reduced speeds on these roads and are traveling too fast.
- Exit 12 turns into two county roads. Truck drivers are becoming confused once they exit this area and are getting lost on local roads. Better signage is warranted in this area. Trucks need signs to find their way to the truck stop.
- Near the center of Lebanon Boro they experience problems with the “cloverleaf” configuration of the roadway. Possible roadway reconfiguration. DOT looked at this already but nothing has been done.
- Rupells road backs up when I-78 is congested. People use this as a workaround.
- Van Sykels Road. People use this to get to route 31 in Flemington. Causes traffic backups in residential areas.

Bicycle/Pedestrian

- A evident concern was to educate bikers to share the road with motorists
- “Share the road” campaigns and signage would be beneficial for both motorists and cyclists

- Group Riders – “Pack Group”- term for riding in groups of 10-15 to protect themselves, this creates a congestion problem for motorists
- 617 CR- cyclists are not riding single file, and this is problematic for motorists (catch 22, hard to ride single file b/c lack of shoulder width)
- Spruce Run Reservoir area can not be accessed in the summer b/c of overcrowding, pedestrian and cyclists need alternative. It was asked if the county could use its’ facilities to print out maps for routes and trails etc.
- A general consensus supporting bike lane implementation was apparent, as well as sidewalks for pedestrian flow
- Sidewalks in Alexandria (Toll Brothers revisited) was an issue that was touched up again
- Educate the *foreign* population about sharing the road, i.e. the Latino population (Flemington used as an example), there exists a language barrier to educate this particular population
- 173 and Center Street in Clinton were sited as problematic areas for pedestrian crossing
- Pittstown Inn was cited as an area that is not conducive to pedestrian flow
- It was expressed that County parks were overloaded with bikers, and that cyclists need to be provided information and maps to gain awareness of areas that can be utilized
- Bikers who use “biking” as a primary mode of transportation need to be better addressed.
- Route 513 in Clinton has problems with shoulder maintenance for cyclists
- 173 from Spruce Run to Clinton would be a great bike route to be proposed for connectivity (lack of existing infrastructure)
- Separate Bike path on County roads- Greenwich was used as an example that Hunterdon county might want to look into b/c of its safety

Public Transportation

- Public transportation to Rutgers and other universities are needed
- Parking facilities are always filled to capacity
- The Hunterdon Hills park and ride: people are unaware that it exist
- Park and rides reach capacity early in the morning
- The parking at the Lebanon Rail Station is bad
- Park and Rides are needed by resident have the NIMBY issue
- Shared parking at churches or other place would alleviate parking congestion
- Brownfield sites are a great location for new park and rides
- Move Clinton Point near the correctional facility
- NJ Transit need to open their schedule in Hunterdon County
- Bike lockers should be at train stations.
- A new rail station should be opened in Hampton Borough
- TransBridge cost \$400 monthly to ride
- A bus ride on the LINK is very long
- The public needs to be educate on good, environment friendly travel
- Maps for all forms to public transportation should be available to the public
- Schedule Coordination is need for multi-modal transportation
- Public transportation should be convenient in order for people to use it.

APPENDIX C

TRANSPORTATION PLAN MUNICIPAL SURVEY FINDINGS

HUNTERDON COUNTY SMART GROWTH TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE PREPARED BY HART COMMUTER SERVICES



INTRODUCTION

The goal of the Hunterdon County Transportation Plan Update is to provide current guidance and recommendations of programs and projects to improve mobility within Hunterdon County.

Survey

As part of the updating process, it was important to collect information on existing conditions (real or perceived) and the concerns of local representatives with regard to current transportation issues.

In August 2007, a survey was developed by Planning Staff and the Transportation Plan Stakeholder Committee. The survey was distributed to official representatives of all twenty six (26) Hunterdon County municipal governments (Mayor, Clerk, Planning Board Chair) to solicit input on a variety of transportation related issues and conditions.

