RECORD OF DECISION

FOR

PENNS NECK AREA EIS
ROUTE 1 SECTION 2S AND 3J
WEST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP,
MERCER COUNTY, N.J.
AND
PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP,
MIDDLESEX COUNTY, N.J.
FEDERAL PROJECT No. STP-IXAF-33(131)

DECISION

The Selected Alternative, which is referred to in the FEIS as Alternative D.2.A (Figure 2-5), includes the following major components:

- Route 1 in-a-cut at Washington Road with Washington Road crossing over Route 1 at its existing grade and a new single-point interchange at Washington Road;
- A new grade-separated single-point interchange in the vicinity of Harrison Street, located south of the PSE&G substation;
- A new westside connector road running parallel to Lower Harrison Street, connecting the new Harrison Street interchange with existing Harrison Street in the vicinity of the D&R Canal crossing;
- A one way frontage road system on both sides of Route 1 between Washington Road and the new Harrison Street interchange, with two travel lanes in each direction; and
- A Vaughn Drive connector road located west of existing Station Drive, connecting Washington Road and existing Vaughn Drive.

In addition, the intersections of Fisher Place, Varsity Avenue, Lower Harrison Street and Eden Way with Route 1 would be modified to include a cul-de-sac at Route 1. Finally,

the driveway providing access to the Sarnoff property at existing Harrison Street would be relocated to the south to connect with the new Harrison Street interchange.

Route 1 Access at Harrison Street
The Selected Alternative would provide direct access to and from Route 1 via the westside connector road and new Harrison Street interchange.

Route 1 Access at Washington Road
The Selected Alternative would provide direct access to Route 1 southbound and from Route 1 northbound. Indirect access to Route 1 northbound would be provided via the eastern frontage road and the new Harrison Street interchange. Indirect access from Route 1 southbound to Washington Road would be provided via the new Harrison Street interchange and the western road.

The Selected Alternative is identified as the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D.2.A) in the FEIS. For a detailed description and graphic see the FEIS.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Penns Neck Area EIS considered a wide range of potential actions to meet the project purpose and need and address the project goals and objectives. This section describes the range of actions considered and indicates which actions were advanced for analysis in the EIS. A complete summary of the actions considered appears in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. The following table summarizes the actions considered and the disposition of each action.

Summary of Actions Considered in FEIS

Action Considered	Disposition
No-Action	As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Penns Neck Area EIS includes consideration of a No-Action Alternative. This "do-nothing alternative" is included as the benchmark alternative against which all "action" alternatives will be compared.
Travel Demand Management	A variety of TDM strategies were advanced as complementary strategies included in the proposed EIS Commute Options package incorporated as a part of each action alternative (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4).
Transit – Creation of a Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit system	This action was examined as part of a concurrent planning study conducted by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission for the Central Jersey Transportation Forum (CJTF) and in partnership with NJ TRANSIT. The study determined that construction of a LRT/BRT system would not significantly improve traffic congestion in the Penns Neck area. This action was eliminated from further analysis in the Penns Neck Area EIS, but study of a BRT system has been advanced separately.
Transit – Changes to the NJ TRANSIT rail service	A variety of rail service changes were considered, including more frequent reverse peak service to Princeton Junction station; new rail stations in Plainsboro and/or South Brunswick; additional Amtrak commuter rail service to the Hamilton station; and changes to the Dinky service between Princeton Junction and Princeton Borough. Based on input from NJ TRANSIT, it was determined that these actions were either under investigation as part of other concurrent studies or the project purpose could be more efficiently addressed through enhanced/expanded use of shuttles/jitneys.
Transit – Modification to existing bus services and the creation of a comprehensive jitney/shuttle system	These actions were advanced as complementary strategies included in the proposed EIS Commute Options package incorporated as a part of each action alternative.
Various road-based capacity improvements	A variety of road-based actions were advanced for further consideration in the alternatives development process. In most cases, individual road-based actions were combined into the alternatives considered in the EIS. Chapter 2 of the FEIS provides a complete description of the alternatives development process.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES EXAMINED IN FEIS

Nineteen action alternatives and the no-action alternative are considered in the EIS. The alternatives are presented in seven groupings, lettered A-G, and are best understood based on the components included in each. A narrative description of the major components and distinguishing features of each alternative is presented below. Chapter 2 of the FEIS includes maps and detailed descriptions of the physical and circulation characteristics of the 19 alternatives.

Major Components and Distinguishing Features

Route 1 at-grade

This component would maintain Route 1 at its existing grade in the Penns Neck area with three travel lanes in each direction and safety shoulders. Under some alternatives, Route 1 would remain on its existing alignment. In others, the alignment of Route 1 would shift slightly to the west. Under most alternatives, the Penns Neck area traffic signals would be removed. Finally, under all of the alternatives that include this component, the Route 1 bridge over the Millstone River would be replaced.

Route 1 in-a-cut

This component would place Route 1 below grade at Washington Road and shift its alignment slightly to the west. Washington Road would remain at its existing grade and remain open to east-west traffic. Route 1 would consist of three travel lanes in each direction, auxiliary lanes, as needed, and safety shoulders. In addition, the Route 1 bridge over the Millstone River would be replaced under all of the alternatives that include this component.

Frontage Roads

This component would include the construction of either two one-way frontage roads running parallel to Route 1 between Harrison Street and Washington Road on the east and west sides of Route 1, or one two-way frontage road running parallel to Route 1 on the west side. The frontage roads would collect traffic from the local roadway network and filter it onto the highway with Route 1 at-grade or in-a-cut.

East-side Connector (ESC) Road

This component would include the construction of a connector road east of Route 1 between CR 571 in Princeton Junction and a new grade-separated interchange on Route 1 located between Harrison Street and Fisher Place. The connector road would traverse the Sarnoff property. There are three potential ESC road alignments:

- **ESC 1** – This alignment would run along the northerly edge of the Sarnoff property adjacent to the Millstone River.
- **ESC 2** – This alignment would run parallel to but south of ESC 1 in the vicinity of the northerly circulation road included on the approved Sarnoff General Development Plan.

- **ESC 3** – This alignment would run along the southerly edge of the Sarnoff property in the vicinity of the southerly circulation road included on the approved Sarnoff General Development Plan. This alignment is adjacent to the Penns Neck neighborhood.

