

DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Highlights of the Central New Jersey Transportation Forum Meeting of November 30, 2001

Attendees (78):

Name	Organization
Jacqueline Alberts	West Windsor Township
Chris Altomari	Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association
Rosemarie Anderson	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Nicholas Angarone	Monmouth County Planning
William Beetle	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
Wendy Benchley	Princeton Borough Council
Peter Bilton	Greater Mercer Transportation Management Association
Wayne Bradley	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA)
Dianne Brake	The Regional Planning Partnership, Inc. (RPP)
Sandra Brillhart	Greater Mercer Transportation Management Association
Robert Bzik	Somerset County Planning Board
David Campbell	Princeton Packet
Peter A. Cantu	Keep Middlesex Moving, Inc., Plainsboro Township
Jon Carnegie	Rutgers Transportation Policy Institute
Paul Cohn	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
John Coscia	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Stephen Decter	West Windsor Township
Elizabeth Donahue	Sarnoff Corporation
Jon Edwards	Hopewell Township
William Enslin	Princeton Regional Planning Board
Andras Fekete	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
William Feldman	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
Leslie Floyd	Mercer County Planning
Michael Fuhrman	Michael Baker Corporation
Tony Gambilonghi	Middlesex County Planning
Hamid Ghadimy	New Jersey Turpike
Bruce Henry	Mercer County Engineering
Pam Hersh	Princeton University
Jim Hess	The Regional Planning Partnership, Inc. (RPP)
David Hojsak	New Jersey Office of State Planning
Shing Fu Hsueh	West Windsor Township
Jack Kanarek	New Jersey Transit
Peggy Killmer	Regional Citizens Committee, DVRPC
Katherine Kish	Princeton Area Chamber of Commerce

Joe Kowalski	Hopewell Township Mayor's Task Force of Traffic & Trucking
Michael LaPlace	Plainsboro Township
Matt Ledger	New Jersey Transit
Michael Leibowitz	New Jersey Transit
Dean Lundahl	Advance Realty Group
Bradford Lyon	Hopewell Borough
Phylis Marchand	Princeton Township
Thomas Marchwinski	New Jersey Transit
Craig Marshall	South Brunswick Township Planning Board
Alison Miller	West Windsor Township
Kendall Miller	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Pam Mount	Lawrence Township
Diane Murphy-Atkins	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Dan Nolan	Bristol-Myers Squibb
Jules Oroszvary	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
George Padgett	Hopewell Borough
David Parris	Penns Neck Communities
Tushar Patel	URS Corporation
Anita Perez	Ridewise of Raritan Valley
Jim Pivovar	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
Stanley Platt	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Candace Preston	Harrison Street Neighborhood Association
Pete Rayner	Greater Mercer Transportation Management Association
Marvin Reed	Princeton Borough
Martin Robins	Rutgers Transportation Policy Institute
Sarah Roberts	Montgomery Township
Tony Sabidussi	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
Roger Sager	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
Vanessa Samdom	Hopewell Township Council
David Schellinger	URS Corporation
Walter Schmidlin	Sarnoff Corporation
James J. Schwarzwald	New Jersey Transit
Kent Scully	Montgomery Township
Don Shanis	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Lee Solow	Princeton Regional Planning Board
Linda Spalinski	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
Becky Taylor	Bristol-Myers Squibb
Ron Tindall	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA)
Peter Tolischus	Heyer, Gruel & Talley, PA - Monroe Township Planning
Paul Truban	New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)
George Ververides	Middlesex County Planning
Kenneth Wedeen	Somerset County Planning Department
Louise Wilson	Montgomery Township
Bob Wolfe	Princeton Forrestal Center

The meeting of the Central Jersey Transportation Forum took place November 30, 2001 at Bristol-Myers Squibb Hopewell Facility in Pennington, NJ. The results of the land-use/transit/highway II modeling scenario was presented to the group by NJDOT's consultant, URS Corporation and New Jersey Transit. In order to start developing a consensus on the future of the Forum and the actions to address the region's transportation problems, a draft Action Plan was presented and discussed. The meeting concluded with discussions on the next steps for the Forum.

1. Introduction of Attendees and Two Minute Reports

John Coscia, Executive Director of DVRPC, welcomed guests. He reminded everyone that it is important that they participate in the presentations and discussions.

