

SRTS – FY 2018
Rosedale Road & General Johnson Drive Intersection and Upgrades to Side path along Rosedale Road
Safe Routes to School Design Assistance
Municipality of Princeton, Mercer County
NJDOT Local Aid District # 3
Design Consultant: NV5

Preliminary Engineering Phase • Public Information Center (PIC)

Tuesday, April 19, 2022

COMMENT RESOLUTION SUMMARY

Prepared By: NV5, Municipality of Princeton, and Mercer County
Question Period: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 to Tuesday, May 3, 2022
Progress Print: August 2, 2022

The Municipality of Princeton along with Mercer County held a Public Information Center (PIC) to provide local residents and businesses with information on the 2018 SRTS Rosedale Road & General Johnson Drive Intersection and Pathways Improvement Project. Mercer County is proposing improvements at Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive as well as Rosedale Road and Elm Road within the project limits to support the SRTS project that will be separate improvements from the SRTS project. A PIC flyer about the PIC was prepared and sent to adjacent property owners as well as a legal notice.

The following is summary of comments received and responses as applicable.

DOCUMENT FORMAT:

- Question or comment received during Virtual Public Information Center (PIC) or question period
Response: | Response to question or comment provided by NV5 and/or Municipality of Princeton

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTER FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS / COMMENTS:

- A. Will the presentation, plans, and meeting material be posted anywhere the public can review?
Response | The PIC presentation and plans can be found on the Municipality of Princeton’s website at the following link: <https://www.princetonnj.gov/1152/Rosedale-Road-Safe-Routes-to-School-Proj>
- B. Questions and comments associated with the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) project:
1. General comment regarding the format of this in-person public information center
Response | This in-person public information center is an open house format meeting with representatives from Princeton, NV5, and Mercer County to discuss plans on display, provide questions and comments in person. In addition, material associated with the project has also been posted to the Princeton website for additional review by the public. Questions and comments can be provided to the project team through the two-week comment period concluding on May 3, 2022:
Deanna Stockton, P.E., C.M.E.
Municipal Engineer / Deputy Administrator
Department of Engineering and Infrastructure Operations
Municipality of Princeton
400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540
P: 609-921-7077 x 1138
E: engineering@princetonnj.gov
Basit A. (Sunny) Muzaffar, PE
Mercer County Engineer
640 South Broad Street
Trenton, NJ 08650
P: 609-989-6600
E: bmuzaffar@mercercounty.org

2. Attendee's concern about speed limit along Rosedale Road, tractor trailers, etc. Is it possible to address speeding through the corridor, whether by use of speed bumps / speed humps, etc.?

Response | Reduction of the speed limit for County Route 604 Rosedale Road is being considered by Mercer County Engineering, in addition to other traffic calming measures (such as travel lane reduction to 11').

3. Attendee's concern about current posted speed limit along Rosedale Road and violations. Request for speed bumps.

Response | Enforcement of speed violations is for police enforcement. Roadway includes several proposed queues for travelers to reduce speeds including proposed roundabout
Speed bumps and/or humps are not permitted on County roadways by decision of County Engineer's office
Reduction of the speed limit for County Route 604 Rosedale Road is being considered by Mercer County Engineering, in addition to other traffic calming measures (such as travel lane reduction to 11').

4. Overall Design and Construction schedule

Response | It was noted by the project team that this project is currently in the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase. Following the conclusion of this public information center's comment period, a Categorical Exclusion Document (CED) will be prepared by NJDOT Bureau of Environmental Program Resources (BEPR) as a part of the project's environmental permitting process. Following completion of the document, the project will advance to Final Design (FD) phase, followed by construction. The anticipated timeframe for construction of the proposed improvements is 2023 to 2024.

5. Limited number of students walk to school: attendee noted that school buses are provided for adjacent neighborhoods; little to no use of existing asphalt sidepath for bicycle traffic

Response | Comment acknowledged

6. Attendee question regarding the shared use path and whether experienced bicyclists can still use Rosedale Road

Response | Experienced bicyclists can continue to use Rosedale Road while limited experienced / younger bicyclists and pedestrians can use the proposed shared use path.