For the purpose of environmental and traffic analyses, the ESC road was analyzed as a 4-lane roadway that includes two 11-foot travel lanes in each direction, a 5-foot shoulder striped as a bicycle lane, and a 10-foot landscaped median. This cross-section represents a "worst-case" environmental footprint.

West-side Connector (WSC) Road

This component would include the construction of a connector road west of Route 1 between a new grade-separated interchange on Route 1 and Harrison Street, Washington Road or both. Some alternatives would also provide a connector road between Washington Road and Alexander Road on an alignment that connects with Canal Pointe Boulevard. All WSC roads would include one 11-foot travel lane with a 4-foot shoulder striped as a bicycle lane in each direction.

Vaughn Drive Connector (VDC) Road

This component would extend existing Vaughn Drive north from its current terminus in the Princeton Junction train station parking lot to Washington Road (County Route 571) in the vicinity of the NEC rail line bridge in Princeton Junction. The road would include one 11-foot travel lane and an eight-foot shoulder striped as a bicycle lane in each direction and a 10-foot landscaped median in some segments. There are three potential VDC road alignments:

- **VDC 1** - This easternmost alignment would parallel the NEC rail line and use the right-of-way of existing Station Drive and parking lot circulation roads. It would require a new at-grade crossing of the Dinky rail line or reconfiguration of the Princeton Junction/Dinky station operations.

- **VDC 2** – This alignment would be located just west of the Princeton Junction Train Station and would traverse a small office complex adjacent to Station Drive and station parking lots before connecting with existing Vaughn Drive. The alignment would utilize the existing at-grade crossing of the Dinky rail line, which connects station area parking lots.

- **VDC 3** – Located west of VDC 2, this alignment would use an existing driveway between two small office complexes and would travel through station parking lots before connecting with existing Vaughn Drive. This alignment would utilize the existing at-grade crossing of the Dinky rail line, which connects station area parking lots.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Process of Selecting a Preferred Alternative

As described above, 19 action alternatives were examined in the DEIS. However, as permitted under NEPA and its implementing regulations, the DEIS did not identify a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was selected after the NJDOT considered all of the data and information presented in the DEIS and the public input received throughout the DEIS process, including agency comments and the numerous comments received from the public on the DEIS during the public comment period.

Of those providing comments on the DEIS, the vast majority expressed support or opposition for a specific alternative or series of alternatives and included reasons for the stated position. The D-series alternatives, and specifically Alternative D.2, received the most support from the public and various state and federal agencies that commented on the DEIS. In addition, many of those providing comments expressed support or opposition for particular components of the alternatives (e.g., Route 1 in-a-cut, ESC road or VDC road).

Based on a comprehensive review of the data on all 19 of the action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative and the nature and extent of the agency and public comment received on the alternatives and potential impacts, consideration was narrowed to two action alternatives, Alternatives D which included an ESC road and D.2 which did not. Once the field of action alternatives was narrowed to two and based on the comments received on the DEIS, additional, more detailed, engineering and traffic simulation modeling studies were completed to facilitate the process of selecting a Preferred Alternative. These studies are documented in Chapter 2 of the FEIS and its appendices.

Agency and public comments and the findings of these additional traffic and engineering studies helped to inform the selection of D.2 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative, which is referred to in the FEIS as Alternative D.2.A (Figure 2-5), is substantially similar to Alternative D.2, with several minor engineering refinements.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

Section 1505.2(b) of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations on implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the agency preparing an EIS to identify an "environmentally preferable alternative." As defined in the regulations, the "environmentally preferable alternative" is the alternative that "will promote the national environmental policy" expressed in NEPA's section 101. CEQ guidance documents state that "ordinarily this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources."

Agency and public comments and the findings of the EIS technical studies documented in the DEIS informed the selection of the Preferred Alternative (D.2.A) as the "environmentally preferable alternative." As detailed in the FEIS, and consistent with the project goals and objectives, the Preferred Alternative would provide a reasonable level

of transportation benefit, while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the biological and physical environment. Specifically, the Preferred Alternative would:

- Provide system-wide congestion relief in the core study area as measured by vehicle hours traveled, vehicle hours traveled under congested conditions and vehicle miles traveled under congested conditions;
- Improve the flow of traffic on Route 1, resulting in shorter travel times in both the north and southbound directions;
- Improve the flow of traffic on east-west routes, resulting in shorter east-west travel times and significantly reducing traffic delays on east-west routes crossing Route 1 from more than 16 minutes under the No-Action Alternative to one minute or less under the Preferred Alternative;
- Maintain an equitable balance of traffic on east-west routes, on both sides of Route 1, substantially consistent with the distribution of traffic that exists today;
- Reduce traffic on residential streets in most parts of the core study area;
- Minimize potential wetland and floodplain impacts;
- Minimize habitat fragmentation and avoid disturbance of potential habitat for the threatened long-eared owl, located adjacent to the Little Bear Brook on the Sarnoff property;
- Minimize impacts to parks and natural areas, including the D&R Canal State Park, Little Bear Brook and the Millstone River corridor;
- Reduce potential pollutant impacts on the Millstone River from new road surfaces;
- Avoid disturbance to National Register eligible archeological sites located adjacent to the Little Bear Brook and Millstone River;
- Minimize disturbance to other National Register listed and eligible historic resources;
- Avoid residential displacements and, subject to the caveat below, minimize adverse impacts to residential neighborhoods;
- Enhance vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access and safety to schools and other community facilities located within the core study area; and
- Minimize business displacements and enhance vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access and safety to institutions and businesses in the study area.

As noted, the Selected Alternative is identified as the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D.2.A) in the FEIS and is also the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. It is acknowledged that the Selected Alternative does not provide the same measure of traffic relief on Washington Road through the Penns Neck neighborhood as Alternative D. Although the number of vehicles traversing Washington Road through the Penns Neck neighborhood will only be somewhat reduced (a 9% reduction or approximately 225 fewer vehicles during the AM peak hour compared to the No-Action Alternative), congested conditions will be improved.