2. Summary of the September Meeting's Highlights

Mr. Coscia asked for changes to the September meeting highlights. It was requested that the highlights be corrected to show the statement "West Windsor Planning Board after reviewing traffic projections from their consultants has endorsed the BRT" be attributed to Jacqueline Alberts and not Alison Miller and the statement "one of the assumptions for the scenario was adding population to West Windsor" be attributed to Alison Miller and not Jacqueline Miller. With those corrections the highlights were adopted.

3. 2020 Transit/Land-Use and Highway II Scenario Results

Tushar Patel of URS Corporation kicked off the presentations. He started by reminding the group that at the last meeting the land-use/transit scenario was presented and in September 2000 the highway II scenario was presented. His current presentation represents a combination of both. He said it included everything the Forum has done so far in terms of highway improvements, transit improvements, land-use growth centers as well as travel demand management (TDM) strategies. In summary he said the scenario was expected to reduce regional travel by approximately 33,000 vehicle trips, which is equivalent to about 6.3% of the growth between now and the future. This is a result of moving 6% of population and 18% of employment. Vehicle mile traveled (VMT) is reduced by 1.5% and congested VMT reduced by 22%. This shows that the relationship is not linear. Although there will still be significant congestion in the future compared to today, it is an improvement over the 2020 "Do Nothing" scenario. Travel time on local roads will improve. This is a result of the location of proposed development centers, new highways (SR 92 and Millstone Bypass) will take away some traffic from local roads. Traffic congestion will be reduced on east-west roads between US 1 and US 130 but will not resolve all the problems.

Katherine Kish asked if any of the assumptions in the modeling process had been re-evaluated to include changes in travel pattern brought about by the incidents of September 11.

In answer, John Coscia stated all the facts are not in yet. There is still a lot to learn before actually including any changes of that event in the modeling process.

To expand on what John Coscia said, David Schellinger vice president at URS Corporation told the group that everything is still very dynamic. URS is working in conjunction with NJDOT to gather data to assess demographic shifts and changes in travel pattern. There has been a series of new regulations such as SOV ban, which could result in traffic pattern changes. Changes in transit ridership as a result of lost PATH service is a shift from one mode to another. It is difficult to read into it any long-term changes for reaction to the issues at the moment. Bill Beetle, Director of Transportation Systems Planning NJDOT said this region has not experienced a big change, there are some jobs being re-located here, that over time, may have an impact on local roadways but not on a regional basis. Most jobs remained in New York. New Jersey got about 20%, most stayed in Hudson, some went to Morris and Somerset but only a few came to central New Jersey.

Tom Marchwinski, Director of Transportation Demand Modeling, NJ Transit said there is a 20% increase in Newark/New York trips. Of the jobs that have been tracked at least half relocated to Midtown Manhattan. Therefore, there are more pressures on those crossings. Transit ridership may have decreased but there has been a shift between modes.

John Coscia asked the presenters how they would characterize the benefit in mobility and congestion that the scenario presents given that the costs for the scenario are in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

In his response David Schellinger said that most of the benefit was focus across screenlines parallel to the Northeast corridor. From a systems perspective benefits are substantial within that area; the drawback is that it does not extend well beyond that on either side when looking at longer east-west travel. It is focused more or less in that area where a lot of growth is projected and screenline are already at capacity.

In answer to Peggy Killmer's question about the projected capital costs of specific projects; Bill Beetle said he did not have those figures in his head, but it is good for the Forum to consider costs when evaluating the scenarios. Operating cost should also be considered because this could be a significant burden overtime.

Peter Cantu, Mayor of Plainsboro and Executive Director of Keep Middlesex Moving Inc. stated that there is policy at the state level to make investments that are consistent with State Plan. It makes sense to overlay the State Plan over proposed transportation improvements to make sure they are compatible. He went on to say that there are

specific planning areas within the State Plan and the policy is try to direct investment to support planning areas where the growth is occurring.

Robert Bzik, Somerset County Planning Director suggested that it would be helpful to show the location of centers and mixed-use nodes on the maps being presented.

In response to several comments about comparing modeling results among alternatives, John Coscia said the project team would put together an understandable table of all six modeling scenarios.