7. Proposed sidewalk along the south side of Rosedale Road from residential properties to Elm Road:

- Reasoning for adding proposed sidewalk along Rosedale Road from Greenway Meadow Park to Elm Road

Response | A segment of 5' wide concrete sidewalk has been included in the proposed improvements to accommodate pedestrians from the residential properties along Rosedale Road to access Elm Road and the proposed shared use path along the north side of Rosedale Road.

- Can a crosswalk be installed to the proposed shared use path? Pedestrians are unlikely to travel to Elm Road, cross at the proposed crosswalk, then continue along the shared use path heading west - pedestrians will likely cross the road regardless of striped crosswalk.

Response | A crosswalk was originally considered by the project team at Constitution Hill West intersection with Rosedale Road, however, this would constitute as a midblock crossing (Rosedale Road traffic not controlled by a stop sign or signalized intersection). Installation of a midblock crossing in this area would be potentially dangerous for pedestrian crossings. As a result, the proposed sidewalk along the south side of Rosedale Road extends from the residential properties, to Elm Road (to be improved by Mercer County), and the shared use path along the north side of the roadway.

8. Additional pedestrian features for consideration along south side of Rosedale Road for residential properties: Additional sidewalk, midblock crossings / Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), and such from the start of project limits at Christopher Drive to General Johnson Road / Greenway Meadows Park entrance. One attendee noted that their child was struck by a car along Rosedale Road and there are pedestrians trying to cross the roadway to access the existing sidepath (future shared use path area)

Response | Additional segments of sidewalk along the south side of Rosedale Road and possible crosswalks will be considered by the project team. The project team will coordinate with NJDOT Local Aid

regarding inclusion of these segments of sidewalk.

9. Existing features in conflict with proposed improvements: attendees noted shrubbery, trees, decorative stone columns, paver driveway aprons, and mailboxes are present in vicinity of proposed improvements (whether within Mercer County right of way or adjacent to the property lines within private property).

- Will residents have an opportunity to move landscaping before future construction?

Response | This project is currently in Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase and during Final Design phase and start of construction, residents with existing features in conflict with proposed improvements will have the opportunity to relocate features.

- Will existing features in conflict with proposed improvements be relocated by the contractor selected for the project?

Response | Existing features present within Mercer County right of way or Princeton's proposed easements in conflict with the proposed improvements would be relocated by the contractor as a part of the contract documents. The design will accommodate relocation of existing features when possible.

- In areas with a grade difference along the proposed shared use path, can a retaining wall be used along the edge of the shared use path?

Response | For the proposed shared use path between Constitution Hill West and Elm Road, the existing sidepath is higher than the adjacent residential properties. The proposed shared use path will be constructed at the approximate existing grade, which will have a berm area that extends downward towards the residential properties within a proposed easement area.

Installation of retaining walls along the proposed shared use path would be considered a vertical drop (depending on the height difference) and would potentially be hazardous to bicyclists and pedestrians using the shared use path. Per the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) 'Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities', a fence or railing would be required to prevent bicyclists and pedestrians from falling.

10. Attendee comment regarding proposed shared use path transition to 5' wide concrete sidewalk in vicinity of Stony Brook structure: would it be possible to use the existing shoulder / modify the curb line in order to accommodate the shared use path across the structure? Also, the attendee noted that the existing "dismount and walk bike across bridge" signs present is potentially confusing for bicyclists using the shoulder of the roadway versus the existing asphalt sidepath / sidewalk.

Response | Mercer County expressed concern with any structure modifications as bridge recently replaced. Structural inspection requirements may prohibit the reduction of travel lanes / bridge deck widths (functional obsolescence definitions).