VALUES CONSIDERED

NJDOT issued a Draft EA for the Route U.S. 1/Penns Neck Area Improvements in September 2000. The Draft EA met with significant opposition from some local officials as well as various community and environmental groups. In November 2000, then Governor Christine Todd Whitman ordered that a full EIS be prepared. In March 2001, NJDOT initiated this EIS process to reassess and redefine the problem of mobility in the Penns Neck Area and its environs and to examine a full range of possible actions and alternatives to address Penns Neck area traffic congestion and mobility constraints.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OVERVIEW

The agency coordination and public involvement program for the Penns Neck Area EIS, which was comprehensive and extensive, was implemented throughout the 24-month scoping and EIS process. It was developed in full compliance with federal public involvement regulations and significantly exceeded NEPA requirements for preparation of an EIS. It was specifically designed as an open and ongoing process aimed at establishing and maintaining effective dialogue between interested and involved constituencies, stakeholders and public agencies.

The program's principal objective was to facilitate open lines of communication and information-sharing, active engagement, and maximum participation of the public throughout the scoping, strategy screening, alternatives evaluation, and impact analysis phases of the EIS process. This was achieved through a multi-faceted cooperative approach that involved municipal, state, regional and federal agencies, as well as a broad spectrum of interested publics.

Specific program elements included: stakeholder interviews, small group listening sessions/meetings, large group forums, project website and six document repositories. A central element of the program involved the convening of the Partners' Roundtable Advisory Committee. The Roundtable, which met 35 times during preparation of the Draft EIS, was composed of community partners from the public, private and nonprofit sectors. Its 32 members represented citizens groups, business organizations and stakeholders; the governments of West Windsor Township, Princeton Township, Princeton Borough, Plainsboro Township, Mercer County and Middlesex County; transportation advocacy groups; FHWA; DVRPC; NJDOT; and other State agencies. All Roundtable meetings were open to the public and, at most meetings, members of the public participated fully in discussions.

PROJECT GOALS

The following goals were developed based on public input received during the EIS scoping process and with significant input from the Partners' Roundtable Advisory Committee:

- For all modes of transportation, improve access, mobility and safety and reduce congestion.
- Protect and enhance the environment and natural resources.
- Protect and enhance natural areas, parks and open space.
- Protect and enhance historic and archeological resources.
- Protect and enhance the integrity of residential neighborhoods.
- Maintain the viability of institutional and business communities
- Recognize the interrelationships between land use and transportation.
- Provide an open, inclusive, transparent and responsive EIS process.
- Provide a proactive, comprehensive and ongoing public participation program.

A complete list of project goals and objectives is presented in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

As detailed in the FEIS, and consistent with the project goals and objectives, the Selected Alternative would provide a reasonable level of transportation benefit, while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the biological and physical environment.

SECTION 4(F)

The Selected Alternative must comply with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470f), the 1974 Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, and Section 4(f) of the 1966 United States Department of Transportation Act. To comply with these regulations, adverse impacts which cannot be avoided must be adequately mitigated. Mitigation for unavoidable impacts to cultural resources has been identified through Section 106 consultation and included as an environmental commitment in this FEIS/Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 5.6).

A total of 16 Section 4(f) properties are addressed in the FEIS. The following is a list of the properties:

- Aqueduct Mills Historic District (National Register (NR) eligible 12/20/88)
- Aqueduct Mills Historic District Extension (NR eligible 7/8/98
- Covenhoven-Silvers-Logan House (NR eligible 7/8/98)
- David S. Voorhees House
- Delaware and Raritan Canal Historic District[1] (NR listed 5/11/75)
- Lake Carnegie Historic District (NR listed 6/28/90)
- Penns Neck Cemetery (NR eligible 3/10/97)

[1] The D&R Canal Historic District is also the D&R Canal State Park.

- Pennsylvania Railroad Historic District[2]
- Penns Neck Baptist Church (NR listed 12/28/98)
- Princeton Operating Station (AT&T Building)(NR eligible 7/8/98)
- RCA Laboratories (Sarnoff Corporation) (NR Eligible 01/03)
- Washington Road Elm Allee (NR eligible 01/18/99)
- Archeological Site 28Me2
- Archeological Site 28Me23
- Archeological Site 28Me86
- Archeological Site 28Me291

Consultation comments from the NJ SHPO and consulting parties on the matter of these properties are provided in Appendix D of the FEIS. Continuing consultation comments on the FEIS were received from the NJ SHPO. (See attached letter dated 2/9/05). The Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission participated in the Partners' Roundtable Advisory meetings, the documentation for which is provided in Section 7 of the FEIS.

The Selected Alternative would use portions of two (2) Section 4(f) properties: the Aqueduct Mills Historic District and the Washington Road Elm Allee.

Aqueduct Mills Historic District

Aqueduct Mills is the site of the earlier of the two principal gristmill locations within West Windsor Township. The first mill, which may have been constructed as early as the 1730s, was purchased by Jacob Scudder in 1749. The significance of this historic district results from its identity as a small crossroads community [located at the junction of Plainsboro-Kingston Road and the Old Trenton to New Brunswick Stage Road] that provided a focus for the surrounding agricultural properties once the mills fell into disuse. Thus, its location is a key defining characteristic. Archeological remains resulting from the construction and use of two mills may be present. The 1834 aqueduct carrying the Delaware and Raritan Canal over the confluence of the Millstone River and Stony Brook; a dry laid stone wall at the corner of Mapleton Road and Route 1; and the18th and 19th century residences that retain interior and exterior architectural integrity define this historic district (National Register Eligible, NJ SHPO Opinion: 12/20/88).

The Selected Alternative would widen Route 1 from the Mapleton Road intersection by 12 feet on either side of the highway. Widening Route 1 would require acquisition of property from the District at the intersection of Mapleton Road and Route 1, and would require removal of a key contributing element: a dry-laid stone wall. The Section 106 opinion of effect is an **adverse effect**. The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in an environmental commitment to undertake the following mitigation:

1. During final design, NJDOT and its consultants will, to the maximum degree feasible, minimize taking of right-of-way from the historic district.