Matt Ledger, Senior Business Planner of New Jersey Transit presented the transit portion of the scenario. He pointed out that there was a modest decrease in transit trips when the model was run with highway II assumptions. The highway II assumptions would make it easier to travel on the highway network and improve highway travel times, resulting in a reduction in transit ridership. Referring to a graph included in his presentation that showed the effects of parking costs and land-use policies on new transit ridership; he said the largest factor impacting ridership is parking fees, it had a much more negative effect than the highway II component. The highest negative effect where transit ridership was decreased by half was where transit/land-use scenario was modeled with no changes in land-use and assumed current trend continued. In summarizing the findings, he told the group land-use changes have the biggest impact on auto trip reduction and supports increased transit ridership potential. He felt improved coordination of land-use in the US 1 corridor along with development of additional information is required to better gauge feasibility of any transit investments.

John Coscia said the key figure in the analysis is mode share. With transit/land-use scenario in place transit captures approximately 6% of riders during the peak period and falls a little when highway improvements are added. The off-peak is dismal almost non-existent less than 2%. The modal share is the key.

Matt Ledger reminded the group that this was with a light rail transit (LRT) alignment with feeder bus service that required a transfer; if this was a bus rapid transit (BRT) alignment without transfer the mode share should increase for transit.

David Schellinger told the group that LRT has its own right-of-way and well defined travel times. BRT could operate in the same way if it had its own right-of-way, but given that it may have to deviate and use regular roads to get to certain sites, and mix with auto traffic, that may have a negative effect on ridership. It may not have as many transfers but it may have an offsetting slower speeds because it may have to mix-in with regular highway traffic.

Peggy Kilmer said the area operates at a disadvantage because it is operating in the shadow of the biggest transit market in the country, New York City. If US 1 corridor is compared to the city of Cleveland, there are thousands more jobs in the US 1 corridor than there are on Euclid Avenue in Cleveland where they are implementing BRT.

Peter Cantu reminded the group that without the concentration of development (developed at the charrette) there is no transit scenario that works.

Marvin Reed told participants Cleveland is an under-populated and underemployed region and is doing the bus-way to attract more people to live and work there. The projections show that more people are likely to live and work in central New Jersey and the residents of the region are not sure they want to make that trend happen, in fact they may want to counter that trend. Certainly not sure want to invite more population and employment than the normal trend would dictate, simply because that would enable the region to meet the density level for LRT or BRT that only takes care of 12-18% of the increased auto traffic that moving that population into the region would represent.

John Coscia said the most important thing is what the municipal officials and citizens of the region want as a vision for the central New Jersey region. Once that is determined the transportation system supports that decision and not the other way around. Do not say the region needs LRT and getting LRT means adding people to the region if that is not part of the vision. It may well be a totally different situation with Cleveland.

4. Issues and Findings

John Coscia told the Forum members that the Issues and Findings were captured in 32 slides and represented the Forum's work to date. It is presented in a distilled, compact format and covers a number of areas. This should be used as a reference and read when there is an opportunity. Some of the work from the Issues and Findings handout would be weaved in the Action Plan presentation.

5. Action Plan

By way of introduction Don Shanis, Deputy Director for Transportation Planning DVRPC told the Forum the Action Plan document was to be thought of as a draft statement and the final document will reflect some level of consensus of the group. It is partial in what it shows and from discussions there will be additions, deletions and changes. The document should be viewed as an umbrella not only looking for the little things in the region. This is a regional Forum and trying to develop a framework for moving forward, a framework for doing the right things and it should be considered in that light.

The presentation was in four sections. 1) What have we learned? 2) Where do we want to go? 3) How do we get there? 4) Next Steps.

The “what have we learned” section of the presentation included findings from the modeling process and the technical presentation given over the years in transit, land-use, trucks and municipal visions. The main lesson learned was that to get any noticeable improvement in congestion a four-pronged approach is necessary including transit improvements, highway improvements, land-use changes and TDM strategies.

Alison Miller, West Windsor Council President said there is a need to change land-use pattern. Legislation is needed to cover the expense of transferring people into a local jurisdiction that is not currently planning for more people. The information presented at the September Forum meeting showed an increase of population in West Windsor and less people everywhere else, to increase densities for transit. What incentives are being considered for West Windsor.

John Coscia said it is not yet know what the incentive package needs to look like but something needs to be presented to West Windsor for instance to make it a viable alternative.

Ms Miller said if major changes depend on the change in the pattern of development and the change depends on subsidizing West Windsor then step one should be legislative.