The absolute curb-to-curb minimum roadway width of 34 feet must be maintained – thus could not divert path off road and bring along roadway so sidewalk option most practical

11. Several attendees expressed concern that the residences along Lambert Drive, which also includes a STEM school and loops around to Rosedale Road west of Christopher Drive and outside the project limits, and several properties along Rosedale Road east of Lambert Drive, do not have a sidewalk or walkway along the south side of Rosedale or a safe means to cross Rosedale Road. A means to safely walk and bike to both the JPES and Green Meadow Park from Lambert Road is needed. It was also noted there is an existing side path on the north side of Rosedale Road in the vicinity of Lambert Drive and east to the school yet those adjacent properties do not even have driveway access or "frontage" to an existing or proposed path yet the properties on the south side do have frontage yet no proposed sidewalk or path

Response | Both representatives from Princeton and Mercer County agreed a connection, such as sidewalk or desirably a 10 foot sidepath (depending on impacts), should be provided as requested from Lambert Drive to General Johnson Drive although not included in the original SRTS grant. As a result, Princeton will submit a scope modification and construction grant increase request to NJDOT Local Aid to request this additional connection be include in the project.

Mercer County will not permit a mid-block crosswalk in this area, however they will consider a mini roundabout at Fairway Drive. This will provide both the benefit of a crossing location and additional traffic calming feature along the corridor.

12. Several existing diseased ash trees are located along the corridor and should be removed. Can other trees be planted?

Response | Tree impacts associated with this project will be assessed and mitigation, such as replanting, will be addressed as part of the environmental services

13. Why does the existing path need to be widened and impact adjacent properties? Who will maintain it because it is not in good condition now?

Response | The project intent is to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. The minimum width proposed is 8 feet where environmental constraints are located. Most of the project is actually within the existing municipal or County ROW. The property owners that expressed concern were shown where the existing ROW is located, not realizing that that their property would not be impacted.
The maintenance of the path will be the responsibility of Princeton. The project includes improving existing path sections as noted.

14. An attendee noted they wanted to install a new fence along their property and inquired if they should wait until after construction.

Response | Homeowner was shown that their existing fence was not being impacted by the proposed improvements as shown of the Preliminary progress plans and they were told they should contact the municipality and make certain they are meeting fence ordinance requirements, such as setbacks and heights, etc. before constructing a new fence. If an existing fence outside the right-of-way and on private property was impacted during construction it would be reset or replaced in kind but in the case, the fence did not appear to be impacted per the current plans.

15. An attendee appreciated the flyer in alternate languages and that a translator was present.

Response | Comment acknowledged.

16. An attendee questioned if additional outreach will be provided and are comments being tallied.

Response | Yes, another Public Information Center will be provided in the next phase, Final Design, prior to construction.
A comment resolution summary for will be posted on Princeton's website summarizing comments received. The Project Team will review comments and plan updates considered. The comments also become part of the outreach record and included in the environment document.

C. Questions and comments associated with Mercer County improvements to General Johnson Drive mini-roundabout, Elm Road intersection improvements, and potential future improvements along County Route 604 Rosedale Road:

1. Mini-roundabout design comments:

- Why can't a traffic signal be proposed for this intersection? What are the justifications for NOT providing a signal at General Johnson Drive

Response | A traffic signal is not a proven FHWA safety countermeasure as it does not calm traffic, nor make the intersection safer for pedestrians to traverse. In order for a traffic signal to be installed, first a Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis needs to be completed per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). This analysis consists of 9 different warrants, any which if met would justify the installation of a traffic signal. More information on the warrant analysis can be found at this link: <https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/htm/2009/part4/part4c.htm>

Response | NV5 performed a preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis using traffic counts taken on April 22, 2021. This analysis of traffic conditions did not meet the requirements of any of the nine (9) warrant criteria necessary to install a traffic light. However, the traffic conditions do meet the criteria for a mini-roundabout.

- Traffic volumes post pandemic seemed to have increased Can new traffic counts be conducted since perhaps they now warrant a signal.

Response | Turning Movement Counts were taken using Miovision (video technology) on April 22, 2021 per NV5's Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis Report. Traffic Data was again collected on October 29, 2021 by Traffic Planning & Design (TPD), a Design Consultant on behalf of Mercer County Engineering Department. A third, and final, round of Traffic Counts was conducted by Mercer County over the

course of six (6) days from February 16, 2022 to February 21, 2022. Analyzing all three (3) datasets, Traffic Conditions do not meet Traffic Signal Warrant criteria and therefore a traffic signal is not warranted.