2 The Pennsylvania Railroad Historic District includes the D&R Canal Bridge that was listed separately in the DEIS.

2. NJDOT and its consultants will develop a plan to move and reconstruct the stone wall on the Route 1 margin of the district. The plan will provide for the use of highly skilled stonemasons and for the construction of sample or test panels for approval by the NJ SHPO, FHWA, and others as appropriate prior to initiating any activities that may diminish the integrity of the historic stone wall. Criteria for the selection of stonemasons will be developed in consultation with the NJ SHPO. Additionally, NJDOT and its consultant will explore both the feasibility and desirability of including appropriate protective measures for the wall. The results of this evaluation will be discussed with the NJ SHPO and documented in a memo to record. If incorporation of such measures into the plans and specifications for the project is determined appropriate, the plans and specifications will be submitted to the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group for review and comment, and will be made available to the other consulting parties and the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers.

3. During final design, NJDOT and/or its consultants will consult with residents of both the Aqueduct Mills Historic District and those living in the Extension of the district to determine the appropriateness of erecting commemorative perimeter or interpretive signs for the district. If there is support from the community, representatives will be invited to consult with the NJDOT and the NJ SHPO on the design and locations of the signs. A plan showing the locations, design and information to be shown on the signs will be submitted to the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group for review and comment.

Considering this information in the context of the Section 4(f) regulations, a use of the Aqueduct Mills Historic District will occur as a result of implementing the Selected Alternative. As a use would occur, the Section 4(f) regulations are applicable to the Aqueduct Mills Historic District.

Washington Road Elm Allée

An allée of American elms lines a straight segment of Washington Road between the Penns Neck Circle (the intersection of Washington Road and Route 1) and the Delaware and Raritan Canal. The original portion of the allée consists of single rows of American elms planted on either side of Washington Road. These elms, planted over 60 years ago, are fully mature. The Washington Road elms are listed on the National Register under Criterion C as a designated historic landscape reflecting significant early twentieth century trends in landscape design. The presence of nearly continuous rows of American Elm trees [with some replacement trees] planted in a specific configuration along Washington Road to form an entry corridor to Princeton and the Princeton University campus defines this resource. The relationship of the trees to the road, and the regular spacing of the trees are key elements of this historic property (National Register Listed: 01/18/99).

The Section 106 opinion of effect is **no adverse effect** if removal of trees can be avoided. If not, the opinion is an **adverse effect** due to the removal of both original and replacement trees**.** The FEIS/Section 106 process resulted in an environmental commitment to the following mitigation:

1. During final design, the NJDOT will ensure that the design minimizes to the maximum degree possible the need for taking both right-of-way and trees from the historic property.

2. During final design, the NJDOT and its consultants will develop a plan to minimize effects to the allee. Consideration will be given, but not limited to, the following elements:
    a. Temporary and permanent relocation of any threatened trees;
    b. Actions that might promote the health of remaining trees;
    c. Evaluation of current drainage conditions and alternatives to prevent salts and other substances used on the road from affecting the health of the trees;
    d. Recommendations to use substances other than salts for winter safety on this roadway; and
    e. Replacement of the trees that must be removed with the largest feasible specimens.

3. Preliminary plans for minimization of effects will be developed in consultation with representatives of the NJ SHPO, the Washington Road Elms Preservation Trust, Princeton Township, Princeton Borough, West Windsor Township, Princeton University and NJDOT's landscape architects. NJDOT will submit preliminary plans to these groups for review and comment. The plans will also be made available to the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers.

Considering this information in the context of the Section 4(f) regulations, a use of the Washington Road Elm Allee will occur as a result of implementing the Selected Alternative. As a use would occur, the Section 4(f) regulations are applicable to the Washington Road Elm Allee.

Section 106 consultation for this project was completed and is documented in Section 4.5 of the FEIS. Section 7.0 of the FEIS summarizes the coordination with consulting parties, other public officials, relevant agencies, and the public in general with regard to this project. Appendix D contains applicable correspondence with the NJ SHPO.

The results of this analysis demonstrate that there is no feasible and prudent Build Alternative that will avoid using Section 4(f) properties. Only the No-Build Alternative will not use Section 4(f) property. The Selected Alternative will require the least use of

Section 4(f) properties among the Build alternatives, and is the feasible and prudent alternative that meets the project goals and objectives, and addresses the project purpose and need. Although use of Section 4(f) properties cannot be completely avoided, the extent of use has been minimized. More importantly, the affected properties are historic resources for which Section 106 consultation was completed. The Section 106 process yielded an adverse effect determination with a commitment during design and construction to examine means to minimize the use of the properties to the greatest extent possible, as well as to develop and implement an appropriate mitigation plan to address remaining unavoidable impacts. These commitments will ensure that the unavoidable impacts to the resource can be effectively mitigated such that the protected resource is not substantially diminished.

MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM

This section summarizes the environmental commitments developed in the Penns Neck Area FEIS for the Selected Alternative. The commitments are organized according to environmental discipline and, when appropriate, by resource.
In accordance with the provisions of 36 CFR 800.8(c)(4), incorporation of the cultural resources commitments proposed in the FEIS, and described below, into this Record of Decision in lieu of executing a Memorandum of Agreement constitutes a binding commitment to implement the measures as described.

Air Quality

- NJDOT Standard Specification, 107.28 Environmental Protection, Section 2 Control of Noise and Air Pollution, should be followed during construction periods to minimize construction related air quality impacts.

Noise

- A Final Noise Study will be undertaken during design to re-evaluate the need for and refine a noise barrier design between Route 1 and Eden Institute.

- The NJDOT's standard construction noise mitigation measures will be included in the project specifications to minimize noise impacts due to construction:
  - All construction equipment powered by an internal combustion engine shall be equipped with a properly maintained muffler;
  - Air compressors shall meet current EPA noise emission exhaust standards;
  - Air powered equipment shall be fitted with pneumatic exhaust silencers
  - Stationary equipment powered by an internal combustion engine shall not be operated within 150 feet of noise sensitive sites without portable noise barriers placed between the equipment and the noise sensitive sites. Noise sensitive sites shall include residential buildings, motels, hotels, schools, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries and public recreation areas. Portable noise barriers shall be constructed of plywood or tongue and groove boards with a noise absorbent treatment on the interior surface (facing the equipment);

- In order to minimize the duration of high noise levels, noisy operations should be scheduled concurrently to take advantage of the phenomena that the resultant noise level will not be significantly greater than the level produced if the operations were done separately, and their duration would be less.

