



ROUTE 18
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

**COMMUNITY
PARTNERING TEAM**

CITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT NO. 4

PROJECT: ROUTE 18 - Section 2F, 7E, and 11H
City of New Brunswick
Middlesex County, New Jersey

PLACE: Conference Room 3C
New Jersey Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Avenue, P.O. Box 600
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0600

DATE: May 10, 2002

DATE OF REPORT: May 13, 2002

SUBJECT: Steering Committee

ATTENDEES:

Mr. Steve Lavelle	(SL)	New Jersey Department of Transportation	609-530-3762
Mr. William Birch	(WB)	New Jersey Department of Transportation	609-530-3003
Mr. Stephen Mikulak	(SM)	New Jersey Department of Transportation	609-530-6558
Mr. Young Kim (YK)		Federal Highway Administration	609-637-4233
Mr. Paul Nowicki	(PN)	Gannett Fleming, Inc.	908-755-0040
Mr. Darryl Johnson	(DJ)	Gannett Fleming, Inc.	908-755-0040
Mr. Jeff Grob	(JG)	Vollmer Associates	212-366-5600

SUMMARY:

This periodic meeting was to evaluate project issues in order to determine the Community Partnering Team and CPT Group schedule and agenda items.



POINTS OF DISCUSSION:

1. (SM) is sitting in for Mr. William Cochran. Any actions required by (SM) will be coordinated through Mr. Cochran.
2. (SL) provided an overview of the Consultant Agreement Modification status for initial design and asked (PN) to discuss the project progress.
3. (PN) overviewed the following items:
 - a. The final geometry is on schedule for completion by end of May.
 - b. The preliminary structures designs are on schedule for completion by the end of July.
 - c. The preliminary ROW is on schedule for completion by the end of July.
 - d. The Traffic Impact Report is on schedule for completion by the end of July.
 - e. The preliminary ITS design is on schedule for completion by the end of July.
 - f. The Utility Checklists are on schedule for completion by the end of July.
 - g. The tentative needs for the Community Partnering Team is for the groups to have a second meeting by late May, full CPT meeting by late June/early July, and a Public Information Center (organized as a Public Hearing) by September. (PN) summarized by stating that input for alternatives regarding noise walls, retaining walls, and corridor aesthetics will determine meeting sequence and schedule.
4. (SL) further added that completion of Initial Design is scheduled for March 2003, followed by ROW authorization, and an award by June 2004.
5. (YK) asked if a public hearing is required for the noise walls. (SL) recalled that it was, but (WB) will verify to (YK). ACTION
6. (YK) asked how many ROW parcels the project has. (DJ) stated 40 are anticipated to date. (YK) then asked how many of those parcels are total takes. (PN) stated 3 are anticipated to date.
7. (YK) asked if there is enough time for ROW acquisition. (SL) stated yes, but the schedule will be accelerated.
8. (SL) asked (YK) if he had received a copy of the CPT Mtg. No. 14 minutes. (YK) said yes.
9. (SL) asked if the minutes from the two recent Group meetings (Boyd Park and Corridor Aesthetics) were complete. (DJ) stated that the minutes were forwarded to Martine Culbertson for distribution.
10. (SL) asked if the next group meetings were scheduled. (DJ) stated that the Group minutes did state tentative dates, but Martine has not provided confirmed dates/times/places. ACTION
11. (YK) asked about bikeway concept/scope along Route 18 north of Route 27 and the underpass at Route 27. (PN) stated that in the current scope, the bikeway north of Route 27 will be repaved only, and the underpass will be replaced with a box structure.
12. (SL) stated that emphasis needs to be placed on minimizing any design rework resulting from the CPT. Therefore, the CPT must provide input, coordinated with the design schedule. (YK) agreed.
13. (SL) provided an overview to the ongoing developments in New Brunswick and potential risks to the project. (SL) further stated that the City and New Brunswick Development Corporation must be more involved to help ensure that developments do not cause adverse impact to the Preferred Alternative or the design schedule such as that happening on New Street. (SL) directed (SM) to set up a meeting with the Mayor (initially without New Brunswick Development Corporation) to discuss concerns as soon as possible. ACTION
14. (SL) asked if the project is in English. (WB) said no as issue was resolved as part of the FSD Package preparation in December 2001. (SL) concurred that project design will be developed in metric, but community presentation graphics will be expressed in US Customary units.
15. (SL) opened discussion on when the next full CPT meeting should be scheduled. (SL) is considering June. (JG) suggested that more Group meetings are necessary before the next CPT meeting. (PN) summarized the consultant team's suggestions that subsequent to the first step which was a discussion on the retaining walls and their treatments, the next step should be to broach the bridge concepts, then assemble a complete coordinated structural concept for Group presentation, and finish with urban design treatments, all before the next CPT. (PN) expressed that the next CPT should be in late June, but more likely early July to allow the Groups to work on these items.