- Children will not know how to cross roundabouts. Motorists are looking at where they have to turn and not for pedestrians

Response | Crossing at a roundabout is no different than crossing the street at other types of intersections. In this location, pedestrian access is pulled away from the roundabout providing for better visibility of pedestrians for motorists and vice versa. As mentioned at the Public Information Center, motorists must always be aware of crosswalks and the presence of pedestrians whether mid-block crossing, intersections, and/or roundabouts. Failure of vehicles to yield to pedestrians within crosswalks violates local ordinance and therefore is subject to enforcement by the Princeton Police.

Response | The County understands the apprehension associated with the reintroduction of Roundabouts, or rotaries, to the new generation of New Jersey and County road-users. It is similar to a “Traffic Circle” in shape, but similarities end there. Roundabouts operate differently than Traffic Circles in that all vehicles must yield, in order to enter, thus slowing, or calming, traffic. In order to help further educate pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists on the proper use and benefits of these facilities, the County is developing educational materials to convey the differences and rules of a roundabout. These materials will be distributed in form of handouts, emails, and a series of TikTok videos. The County will post these materials on our website and provide them to the school for distribution to the staff, parents, vendors, and students.

- Pedestrian movement through proposed mini-roundabout; attendee noted that vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians may not understand how to use the mini-roundabout

Response | Please see previous response in Section “1” subsection “c”

- Attendees asked for material related to mini-roundabout incidents involving pedestrians

Response | Information on roundabout safety can be found here: <https://www.iihs.org/topics/roundabouts>

2. Police and crossing guards for General Johnson Road: attendees noted that previous requests for crossing guards for the school entrance require Princeton Police since Rosedale Road is a County Route, also local residents in the past have collected funds to cover the cost. Would it be possible to have crossing guards for the proposed mini-roundabout when constructed?

Response | This determination is decided by the municipality. There are many routes within Mercer County jurisdiction with schools located on or adjacent to them. Many of these schools have police presence, crossing guards, both, or neither. As the County’s priority is safety, it does not object to the use of Police or Crossing Guards within our jurisdiction.

3. Elm Road signalized intersection improvements:

Response | The county is in the process of analyzing the intersection of Elm and Rosedale Rd to determine what changes can be made to improve pedestrian safety

4. Potential future improvements to be considered by Mercer County:

Response | Mini-roundabout installation for Rosedale Road at Fairway Drive, including installation of sidewalk, crosswalks, and potential pedestrian-scale lighting

5. Lighting needs of proposed roundabouts to be evaluated by the County

Response | County consultant, Traffic Planning and Design will complete lighting analysis in conjunction with designing roundabout.

D. Additional questions and comments:

1. Existing trails are located within the project limits and surrounding areas (for instance, the Lawrence Hopewell Trail): are any connections going to be made to these trails?

Response | Currently connections are not part of this project.

2. Existing trail from Greenway Meadows Park to Rosedale Road, east of Stony Brook bridge: existing condition features the trail ending at the roadway with an unsigned / unstriped midblock crossing. Will this condition be addressed?

Response

A segment of proposed sidewalk has been included in the project along the south side of Rosedale Road to connect Greenway Meadows Park trails to Rosedale Road. Existing trail connections along the north side of Rosedale Road will be connected to the proposed shared use path / sidewalk, where applicable.

PRE AND POST PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTER QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

- Friday, July 30, 2021 – 1:45PM: Received via Email

I have been a property owner at 57 Brookstone Drive for the past 20 years. Between 2001 and 2011, three of my four children attended Johnson Park School, so I am very familiar with the circumstances surrounding the difficulties managing traffic at drop off and pick up at the school, as well as the condition of the bike/foot path that runs the length of the northern side of Rosedale Road.