Property Acquisition

- During design, means to avoid business, residential, parks, recreational area, and open space impacts will be examined. Where such impacts are found to be unavoidable, particular efforts will be taken to minimize impacts. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, will be applied where unavoidable relocations are required.

Community Enhancements

- **Socioeconomic and Land Use:** During design, the ability to overcome traffic impacts on Harrison Street in the Upper Harrison Street neighborhood, and at the Alexander Road/Vaughn Drive intersection near the Bear Brook and Windsor Haven neighborhoods will be examined. Context sensitive design principles such as operational improvements, traffic calming, monitoring, or other techniques at those locations will be examined.

  During design, the feasibility of providing pedestrian and bicycle strategies, route signage, traffic calming near the D&R Canal Park and school children walk routes, and operational improvements at the Alexander Road/Vaughn Drive intersection will be examined.

Cultural Resources

- During design, a reassessment of the ability to avoid or further minimize impacts to cultural resources will be undertaken.

- **Aqueduct Mills Historic District**

The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in an environmental commitment to undertake the following mitigation:

1. During final design, NJDOT and its consultants will, to the maximum degree feasible, minimize taking of right-of-way from the historic district.

2. NJDOT and its consultants will develop a plan to move and reconstruct the stone wall on the Route 1 margin of the district. The plan will provide for the use of highly skilled stonemasons and for the construction of sample or test panels for approval by the NJ SHPO, FHWA, and others as appropriate prior to initiating any activities that may diminish the integrity of the historic stone wall. Criteria for the selection of stonemasons will be developed in consultation with the NJ SHPO. Additionally, NJDOT and its consultant will explore both the feasibility and desirability of including appropriate protective measures for the wall. The results of this evaluation will be discussed with the NJ SHPO and documented in a memo to record. If incorporation of such measures into the plans and specifications for the

project is determined appropriate, the plans and specifications will be submitted to the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group for review and comment, and will be made available to the other consulting parties and the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers.

3. During final design, NJDOT and/or its consultants will consult with residents of both the Aqueduct Mills Historic District and those living in the Extension of the district (see below) to determine the appropriateness of erecting commemorative perimeter or interpretive signs for the district. If there is support from the community, representatives will be invited to consult with the NJDOT and the NJ SHPO on the design and locations of the signs. A plan showing the locations, design and information to be shown on the signs will be submitted to the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group for review and comment.

- **Aqueduct Mills Historic District Extension**
  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in an environmental commitment to evaluate community support for the erection of commemorative perimeter or interpretive signs as described in Mitigation Item #3 for the District above. If sufficient support exists, signs will be erected.

- **Covenhoven-Silvers-Logan House**
  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

  1. No noise or other substantial barrier will be erected.

  2. No widening or substantial alteration of Eden Way will occur.

  3. In consultation with the owner of the property, the NJ SHPO, and NJDOT's Landscape Architects, NJDOT and/or its consultants will develop a preliminary landscape plan that provides a visual buffer between the connector road and the historic property, and that continues the insularity of the property. In developing the plan, consideration will also be given to the appropriateness of providing a visual buffer comprised of landscape elements along Eden Way. If such a buffer is determined appropriate, a written statement of its desirability will be provided along with the landscaping plan. The final plan will be submitted to both the property owner and the NJ SHPO for review and comment.

- **David S. Voorhees House**
  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following condition:
  During final design consideration will be given to providing a landscaped buffer between the house and the parking area. If the buffer is determined appropriate, plans will be submitted to the NJ SHPO for review and comment.

- **Delaware and Raritan Canal Historic District**
  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

  1. The perpendicular crossing of the Canal by Harrison Street will be maintained.
  2. The cross section of Harrison Street will be maintained; no widening will occur.
  3. The 25 mph design speed will continue to govern the design at this location.
  4. During final design, the landscaping plan(s) for all areas within and adjacent to the D & R Canal Historic District will be submitted by the NJDOT to the Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission [DRCC] and the NJ SHPO for review and comment. The plan(s) will also be made available to the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers. The plan(s) will clearly show landscaping for any reclaimed roadway areas; any traffic calming and/or aesthetic treatments proposed; and interpretive and directional signage proposed. In developing these plan(s), consideration will be given to co-locating signs on a single pole to reduce visual clutter.

- **Pennsylvania Railroad Historic District**
  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

  1. During final design, and in consultation with the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group, NJDOT and its consultant will determine if opportunities exist for landscaping and aesthetic enhancement of the Vaughn Drive Connector crossing of the Princeton Branch Railroad. Consideration will also be given to the appropriateness of developing commemorative and/or interpretive signing. If it is determined that any of these elements will be included in the project, a plan clearly depicting the proposed features will be submitted to the NJ SHPO and a designated ad hoc community group for review and comment. The plan will made available for public comment by placing it on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site]. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least two local newspapers.

  2. During final design, and in consultation with the NJ SHPO, the NJDOT and its consultants will develop plans and specifications for rehabilitation of the CR 571 bridge according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Consultation will also include identification of appropriate opportunities for commemorative/interpretive signing. Plans and specifications will include the location, design and information to be

displayed on any such sign. All plans to be submitted in satisfaction of this condition will be submitted by the NJDOT to the NJ SHPO for review and comment.

- **Penns Neck Baptist Church**

The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

1. No acquisition of real property belonging to the church will occur. Temporary access or easements may be required for construction; no permanent easements are anticipated.

2. Route 1 will be placed in-a-cut in front of the property.

3. The curb line will be no closer to the church than it is currently.

4. During final design, all possible planning will be undertaken to ensure that adverse noise and vibration effects to the church are avoided/minimized to the extent practicable. NJDOT will ensure that a structural survey/conditions assessment will be undertaken. The scope of work will be developed by NJDOT in consultation with the NJ SHPO and the Church, and the results made available to them. The study will recommend the following: permissible construction noise and vibration levels; the geographic area in which construction techniques are of concern and may cause effects; construction techniques to minimize noise and vibration effects; appropriate monitoring techniques and duration during construction; protective measures that may be employed if construction noise and vibration levels exceed recommended levels; and post-construction actions that might be required. At the discretion of the FHWA, other consulting parties may be invited to comment on the scope for this work because of their expertise with respect to historic structures. The results of this study will inform preparation of plans and construction specifications. The specifications will specifically include provisions for interrupting construction and initiating consultation among the FHWA, NJ SHPO, NJDOT and others to address any noise and vibration problems that arise during construction at this location. Preliminary plans will be developed in consultation with representatives of the Church, the Penns Neck Community and the NJ SHPO. Preliminary plans will be submitted to the same parties for review and comment, and will be made available to the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties, and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers.