Marvin Reed said trend or non-trend all municipalities in the region face large increases in population and employment because that is the way it is zoned. If nothing is done there will be increase in congestion as presented. What tools are needed to forestall this from happening?

Paul Truban said the group had learned about other municipal plans, this was brought out in the municipal vision.

Phylis Marchand, Princeton Township’s Mayor said she had learned that no matter what is done or what is spent the future will not be ideal or perfect. Improvements, whatever they may be, a few people may notice some improvement in congestion levels but for the most part motorist will still be sitting in traffic.

Wendy Benchley said there exists a real opportunity for elected official to be more innovative in their approach. People are looking for more innovative, experimental approaches coming out of the Forum. We need a bigger toolbox, a bigger approach to what have we learned and not just go by the numbers.

Don Shanis replied the numbers do disguise a lot of human features.

Ms Benchley said TDM strategies were not given the infusion of money and importance. It cost a lot of money for them to succeed but roads also cost a lot of money to build.

Dave Schellinger said one of the things he learned in the “Do Nothing” scenario was there is a mass of development coming. West Windsor took a bold step in buying up

residential land in the township to stem that wave of development. Innovative things are not on the capacity or supply side of the equation. When Governor Whitman proposed using gasoline tax to preserve open space it got to the demand side of the equation that could be just as dynamic and powerful if the township did have the ability to employ that kind of technique.

Jon Edwards, Deputy Mayor of Hopewell Township said while he is in agreement with most of what was said, he regret that only half of the state plan is really being implemented at the Forum. While the development side has been discussed, the discussion failed to focus on the redevelopment side in Trenton. Look at broadening the group; its vision and approach. Try to find some creative ways within Mercer County and the entire region to employ a kind of transfer of development rights in the cities with advantages that can still come to our municipalities instead of creation of centers in our municipalities. Find ways to take advantage of infrastructure that exists in Trenton as opposed to doing everything that we are talking about doing in recreating that kind of infrastructure in our rural communities.

In the analysis of “where do we want to go” Don Shanis said since no scenario seem to optimize the situation and there are synergistic effect between all things some balance approach is needed that uses all the things we have talked about, and on top of that, innovative and creativity of the group. In the presentation Don said that comprehensive planning was needed which would encourage coordination of land-use and transportation planning. He then discussed how highways, transit, land-use and TDM strategies would help in where we want to go.

Jacqueline Alberts, West Windsor’s Council commented that we should not be advocating increasing the total population numbers just to get limited mass transit effect but take existing numbers and make more compact centers.

William Enslin said instead of looking at development as a government problem, we need to move out further and bring in other stakeholders, such as the private sector, who can influence and certainly have some responsibility.

Dianne Brake said to have a balance approach emphasize in each of the categories the need for a multi-modal approach.

Marvin Reed said one of the things he learned, is there has not been any comprehensive planning in the region. Central New Jersey has become a region on to itself and has municipalities that need to interact with each other and they did not have the planning mechanisms in the past to enable them to do that. We have succeeded by getting the Central Jersey Transportation Forum operating in order to provide us with the kind of focus we deserved and needed. The question is how do we continue to make this happen.

Wayne Bradley, Director of Planning NJTPA suggested the first bullet on the slide should be “to encourage coordination and interaction”. There as been interaction at the Forum, more than coordination it has been a sharing of development plans and zoning.

Wendy Benchley said in pursuing comprehensive planning it makes no sense not to include Trenton with the infrastructure, job base and employees that are available.

John Coscia said they are included as part of DVRPC region and do work with Mercer County Planning Department and the County Executive. He said the Forum should keep in mind that as geographic limits are expanded the work that needs to be done also increases.

Wendy Benchley said the reason Trenton needs to be brought in has to do with mass transit and the numbers are skewed because bringing people from Trenton to the job bases up the US 1 corridor has not been included. This would make a difference in the numbers.

Pam Mount, Lawrence Township Mayor said the analyses has only looked at one train station in a region that has three major train station that influence how people move around. The studies are therefore flawed to begin with. Lawrence objects to not being part of the process since it is a major thoroughfare.

Jon Edwards said in looking for innovative approaches there are many but they will involve including the capital city.