The survey was crafted to collect information and opinions on the following:

1. Local transportation planning efforts and or documents
2. Areas of concern related to local roads, county roads, state/interstate roads
3. Status of public transportation services
4. Status of bicycle accessibility
5. Status of pedestrian accessibility
6. Future planning priorities

Response Rate

Response to the survey was excellent with 100% participation from municipalities. A total of thirty six (36) responses were received from all twenty six (26) Hunterdon County municipalities (NOTE: Some municipalities had more than one respondent. In several questions, respondents could choose multiple answers).

It should also be noted that while all municipalities were represented, the overall number of respondents is only 36 individuals. It would be incorrect to assume that the individual responding to the survey would be representing a complete consensus of opinion from their community. All responses and percentages presented in this analysis should be viewed as illustrative and not conclusive.

Of those responding, the majority identified themselves as elected representatives of the “Town Council or Committee” (35.1%), followed by “Staff/Professional” (32.4%) and “Planning Board” (27%). Approximately five percent identified themselves as “Other”, with no further description.

Local Transportation Planning

Nearly half (48.6%) of respondents reported that their Municipal Master Plan contained a formal “Circulation Plan” element. However, sixteen percent (16%) indicated that they were “Not sure”. Ten (10) respondents reported that their municipality *does not* have a Circulation Plan element within the Municipal Master Plan.

A significant number (54%) of respondents indicated that they planned to include a Circulation Plan in their next Master Plan Update, but nearly a quarter, 23.4%, were “not sure”.

Among those respondents reporting that their Master Plan included a Circulation Element, the two transportation modes most frequently included in the element were “Public Transportation” (21.6%) and “Bicycle Facilities” (21.6%), followed closely by “Pedestrian Facilities (18.9%).

Interestingly, “School Access” was noted by 16.2% of respondents as part of their Circulation Plan. Three respondents indicated that language regarding “Carpool/Vanpool” is incorporated into their Plan. Only one respondent reported the inclusion of “Senior Citizen/Disabled Citizen Mobility” in the Circulation Element of the Master Plan.

Similar to those communities with formal Circulation Plan elements, those respondents reporting that their municipality does not have a formal Circulation Plan element in the Master Plan, still included language elsewhere in the Master Plan regarding “Public Transportation” (16.2%), “Pedestrian Facilities” (10.8%) and “Bicycle Facilities” (8.1%).

Approximately 20% of respondents reported that the transportation goals of their Master Plan are currently incorporated and up to date. Thirty five (35%) of respondents reported that the transportation goals of their Master Plans are currently incorporated into their Land Use ordinances, but are in need of updating.

AREAS OF CONCERN

LOCAL ROADS

More than 75 percent of respondents noted that current “Traffic Congestion/Volume of Traffic” on local roads were of “Significant” or “Some” concern. More than 90%, however, had “Significant” or “Some” concern about “*Projected* Traffic Congestion/Growth in Traffic Volume”.

The issue of “Through Traffic” on local roads was of “Significant” or “Some” concern to nearly 80% of respondents. However, nearly 14% indicated that it was “Not of concern”.

Speed of traffic was of concern to nearly all respondents (92%).

When asked to choose potential solutions to concerns on local roads, “Review of Speed Limits” was the primary response (73%), followed by “Traffic Calming” (65%) and construction of bypass roads (39%)

COUNTY ROADS

Close to 90% of respondents indicated that “Traffic Congestion” and “Projected Traffic Congestion” were of “Significant” or “Some” concern on County roadways. Nearly 80% believe that “Through Traffic” is of “Significant” or “Some” concern as is the speed of traffic (86.4%).

STATE OR INTERSTATE ROADS

Regarding State or Interstate roads, respondents have just about as much concern about current traffic congestion (76%) as projected traffic congestion (78%). “Through Traffic” and “Speed of Traffic” on State and Interstate roads is of “Significant” or “Some” concern to nearly 80% of respondents.

In terms of identifying solutions to concerns on State and Interstate roadways, the majority of respondents (62%) indicated that they believed that “Increased Rail Service” would be a good solution to traffic congestion, followed by “Interchange Improvements” (59%), “Limited Access Points” (51%) and “Increased Bus Service” (51%).