5. During final design, NJDOT and/or its consultants will seek the comments of the consulting parties and the public [specifically including the Penns Neck Community] on appropriate/proposed aesthetic treatments in proximity to the Penns Neck Baptist Church. Consideration will be given to the appropriate design of the area to the west of the church, between it and the roadway, and the aesthetics of the roadway [retaining walls, portal treatment, lighting, landscaping, etc.] in the cut. Consideration will also be given to treatments,

motifs, textures, and workmanship that enhance public awareness of the history and significance of the historic properties within the project area.

- **Princeton Operating Station**

The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

1. No noise barrier will be constructed at this location.
2. No widening or substantial alteration of Eden Way will occur.
3. During final design, NJDOT will ensure that horizontal and vertical intrusions into the property are minimized. The ramp will be as far from the face of the building as is feasible and the height of the ramp will be the minimum required. Preliminary plan and elevation sheets showing the proposed design and appropriate text explaining how the design was minimized will be submitted to the NJ SHPO by NJDOT for review and comment.
4. During final design, NJDOT and its consultants will coordinate with the NJ SHPO to develop appropriate landscaping and aesthetic treatments for those portions of the roadway proximate to this property. Preliminary plan and elevation sheets showing the proposed design will be submitted to the NJ SHPO by NJDOT for review and comment.

- **RCA Laboratories (David Sarnoff Research Center)**

The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

1. During final design, NJDOT and its consultant will minimize real property takings to the degree feasible
2. In consultation with representatives from Sarnoff Corporation, Princeton University and the NJ SHPO, the NJDOT and its consultants will develop a landscaping plan that is consistent with the historic character and setting of this property. Opportunities for commemorative/interpretive signing will also be considered and, if appropriate, the location, design and information to be displayed on any such sign will be shown on plans to be submitted to the NJ SHPO, Sarnoff Corporation and Princeton University for review and comment.

- **Washington Road Elm Allée**

The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in an environmental commitment to the following mitigation:

1. During final design, the NJDOT will ensure that the design minimizes to the maximum degree possible the need for taking both right-of-way and trees from the historic property.
2. During final design, the NJDOT and its consultants will develop a plan to minimize effects to the allee. Consideration will be given, but not limited to, the following elements:
    a. Temporary and permanent relocation of any threatened trees;

b. Actions that might promote the health of remaining trees;

c. Evaluation of current drainage conditions and alternatives to prevent salts and other substances used on the road from affecting the health of the trees;

d. Recommendations to use substances other than salts for winter safety on this roadway; and

e. Replacement of the trees that must be removed with the largest feasible specimens.

3. Preliminary plans for minimization of effects will be developed in consultation with representatives of the NJ SHPO, the Washington Road Elms Preservation Trust, Princeton Township, Princeton Borough, West Windsor Township, Princeton University and NJDOT's landscape architects. NJDOT will submit preliminary plans to these groups for review and comment. The plans will also be made available to the public by placing them on the project web site [www.policy.Rutgers.edu/vtc/pennsneckareaeis/index.html or other identified web site] for review and comment. A notice of the availability of this information will be sent to all consulting parties and a similar notice placed in at least one Trenton newspaper and two local newspapers.

- **Archeological Site 28 ME 2**

  The EIS/Section 106 process resulted in the following conditions:

  1. During final design the NJDOT, using the services of a consultant, will initiate additional archeological survey work to confirm the western boundary of site 28Me2. If, based on this work, archeological remains will be affected by the project, all reasonable efforts will be made to refine the design and avoid affecting the archeological remains. If the entire site cannot be avoided, as much of the site as possible will be preserved in situ.
  2. If avoidance is possible, protective fencing [chain link] will be erected on the perimeter of the site as an initial construction item prior to initiating any proximate work.
  3. If the proposed construction cannot avoid adverse effects to the site, consultation with the NJ SHPO and others to develop an appropriate data recovery and reporting program will be initiated. A synthetic approach that considers the archeological data in both local and regional contexts will guide archeological fieldwork, analysis and reporting efforts. Protective fencing may also be used to safeguard those portions of the site that are not within the construction zone.

Surface Water and Aquatic Ecology

- During design, the areas of proposed construction disturbance and areas of proposed impervious surfaces will be minimized. During construction, the limit of disturbance area will be clearly marked, maintained, and monitored. As well, an NJDOT-compliant soil erosion control plan will be implemented and maintained.

Providing increased protection of areas that are particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss will be considered. Temporarily disturbed areas will be restored immediately upon completion of work in the disturbed area.

- During design, an NJDEP Stream Encroachment Permit will be obtained for the project. The stormwater management design will comply with the New Jersey Flood Hazard Area Control Regulations (NJAC 7:13-2.8 et seq) as they pertain to water quality, hydrology, flood control, stream corridor buffers, and protection of aquatic ecology. The drainage design will consider the feasibility of minimizing the use of scuppers on bridges and conveying deck drainage to land for treatment prior to discharge. The design will strive for water quality management practices that will result in better than average removal of pollutants.

- During design, the feasibility and practicality of adapting region-wide measures to minimize the impact of road salts on stormwater runoff from NJDOT-maintained roadways will be examined. These measures are found in the *Stormwater and Non-Point Source Pollution Control: Best Management Practices Manual* (NJDEP, 1994).

Groundwater

- During construction, wells that lie within the right-of-way or that would have to be removed will be legally abandoned and capped by a well driller licensed by the State of New Jersey to perform such work.

- During design, the provision for managing groundwater seepage during construction will include use of sump pumps and drainage ditches. Operational stormwater runoff will be designed to be transmitted through closed piping to the ground surface, thereby providing some groundwater quality protection.