Marvin Reed said what is happening in central New Jersey is critical to what is happening in the state as a whole, and what is happening is due to the lack of comprehensive planning for the area. If the two existing MPOs can figure out how to do it that is fine, but if not, there is interest on both the representative and senatorial sides to make this its own MPO. It would keep our municipalities in the center and might include New Brunswick and Trenton. It has come to the realization that the economic development and transportation development is swirling around us. Trenton and New Brunswick are peripheral, this is where the growth is occurring, here is where the jobs are moving. The employees are coming from Bucks County not from Trenton. That is what is causing the traffic in our towns, employees coming from Bucks County.

Alison Miller said one of the reason people from Trenton is not being hired is the bus service does not deliver them here in a timely fashion. We should not ignore the links to the capital city and should not ignore the jobs that are not the high paid but are the service and support jobs without which we could not have the high pay. We are inter-linked on a mega-level to Trenton and New Brunswick at both ends and a peak viable bus service from Trenton to employment centers in Route 1 corridor would be extremely valuable to the people and city.

In “how do we get there” the presentation dealt with specific tasks under comprehensive planning, transit, highway, land-use and TDM strategies. Under comprehensive planning the continuation of the Forum and the questions of source of continued funding and redefining the scope of its activities were discussed. Technical support was also discussed at this juncture. Transit initiatives that have been discussed at previous Forum meetings were re-introduced; initiate BRT study, West Trenton line and feeder services for Princeton Junction train station. With highways advancing existing projects, replacing bridges, ITS improvements on major roads and addressing the Millstone River capacity needs were discussed. The land-use initiatives included working with municipalities in a technical advisory and educational capacity.

Dianne Brake said the definition of the boundary should come after we have decided what we want to do. We do not want to undermine the work that has been done already by starting over with a new group. All the points made about the regional connection are valid whether or not we need more we can do both things without expanding to the point where a new MPO has to be created.

John Coscia said there is a window of opportunity for elected officials. There is a need to take this opportunity and continue the work and do the things you want to do and get out of the situation you are in. DVRPC is very pleased and thinks it is very meaningful and will continue the work if that is what the Forum wants. There are many things that could be done. For example, this could be created as a separate board that would meet and send recommendation to DVRPC and NJTPA’s board. But the most important thing is to move ahead and not abandon this type of work.

Peter Bilton, Greater Mercer TMA suggested, the Forum or townships need to include developers in the planning process and not bring them in later. Marvin Reed said a number of municipalities at the table are engaged in changing their land-use codes or challenging developments that were approved years ago which in hindsight were not necessarily wise development. When we get into the question of how to change land-use municipalities cannot make changes. Municipalities cannot do it alone. The litigation, when challenged, becomes very expensive and frightening, and as a result municipalities tend not to challenge developers. It is not necessarily a lack of will. If municipalities really want to change land-use the State Planning Commission with whatever mechanism it has needs to step up to the plate and be supportive because they motivate the municipalities and when municipalities step out and do it they are left hanging out on a branch.

Wendy Benchley suggested there really needs to be a political process. The legislature and governor needs to be on board. We need the tools and the money to change land-use.

Louise Wilson, Montgomery Township Council said it needs to be made clear to those at the state level, assembly and senate, that we have the mandate to be making these changes and that the taxpayers want this to happen. They are beginning to understand

the potential pay off for investment in planning. The residents of Montgomery have begun to understand how important it is to integrate land-use and transportation planning and the Forum as a coalition needs to make that connection for the legislators. We have a mandate and it is time for them to give us the tools that we need.

Martin Robins, Director of Rutgers Transportation Planning Institute said the question everyone is wrestling with is “what is it that really prevents us from doing some more to make this situation some what manageable”. We have traveled so far down the road, but we can do something. It cannot be done on the edges, the entire structure has to be looked at and fiscal planning needs to be added because it is easily ignored. This can be made into a showcase region; we need to re-examine why things have happened and bend the trends and change things and provide a model for areas that have not yet gone through twenty-five years of change. It comes down to legislative change.

Dianne Brake said we should be in a “let’s do it” mode rather than more study, analysis, and what standing in our way because we do know what is standing in our way. If we do change those things that we know would we get more of what we want. We ask the question of how can we get there. We don’t have to do everything here. New Jersey Future and Coalition for Affordable Housing and Environment are statewide organizations also pressing for all the things we have identified as obstructing smart growth. It would be helpful to look at their agendas and possibly add to their voice. Mercer County got a smart growth grant and they will be addressing some of the things we have identified; some of this could be coordinated within the region. She went on to say that the Regional Planning Partnership is currently working on an Urban Growth Targets project looking at the capacity of Trenton to grow, and to figure how much of the regional growth can be absorbed in the city not only by the available infrastructure but also the citizens and what they want in terms of their vision and that has been a voice that has not been at the table.