I am also very familiar with the high water table and its impact on properties in my neighborhood, and, obviously, in my own home. My sump pump operates on an almost continual basis, even during dry conditions. I have had the unfortunate experience on several occasions, due to power failure or mechanical failure of the pump, of having up to a foot of water in my basement. I am now in the process of installing a back-up pump which will be powered by battery in an attempt to mitigate future water seepage into the basement from the sump well in the event of primary pump failure. Since 2012 when Hurricane Sandy knocked out power to our neighborhood for two weeks, many of my neighbors, including the two on either side of my property, have had whole-house Generac generators installed. I have not done so due to the considerable expense involved, but have considered doing so myself.

I would urge you while making your investigation as to how best to proceed with the Safe Routes to School improvements, not to consider any additional paving on Rosedale Road, especially on the section between Fairway Drive and General Johnson Drive. The current path need to be repaved as it is uneven in many areas, especially in the stretch mentioned above. In addition, the maintenance of shrubbery and trees along the path has been completely neglected except as needed by PSE&G: Keeping the foliage pruned would provide a much more accessible pathway for children and parents going to and from Johnson Park School, as well as the many other residents who use it on a frequent basis. I would also urge the speed limit on Rosedale Road to be decreased from 40 mph to 35, especially between Province Line Road and General Johnson Drive.

I look forward to hearing the results of the wetlands investigation and hope you will take my suggestions into consideration. Please feel free to contact me either by e-mail or phone [redacted].

Response

Deanna Stockton email – August 9, 2022

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the Rosedale Road project. We have forwarded it to the design engineering consultant. The project will include the widening of the sidepath along Rosedale Road. Per local and state regulations, stormwater management measures will be considered to negate the impact of the additional impervious surface.

- Thursday, April 21, 2022 – 4:53PM: Received via Email

I wanted to find out more about the proposed roundabout planned for the intersection of Rosedale Rd. and General Johnson. I see how a roundabout would slow traffic; however, because drivers need to keep an eye on multiple points of entry/exit, decide when to yield and when to merge into traffic in the circle, and keep an eye on which exit to take, I worry that pedestrians and bikes crossing the intersection might go unnoticed.

I was unable to attend the Public Meeting, but I heard that a stop light was ruled out because someone might run a red light. I've never heard that as an excuse for not having a traffic light installed before. Perhaps this conclusion was drawn because someone struck and killed a pedestrian last year, despite the pedestrian having activated the flashing yellow lights at the edge of the crosswalk. The crosswalk lights are not comparable to a traffic light, though. As it is now, the crosswalk at this intersection is especially unexpected: the speed limit approaching the intersection is 40 mph, the school is not visible from the road, and the area looks like it's almost entirely forest. One wouldn't expect someone to step out into the road even with a flashing yellow light off to the side of the road. Having a traffic light would be more obvious for drivers.

If you have any data available about pedestrian incidents in roundabouts vs. at a traffic light, I would appreciate if you could share it.

Response

As discussed with the attendees at the Public Information Center (PIC), the signal was ruled out because it did not meet warrant criteria per the MUTCD as explained in the attached Comment Responses from the PIC and not because a driver may run a red light. Further the purpose of a

traffic light is not to meter pedestrians, but to meter traffic; and it cannot be assumed that because a traffic light exists that a pedestrian is safer, nor that a driver will comply. In order to best fit the conditions and improve safety at this location we have employed the “3 E’s”, Engineering, Education & Enforcement. Engineering states that according to manuals and guidance that a signal is not warranted, and further, a roundabout is more appropriate for the conditions and safer for pedestrians. Education is underway as the County is preparing handout documents, online literature, and social media videos to educate all road users; drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists. This education will not be for roundabouts alone, but for use of each type of County crossing facility including pedestrian buttons at conventional intersections, Rapid Flashing Beacons at mid-block and roundabout crossings, and unsignalized pedestrian crossings. Once the other conditions are met Enforcement is the final piece of the puzzle. Through coordination with Princeton Police, those failing to comply with traffic ordinances will be provided a summons for non-compliance.