Floodplains

- The Selected Alternative will be required to comply with all stream encroachment regulations. Various forms of mitigation will be implemented to maintain the function and quality of the affected floodplain during construction. The Selected Alternative will meet the NJDEP's requirements for a Stream Encroachment Permit. These requirements include detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses demonstrating that new structures would not constrict normal or 100-year flood flows, or alter the flood storage capacity of the regulated floodplain. The Selected Alternative will have to meet design guidelines prescribed by the NJDEP as part of the permitting process to protect floodplains and avoid creating or exacerbating a flooding condition.

Wetlands

- The Selected Alternative will result in 0.18 acres of fill in wetlands and 0.08 acres of shading of waterbodies. During design, an NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Permit will be obtained for the project. The design will comply with the New

Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act. If required, mitigation in the form of wetland creation would occur at a ratio of two acres created for every one acre impacted.

Vegetation

- During design, an assessment will be made as to the applicability of the New Jersey No Net Loss Reforestation Act to the project. If applicable, a specific mitigation plan will be developed and a determination will be obtained from the NJDEP that the project complies with the Act.

- During design, a landscaping plan will be developed that will permanently stabilize exposed soils and indirectly provide wildlife habitats. Plant materials selection will focus on native materials and their cultivars to the greatest extent possible.

Wildlife

- During design, the feasibility of providing means to reduce the potential for vehicle-wildlife collisions on new roadways will be considered.

- During design, coordination will be undertaken with the NJDEP to evaluate means to avoid impacting the long-eared owl, bald eagle, and triangle floater habitats. Where habitat impacts cannot be avoided, strategies to minimize impacts will be examined in consultation with the NJDEP.

Contaminated Sites

- UST Systems: During construction, UST systems within the right-of-way will be removed according to NJAC 7:14B. In addition, free-phase petroleum hydrocarbons will be identified, if present, in the soils or groundwater around USTs in the right-of-way. In accordance with NJAC 7:26E, free-phase hydrocarbons will be removed and disposed of at an approved, off-site facility. Potentially impacted soils will be addressed in accordance with NJAC 7:26E and the NJDEP guidance, 1998 Revised Guidance Document for the Remediation of Contaminated Soils.

- Chlorinated Compounds: During construction, **p**otentially impacted soils and/or groundwater will be addressed in accordance with NJAC 7:26E and the NJDEP guidance, 1998 Revised Guidance Document for the Remediation of Contaminated Soils.

- Herbicides and Pesticides: During construction, potentially impacted soils will be addressed in accordance with NJAC 7:26E, including, but not limited to, the NJDEP guidance document entitled, *The 1998 Revised Guidance Document for the Remediation of Contaminated Soils*.

- Groundwater: During construction, contaminated groundwater, if encountered, will be addressed according to all local or county regulations, including but not

limited to: NJAC 7:26E; NJSA 58:10A-1 et seq., New Jersey Water Pollution Control Act; NJSA 58:11-49 et seq., Pretreatment; NJAC 7:14, Water Pollution Control Act; NJAC 7:14A, New Jersey Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NJPDES); and NJAC 7:1C, 90-Day Construction Permits.

- Asbestos-Containing Building Materials: During design, a survey for ACM will be conducted. All work will be completed according to the NJAC 7:26-1 et seq., the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), the Department of Health (DOH), and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

- Air Monitoring and Personal Protective Equipment: During construction, the contractor will develop and implement a Health and Safety Plan.

Aesthetics

- During design, examine the feasibility of providing visual enhancements, such as: concrete form liners for the retaining walls along the cut section of Route 1; thoughtful design of safety walls and fencing along Route 1; landscape buffering in the project right-of-way near Harrison Street and Eden Way; supplementing plantings of the same species of elm trees along the elm allee to unify its appearance, particularly at its end points; and guide rails with wooden posts and cor-ten steel with a W-beam pending NJDOT approval. When visual enhancements will be considered in proximity to historic properties, discussions with the appropriate consulting parties will be initiated.

Construction

- Construction materials will not be stockpiled in or near adjacent streams or wetlands. If materials require stockpiling for significant durations, they will be covered with an impermeable liner to prevent runoff and leachate during precipitation.

- During design and construction**,** appropriate techniques for removing and transporting the rock will be selected based upon the nature of the material encountered. Construction procedures will follow prescribed NJDOT protocols and would recognize local requirements concerning methods such as blasting if no other options are available.

Section 4(f)

- The EIS/Section 106 process yielded environmental commitments to address unavoidable use of Section 4(f) properties: the Aqueduct Mills Historic District and Washington Road Elm Allee. These commitments are described in the Section 4(f) and Cultural Resources discussions.

Other Issues

- During design, the location of geodetic control reference marks will be identified in the right-of-way of the Selected Alternative. A determination will be made as to whether such marks would be impacted by construction. Coordination with the NJ Geodetic Survey Control office will be undertaken regarding relocation of markers, as needed.

Complementary strategies - Penns Neck Area EIS Commute Options Package

As explained in the FEIS, a variety of complementary travel demand management strategies, transit improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian enhancements had been considered as possible actions to address Penns Neck area mobility constraints. Based on an initial consideration of these actions, a "Commute Options" package was developed.

Each road-based alternative examined in the EIS was analyzed assuming concurrent implementation of a "Commute Options" package. For transportation modeling purposes, a trip "credit" was taken against future travel demand. In simple terms, the modeling assumed that 4-5% of peak period work trips will be diverted from single-occupant vehicle travel to other modes of commuting. This percentage is consistent with the findings of the 1998 Congestion Management System (CMS) Study and the trip reduction factors presented in New Jersey's current Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Choices 2025, for Mercer and Middlesex Counties. It is also consistent with the findings of the recently completed Central Jersey Transportation Forum Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study.

While travel and mode choice decisions are made by individuals and cannot be dictated by policy-makers, the proposed "Commute Options" package is intended to encourage the use of alternative modes of commuting, help decrease growth in single-occupant vehicle use in the Penns Neck area, help reduce peak-hour traffic congestion, provide traffic mitigation during construction and ensure the sustainability of the significant investment in roadway infrastructure contemplated as an outcome of the EIS process.

The proposed package is specifically designed to be consistent with the recommendations of the CMS, to complement existing TDM programs and activities undertaken by the Greater Mercer Transportation Management Association (GMTMA) and Keep Middlesex Moving, Inc. (KMM); enhance and expand existing transit services in the study area; improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists; and target commute option programs to the employment core areas located along and near the Route 1 corridor in West Windsor and Plainsboro Townships.