Phylis Marchand said the municipalities in the region should be helping developers look in Trenton when they are approached to build more buildings in the region.

John Coscia said there are many reasons why developers are coming to this region and it is difficult to deflect them.

Robert Bzik said as we continue to bring some of those creative ideas forward we must understand that legislative change takes time. Somerset County is currently involved in updating three municipal management plans with regional centers and Burlington County is engaged in similar work.

Peter Cantu said he supports formalizing the regional planning process. While the Forum is good for a lot of reasons, bring people together and express new ideas, the conclusion of this Forum has not changed from those other studies in the past and

those have not been addressed. It begins with the legislative action that is required. What is missing is the formalization of the planning process. We may want to start at the county level, empowerment and coordination between the counties and greater strength within the county master plan. If that is not done, five years from now we will be back talking about the same problems we are talking about today.

John Coscia said, at DVRPC the commissioners have been advocating moving zoning review authority to the county level for those types of developments that have multi-municipal impact.

Alison Miller said, as an advocate of regional planning, what stops regional planning is the perception that regional planning means you all can tell me what to do in my town. This group should stay away from telling one town what to do. The group needs to have a plan for everybody and not just focus on building up West Windsor. The group needs to be respectful of the pressures West Windsor is under. West Windsor is looking into what to do at the train station Until the legislative tools of fiscal management to manage more people than our current master plan calls for are in our hands are we going to be able to move with any realism towards that scenario. Therefore be less specific in what the Action Plan calls for.

In pursuing the “next steps” the main issue was focusing on county and municipal transportation needs. Other issues included obtaining funding for continuing the Central Jersey Transportation Forum and initiating further analysis of BRT potential in the region.

Pete Rayner, Greater Mercer TMA suggested a list be made in generic terms of specific things that the Forum would like to take to the legislature as a group. Things that we can all agree on for example, transfer of development rights.

Wendy Benchley suggested as a main step a legislative committee be formed that develops this list with the cooperation of New Jersey Future and other organizations that have been working on this for years and then use political clout present in the room. This is a powerful group, we could invite the legislative leaders to come here and listen to us.

Shing Fu Hsueh, Mayor of West Windsor said this is a strong lobbying group if we can get organized. There is a need for action and getting things moving. Transportation ties to a number of other issues.

John Coscia said on December 5 DVRPC will have their annual Board Retreat. At the Retreat staff will be advocating, spending \$1/2 million per year in four New Jersey counties and providing direct grants to municipalities for all types of land-use/transportation work. DVRPC will be asking for applications and will be working closely with NJSOP and NJDOT to do a lot of the work.

George Ververides, Middlesex County Planning Director said that the two MPOs should work together on cross jurisdictional application because if it is done on a municipal by municipal basis it eliminates the regionalism which the Forum is trying to foster and we are back to ground zero.

Wayne Bradley told the group that the NJTPA differs from DVRPC in that NJTPA is strictly a transportation planning agency; they do not have a land-use function. NJTPA does have a grant program that provides money to counties for transportation planning. It may prove to be a hitch, but maybe they could find some way for this to work.

John Coscia said the two agencies would work together to make this a seamless process as against one split by the MPOs.

To summarize Mr Coscia said 1) We are going to continue to support individual projects that are on a separate by parallel track. Projects that have a life of their own and proceeding, will work on that path. 2) Get involved in additional work that needs to be done through the Central Jersey Transportation Forum as the advisory group such as BRT work and other new needs identified by the municipalities. 3) Obtain a capital program list of the costs involved for projects and the schedules they are on. 4) Bring together a small group of the Forum to talk about the Forum, its mission, geographic extent, its work and the kinds of things it should be doing. 5) Develop a sub-committee to begin framing a legislative agenda, examining and incorporating work done by others. Put this together to present to the Forum.

Bob Wolfe, Princeton Forrestal Center suggested that volunteers for the sub-committee make themselves known.

Mr Wolfe consented to chair the legislative committee.

The next meeting was tentatively set for February 22, 2002 at the Sarnoff Corporation in Princeton.