Regarding the safety of roundabouts, according to the FHWA roundabouts are safer than traffic signals for both vehicles and pedestrians. Of the two, only roundabouts are on the FHWA’s list of Proven Safety Countermeasures. Please see the attached PIC Comment Responses for further discussion regarding the increased safety that this roundabout will provide to all users.

In addition to the safety improvements to be made by the County at the intersection of Rosedale Road and General Johnson Road, through the installation of the roundabout, the County is further investigating additional methods to increase safety along Rosedale Road. One such method would be the reduction the statutory speed limit between Elm Road and Province Line Road. The reduction of the speed limit require concurrence, ultimately approval by NJDOT. The County has started the approval process with NJDOT and coordination is ongoing.

Some addition links to available literature regarding roundabouts is provided below:

https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/effects_roundabouts_pedestrian_safety_stone.pdf

https://www.craftontull.com/insights/insight_posts/view/63/pedestrian-friendly-roundabouts

<https://www.nymtc.org/portals/0/pdf/Transportation%20Safety/08DPS-Roundabouts.pdf>

- Friday, April 22, 2022 – 11:17AM: Received via Email

I attended the information meeting on Tuesday, April 19th and have a few comments and questions:

- It appears that the project will “take” a significant part of my property (89 Rosedale Road). What will I be reimbursed for this property being usurped for town use?
- It also appears that some of the very expensive rhododendrons and plantings that I planted to enhance the appearance of my property next to the existing path will have to be removed/moved. I spent a lot of money installing these – what will I be reimbursed for these? My gardener may be able to relocate some of the rhododendrons and plantings, but I will then need to be reimbursed for this relocation.
- I could not tell from the drawing that I saw whether it will be necessary to move the two stone pillars on either side of my driveway entrance onto Rosedale Road. My house and these pillars were built in 1912, therefore it is a historic location and the pillars should not be removed. However, if they have to be moved how are you going to do this and not damage them?

Comments

This project appears to me to be totally unnecessary for the following reasons:

1. I have lived here for 17 years and have spent a lot of time out in my garden and seen very little activity on the sidewalk. Have you taken a census of how many people or cyclists actually use the sidewalk? No school children ever walk on this sidewalk to get to school. The school bus collects children on the corner of Rosedale Road and Rosedale Lane and drops them at Johnson Park School.
2. The proposal is to have a joint walking and bicycle dual-use pathway. This won’t work because bicyclists will force walkers off the pathway. Most of the walkers that I see using the existing pathway are walking their dogs. The dogs’ leads will undoubtedly get tangled up with bicyclists causing injury to both dogs and bicyclists. If there’s a situation of two people or bicyclists coming from opposite directions, someone would have to go out into the road and it wouldn’t be safe. Who has the right of way? A grass buffer between the sidewalk and the curb is a hazard if the bicycle has to veer onto it. If the sidewalk is recessed (lowered) so that there is an edge to the curb, it would be better.

3. The sidewalk on Great Road is not 10 feet wide and is used by pedestrians and cyclists. Why does the sidewalk on Rosedale Road have to be 10 feet wide?
4. Rather than going to the expense and disruption that this whole project will incur, it will just make more sense to repair the existing walkway and let the bicyclists continue to use Rosedale Road. Another alternative is to require the bicyclists to use the proposed new pathway on the south side of Rosedale Road and keep the existing pathway on the north side of Rosedale Road for the use of walkers only.

Other Proposals

1. Although the presenters focused our attention on the pathway, they also provided some information about the proposed roundabout on the Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive intersection and the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road. Apparently the roundabout at Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive will have a raised center. This will cause a problem for school buses entering and leaving General Johnson Drive. Apparently no traffic light is planned for this location. As you know, a walker was killed last year at this location and it would appear to be an appropriate place for a traffic light. There are existing flashing lights on either side of General Johnson Drive. I suggest you convert these to traffic lights which could be timed to both be red at the same time. This would permit buses, etc., to leave the school from General Johnson Drive without having to drive over the raised material in the middle of the “circle”. At the circle at Route 31 in Pennington, there are stop lights a few yards from the circle north and south of the circle. It has made a massive difference for the east and west roads – they now have time to cross. The traffic light that I propose at the intersection of Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive could be timed so that it was green for people leaving the school when the other two (now the flashing lights) are red.
2. At the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road consideration is being given to eliminating the ‘slip road’ which allows you to turn right onto Elm Road from Rosedale Road. This is a very, very bad idea. This slip road carries a very large volume of traffic and if you are going to require people to make a sharp right hand turn instead of using the slip road it is going to cause a serious traffic backup.