For the purposes of the EIS, it was assumed that, if a "Commute Options" package was approved for implementation in the Final EIS, the NJDOT would work with GMTMA, KMM, NJ TRANSIT and the appropriate Metropolitan Planning Organizations to develop final implementation plans, fund and implement a "Commute Options" package prior to or concurrent with construction of the Selected alternative. It would serve as a three-year demonstration program.

The "Commute Options package" is considered complementary to the Selected Alternative. The following is a description of the specific components of the "Commute Options" package.

- **Enhanced Transportation Management Association (TMA) Services**
  Existing TMA services and programs would be expanded and enhanced in the following ways:

  - Comprehensive employee survey – A comprehensive employee survey would be undertaken. The survey would target employees working in the Carnegie Center/Alexander Road employment core in West Windsor Township and the Forrestal Center employment core in Plainsboro Township. In addition, employees of Princeton University and Sarnoff Corporation would be surveyed. At a minimum, the survey would query employees regarding residence location, mode of travel, time of travel, decision factors affecting mode choice and attractiveness of potential commute option incentives. Survey data would then be used to inform the planning and implementation of enhanced and strategically targeted TMA services.
  - Enhanced rideshare services – Consistent with CMS Commitment #3, existing rideshare services would be reviewed, coordinated, modified, enhanced and expanded, as needed, to target the West Windsor and Plainsboro employment cores. This would include investigating new information technology solutions, such as real-time, on-line ride matching.
  - Enhanced marketing and outreach to employers and commuters – Consistent with CMS Commitment #3, a comprehensive commute options marketing campaign and special promotion efforts would be developed to expand the use of various employee incentive programs, such as commuter tax benefits and Transit Pass. The marketing campaign would be targeted to employers and employees working in the West Windsor and Plainsboro employment cores. In addition, an effort would be made to encourage employers to permit and promote work alternative arrangements, such as telecommuting, flexible work hours and compressed work weeks.
  - Expanded vanpool incentives – Consistent with CMS Commitment #4, promotion and recruitment efforts related to NJ TRANSIT's vanpool subsidy program would be expanded, and new incentives to recruit volunteer drivers and coordinators would be explored.
  - Enhanced transit information program – Consistent with CMS Commitment #4, new transit marketing materials, a web-based transit information clearinghouse, and an information kiosk at the Princeton Junction train station would be planned and implemented.
  - Parking Cash-Out Incentives – Parking cash-out involves providing financial incentives to employees to forgo their right to drive alone and park at an employment destination. These incentives most often are monthly or annual cash bonuses for participating in the program. Ordinarily the cost of such

financial incentives is borne by the employer. A voluntary parking cash-out program would be investigated and implemented targeting employers in the West Windsor and Plainsboro employment cores. Such a program would include subsidies to employers to offset some of the cost of the program and the identification and recruitment of one or more "leadership" employers to participate in the program.

- **New Jitney/Shuttle Services**
  Consistent with CMS Commitment #4, existing public and private jitney/shuttle services would be coordinated, expanded and supplemented. This effort would include service planning, negotiation of service contracts and operational subsidies for up to three new demonstration services. New jitney/shuttle services would be designed to:

  - enhance the use of the Northeast Corridor rail line for reverse and peak direction peak period commuting to work sites in the West Windsor and Plainsboro employment cores;
  - provide alternative travel modes for targeted commuter markets; and
  - enhance daytime access to area retail and restaurant locations (e.g., noon-time shuttle service).

  Service expansion would be designed in the context of the recently completed preliminary BRT studies conducted by NJ TRANSIT and GMTMA.

- **Modifications to Existing Fixed-Route Transit Services**
  In the context of the service planning for new jitney/shuttle services, existing fixed-route services operating in the primary study area would be analyzed and modified, as warranted.

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements**
  Consistent with CMS Commitment #1, all road-based improvements would include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. These facilities would be designed and constructed to integrate with existing and other planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In addition, other improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network in the Penns Neck area will be investigated and implemented.

  - Pedestrian facility improvements – In addition to providing pedestrian accommodations as part of new road construction, other pedestrian facility improvements in the Penns Neck and Princeton Junction neighborhoods will be investigated in consultation with West Windsor Township. Improvements could include but would not be limited to: repair of existing sidewalks, construction of new sidewalks, cross-walk striping, traffic calming and traffic signal upgrades to include pedestrian crossing phases.

- Bicycle network improvements – Potential bicycle commuter routes within a five-mile radius of the West Windsor and Plainsboro employment cores will be investigated and implemented in consultation with the affected municipalities. Improvements could include, but would not be limited to: striped bike lanes, new dedicated bike paths, signage, and other amenities intended to promote the use of biking as a commute option in the Penns Neck area.

- Route 1 Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing - Consistent with CMS Commitment #1, a study to investigate the need for and feasibility of a grade-separated pedestrian/bicycle crossing of Route 1 in the Penns Neck area will be undertaken. If the feasibility study determines that the crossing is warranted, a location for the crossing will be determined, and implementation of the crossing would occur with the construction of the Penn Neck area improvement project.

MONITORING /ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

Future stages of project development and design will be monitored to ensure conformance with mitigation commitments made in the FEIS, prior to authorization of federal-aid funds. Agency and stakeholder coordination will continue during project development, design and the permit process. Construction monitoring and enforcement programs will consist of ensuring that the contractors carry out project construction in accordance with NJDOT contract provisions and design plans.

COMMENTS ON FINAL EIS

The Notice of Availability of the FEIS was published in the Federal Register on January 14, 2005, with the wait period ending on February 14, 2005. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Interior, the N.J. Department of Environmental Protection's Office of Permit Coordination and Environmental Review and the Historic Preservation Office (HPO) sent comment letters on the FEIS. All issues raised have been responded to in the FEIS. Thus no substantive comments have been received on the FEIS.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and evaluation presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, careful consideration of all engineering, social, economic and environmental factors; and input from the public involvement process, including comments received on the EIS, **Alternative D.2.A is adopted as the Selected Alternative.**

Division Administrator **Date**
Federal Highway Administration
New Jersey Division