PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
RELATED TO DVRPC BOARD ACTION ITEMS

July 24, 2014

Agenda Item:

2a. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Action NJ14-32: Route 30, and Evesham Road Intersection Improvements, (DB #93263), Camden County

From: Leonard Fritz
County: Gloucester
Zip Code: 08094
Date Received: July 15, 2014
Comment/Question: These proposed improvements are long overdue. How soon will this actually be constructed? Thank you.

Response: Construction is scheduled to begin in the fall of 2014 and be completed by January 2016.

From: Joseph Russell
County:
Zip Code:
Date Received: July 15, 2014
Comment/Question: I grew up just a few miles from this part of Route 30 and have driven on it a countless number of times. While I understand that it is frustrating to be stuck behind someone turning left, the changes described in this action item will turn a roadway that is today merely busy into an extremely pedestrian unfriendly "stroad", a "street/road hybrid that, besides being a very dangerous environment (yes, it is ridiculously dangerous to mix high speed highway geometric design with pedestrians, bikers and turning traffic), are enormously expensive to build and, ultimately, financially unproductive" (more at http://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2013/3/4/the-stroad.html#.U8UwuY1dXaY).

Turning this already fast road into an even faster, wider, and more dangerous road for pedestrians is wrong. It reflects the antiquated, outdated way of thinking about our communities that made them sprawling nightmares that necessitated car dependency in the first place. This isn't the kind of sustainable development that older, dense areas need to remain viable for the future, nor does it reflect the "complete streets" ideal contained in the Camden County master plan.

The imperative to foster walkability in New Jersey's extremely car-dependent suburban environment is driven home at this very intersection by the fact that there is a recently-built mixed use "town center" style development called CooperTowne Village a short walk from this intersection. Millennials like myself have sent the signal that we're driving less and choosing where to live based on walkability, retail density, and access to public transportation, and developers have listened. The fact that a previously suburban-style, drive-in retail center now hosts a mix of retail and residential shows that we're slowly moving on from a car-only mentality. Unfortunately, the New Jersey DOT neither understands nor cares about this, seeing the throughput of cars as their only metric for success. They aren't concerned with making New Jersey's communities nice places to live.

I implore you, do not accept this request to spend nearly $7 million making South Jersey even more unwalkable than it already is. As the regional planning commission, I'm sure you understand that this isn't the way forward into the 21st century. We should be working to undo the bad choices of the past and helping to turn our suburban towns into spaces for everyone, not just cars. If this project succeeds, it will only alienate future South Jerseyans who choose not to drive cars to every single place in their lives.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Response: The Route 30 Evesham Road Intersection project will improve both vehicular safety and pedestrian safety. Sidewalks and crosswalks will be upgraded as follows:

- Pedestrian push-buttons and "walk" signs with countdown timers will be installed
- Pedestrians in the crosswalk will be protected from conflicts with the left turns
- Right Turn on Red will be prohibited, reducing conflicts

More specifically, regarding pedestrian safety, in the existing condition, left turns are uncontrolled and drivers are allowed to make their turn anytime during a green traffic signal. The drivers' attention is divided between oncoming traffic and pedestrians in the crosswalks leading to potential hazard. Under the proposed project, pedestrian "walk" signals will be timed to prevent drivers making left turns when pedestrians are crossing. Pedestrians in the crosswalk will be protected from conflicts with the left turns, therefore enhancing pedestrian safety. In addition:

- Speed Limit will not change. It is 40 mph now and will remain 40 mph after the project.
- Sidewalks will be replaced with six foot-wide sidewalks on Route 30, which will be new, smooth and even and comply with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements
- Handicapped ramps will be constructed at all side streets and driveways. Detectable warning surfaces and crosswalks will be installed on the ramps at the side street intersections. Handicapped ramps will comply with requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and pedestrian push-buttons will also comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act

2b. <u>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Action NJ14-33: Burlington County Centerline Safety Enhancement Project, 2014, (DB# 04314), Burlington County</u>

From: Cyndi Steiner
County: New Jersey
Zip Code: 07043
Date Received: July 14, 2014
Comment/Question: The New Jersey Bike & Walk Coalition opposes centerline rumble strips on roads that lack bike lanes or usable four foot shoulders. Section 4.5.2 of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities notes that "A potential concern for centerline rumble strips is that the rumble strips may lead motorists to shy away from the centerline and move closer to the bicyclists riding near the edgeline of the travel lane." The guide also suggests that the use of an inverted profile (auditory-vibratory) centerline marking may be more conducive should motorists need to cross the centerline

to pass bicyclists. This type of treatment may also have the benefit of better compliance for New Jersey's "Move Over" passing law. We strongly support all traffic crash reduction measures including rumble strips as long as they do not compromise the safety and comfort of bicyclists and pedestrians.

Response: The *2012 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 4th Edition* states the following with regard to centerline rumble strips:

> "A potential concern with centerline rumble strips is that the rumble strips may lead motorists to shy away from the centerline and move closer to bicyclists riding near the outside edge of the travel lane, leaving less lateral separation between a bicyclist and a motor vehicle during passing maneuvers. Where centerline rumble strips are used, shoulder rumble strips should be used only where a full-width paved shoulder of 6 ft. or more is provided…"

This quote taken from AASHTO by the Coalition relates to the combined use of both centerline rumble strips and shoulder rumble strips along a section of road. The County is NOT proposing the installation of any shoulder rumble strips under this project.

In addition, for the construction of this project, Burlington County is considering the use of a new type of rumble strip which has a sinusoidal profile. A test area is currently scheduled for installation next month and will be evaluated by the County Engineer's Office to determine if this type of rumble strip is more conducive to motorists and bicyclists who need to cross the centerline.

From: John Boyle
County: Pennsylvania
Zip Code: 19102
Date Received: July 14, 2014
Comment/Question: Comments from the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia: We (BCGP) oppose centerline rumble strips on roads that lack bike lanes or usable four foot shoulders. Section 4.5.2 of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities notes that "A potential concern for centerline rumble strips is that the rumble strips may lead motorists to shy away from the centerline and move closer to the bicyclists riding near the edgeline of the travel lane." The guide also suggest the use of an inverted profile (auditory-vibratory) centerline marking may be more conducive should motorists need to cross the centerline to pass bicyclists. This type of treatment may also have the benefit of better compliance for New Jersey's "Move Over" passing law. We strongly support all traffic crash reduction measures including rumble strips as long as they do not compromise the safety and comfort of bicyclists and pedestrians.

Response: See above response.