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Access to public transportation is relatively limited in Hunterdon County. However, according to survey responses, the public transportation that is available is important to municipalities.

Approximately 70% of respondents noted that the availability of the TransBridge Bus was “Very” or “Somewhat” important to their community. Though offering very limited service in Hunterdon, the New Jersey Transit Raritan Valley Line rail service was ranked as “Very” or “Somewhat” important by nearly half (46%) of respondents.

The vast majority of respondents reported that public transportation in Hunterdon County is used by residents primarily as a mode of commuting to work (73%), followed by “Personal Appointments (32%) and Recreation (14%).

In terms of perceived destinations, New York City was viewed as the primary destination (54%), followed by Hunterdon County (22%) and Newark (16%). However, one third (32%) noted that they were “Not Sure” of the destination of public transit users in their community.

Access to stations, parking constraints and service destinations were all cited by close to half of respondents (46-48%) as perceived obstacles to residents using public transportation.

PARATRANSIT SERVICES

With limited public transportation services, Hunterdon County’s transit dependent population relies heavily on the Hunterdon County LINK Transportation System.

While 85% of respondents reported that the availability of the LINK is “very” or “somewhat” important to residents, 43% of respondents were “not sure” how many residents within their community would qualify for paratransit services (seniors/disabled). More than half (51%) were “not sure” of resident’s primary purpose for using The LINK. (i.e. medical appointments, work, shopping, etc.)

More than half of respondents could not identify the greatest paratransit service needs of residents.

“Awareness of services” (35%) was cited as the greatest obstacle to residents using the system, followed by “scheduling” (32%). “Availability of out of county travel” was noted by 22% of respondents as an obstacle to using the service, followed by “accessibility for pick up” (16%) and “length of time riding”(16%)

BICYCLING AND WALKABILITY

Bicycling

Hunterdon County is a mecca for recreational bicyclists who enjoy the rolling hills, scenic vistas, and, of course, the D&R Canal Tow Path. Traditionally, bicycling has not been a primary mode of transportation. However, that is changing. Thirty percent (30%) of survey respondents report that bicycling is a common mode of transportation within their communities. More than half, 51%, report that it is “Not” common and even more (72%) do not have bicycle facilities within their municipality.

Respondents describe the current environment on county and local roads as generally “Poor” with “Inadequate road widths/shoulders” and a “Lack of designated bike lanes”.

Both “Motorist awareness” and “Bicyclist Awareness” were noted as “Poor” on both county and local roads.

Suggestions for improving the bicycling environment within Hunterdon County included: “More multi use paths” (59%); “Increased motorist awareness/share the road” (57%); “More designated bicycle lanes” (51%) and “Increased bicyclist awareness/share the road” (43%).

Walkability/Pedestrian Conditions

A majority of respondents described the availability of sidewalks in their community as “Poor” (43.2%). As a rural county, many municipalities do not currently have sidewalks at all. Among those with sidewalks, 22% reported the physical condition of the sidewalks as “Satisfactory”, followed by “Good” (19%), and “Poor” (16%). “Connectivity” of sidewalks also rated “Poor” (38%), but 19% rated their sidewalks network as “Very Good” or “Good”.

Nearly 60% of respondents reported the condition of “Pedestrian Crossing Signage” in their community as “Satisfactory” or “Poor”, but 19% reported the condition as “Good”. More than a third, 35%, of respondents indicated that the road widths were conducive to pedestrian crossing, but nearly as many, 27%, reported that the road widths were not conducive (Poor) to pedestrian crossing.

Motorist speed was cited as the most significant threat to pedestrians (59%).

In terms of suggestions for improving the pedestrian/bicycling environment in Hunterdon County, respondents noted “Motorist Speed” (68%), followed by “Motorist Awareness /Driver Courtesy” (51%) as factors to be improved.

Adequate roadway widths and the presence of shoulders” were cited by 49% of respondents and “Availability of Sidewalks” was noted by 43%.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Awareness were also cited as needing significant improvement by 43% and 49% respectively.