16. (JG) added that he is waiting for the Group meeting minutes to finalize the direction and prepare for the next meeting. (SL) asked that (PN) email the draft minutes from the Corridor Aesthetics Group and for (DJ) to email the Boyd Park Group minutes to Martine Culbertson. ACTION
17. (SL) emphasized that the schedule must be set during the Group meeting and that the Group Coordinators must help maintain schedule by prioritizing the issues for discussion.
18. (WB) stated that we need to have State House approval to sponsor the Boyd Park Extension transfer.
19. (SL) asked (PN) to review issues that should be considered with respect to a Group's function.
 - a. (PN) posed the question of whether the CPT should facilitate and refine the scope, or alter the project scope as the design develops.
 - b. (PN) stated that the SMEs need to be involved with design/scope issues and posed the question of whether they should be involved prior to meeting with the Groups, or should they be brought in at the same time that the Groups meet? (PN) stated that we typically meet with the SMEs prior to meeting with other stakeholders to coordinate owner interests/concerns/direction.
 - c. With respect to the Design Development Group and the Boyd Park Group, (DJ) emphasized the importance of identifying what issues the City controls or must make a decision on, how the City government will be formally approached with the issues, who will ultimately make the decision on an issue, and the schedule on when that decision could be made (or desired).
 - d. (SL) suggested that the Mayor's office be considered to include as a Steering Committee member.
 - e. (SL) directed (SM) to set up a meeting with the Mayor's office immediately and for (PN) to create an issues list for resolution with the City. (SL) further directed that the issues regard previous CPT meetings and meetings with the Mayor. ACTION
 - f. (YK) asked that the design schedule reflect the City's timeframes/schedule.
20. (WB) indicated that a letter was received from the attorney representing Tov Manor requesting a meeting to discuss the use of their street if Phelps Avenue were to be closed. The meeting was requested for 5-21-02. (WB) will confirm meeting date/time and involvement by Access Bureau. ACTION
21. (SL) asked that a government officials briefing be scheduled. ACTION
22. (JG) stated that he will need to identify, develop, and gain consensus on the Boyd Park issues.
23. (SL) stated that jurisdictional issue resolution be planned. (DJ) added that the jurisdictional issues may be broached in order to make a final decision regarding corridor aesthetic elements of walls and bridges, lighting, and landscaping. (SL) noted that Roy Gustavson will be retiring and that his replacement be identified for involvement as soon as possible.
24. (SL) asked if SMEs should be involved in the CPT Group meetings. (PN) said yes, but when design elements are on the agenda. (SL) suggested that Martine Culbertson send out a notice to the SMEs of their impending involvement with the CPT. ACTION
25. (DJ) noted that the design team will need the City to open existing manholes within the next 2 weeks.
26. (SL) directed that a primary point of contact be established for all the City issues. This is to be coordinated in the meeting with the Mayor.
27. (SL) asked if the project model is current. (PN) said that other than minor differences, it is current. (SL) directed that the model be updated prior to the Public Information Center in September and that (DJ) add expenses to the Initial Design Price Proposal. ACTION
28. (SL) asked why the model is not being used. (PN) said that model is not easily portable.
29. (JG) stated that awareness by the CPT Group of the size and location of the walls was a primary goal of the last meeting. (JG) felt that awareness was gaining.
30. (SL) asked if Police, Fire, and EMS services have been regarded in design. Examples provided were to regard fencing or walling off of areas, signage, and emergency boxes. (SL) stated that planning of these items must be regarded.
31. (WB) asked if signal preemption is desired by the City.
32. (SL) directed (PN) to review the CPT Meeting No. 14 issues for items posing a high risk to the design. Items are to be listed and prioritized. ACTION
33. (SL) asked for a briefing of the upcoming structures concept meeting on 5-13-02. (PN) stated that the meeting is to have agreement with NJDOT as to the structure concepts under evaluation which will

eventually be presented to the CPT. (DJ) stated that it is important to have Project Management present while the concepts are being discussed with structures. (PN) stated that the results of the meeting should be presented to the Steering Committee prior to going to the CPT Group for discussion. (JG) will be present at the structures meeting. (SL) suggested that NJDOT Landscaping be invited. ACTION 34. (SL) asked what consideration has been given to relocating utilities underground. (PN) explained that the design team is considering the possibility, but the concepts are still in development.

We believe the foregoing to be an accurate summary of discussions and related decisions. We would appreciate notification of exceptions or corrections to the minutes within three (3) working days of receipt. Without notification, we will consider these minutes to be record of fact.

Darryl Johnson

cc: Attendees
36093.30
Chrono