It is my opinion the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road works very well as it is currently constituted and should not be altered in any way.

Public Meeting?

Has there been a public meeting of the Town Council in which this project was discussed? If so, when was it? If there has not been such a public meeting at which we taxpayers may make comments, do you propose to have one and when?

Conclusion

I think this whole project is completely unnecessary. Perhaps the more appropriate thing to do is to repair the walkway on the north side of Rosedale Road and make it for the exclusive use of walkers. The new pathway being proposed for the south side of Rosedale Road could then be used exclusively for the use of bicyclists.

Response	<p>Deanna Stockton Email – April 22, 2022</p> <p>Thank you for providing comments on the Rosedale Road Safe Routes to School project. We have forwarded your email to the project consultant who will formulate responses to all written comments received. Once the comment period has ended on May 3, the comments and responses will be posted to the project webpage at https://www.princetonnj.gov/1152/Rosedale-Road-Safe-Routes-to-School-Proj. We can also provide a more detailed response directly back to you after the deadline for public comments.</p> <p>We have also forwarded your comments on the roundabout to the County Engineer, copied, as that is a County initiative that is moving ahead concurrent / ahead of the municipal Safe Routes to school pathway project. I will note regarding the Elm / Rosedale intersection that Princeton Police have requested that the slip ramp be reconsidered due to the number of crashes that occur there.</p>
-----------------	--

- *It appears that the project will “take” a significant part of my property (89 Rosedale Road). What will I be reimbursed for this property being usurped for town use?*

Response	<p>The proposed shared use path from east of General Johnson Road to Elm Road is 8’ wide due to environmental and property line constraints through the area. In areas where the existing right of way narrows from 60’ to 50’ (primarily near the residential properties along Rosedale Road), shared use path easements, set 5’ from the edge of the proposed shared use path, and temporary</p>
-----------------	--

construction easements will be acquired by the Municipality of Princeton to construct the shared use path and grading.

Reimbursement for easement acquisition will be discussed between impacted property owners and the Municipality of Princeton during the final design phase of the project.

- *It also appears that some of the very expensive rhododendrons and plantings that I planted to enhance the appearance of my property next to the existing path will have to be removed/moved. I spent a lot of money installing these – what will I be reimbursed for these? My gardener may be able to relocate some of the rhododendrons and plantings, but I will then need to be reimbursed for this relocation.*

Response | Existing features present within Mercer County’s right of way that are in conflict with the proposed shared use path would need to be relocated or removed to facilitate construction. Reimbursement can be discussed with representatives from the Municipality of Princeton, however,

- *I could not tell from the drawing that I saw whether it will be necessary to move the two stone pillars on either side of my driveway entrance onto Rosedale Road. My house and these pillars were built in 1912, therefore it is a historic location and the pillars should not be removed. However, if they have to be moved how are you going to do this and not damage them?*

Response | Impacts to the two stone pillars for Block 8601, Lot 11 (89 Rosedale Road) driveway are not anticipated. Notes on the plans will be added to inform the future contractor that impacts to these existing pillars should be avoided.

- *I have lived here for 17 years and have spent a lot of time out in my garden and seen very little activity on the sidewalk. Have you taken a census of how many people or cyclists actually use the sidewalk? No school children ever walk on this sidewalk to get to school. The school bus collects children on the corner of Rosedale Road and Rosedale Lane and drops them at Johnson Park School.*

Response | The purpose of improvements to the existing sidepath / sidewalk is to increase bicyclist and pedestrian safety through the area, which would promote school children and the public to use the shared use path in lieu of driving to school.

- *The proposal is to have a joint walking and bicycle dual-use pathway. This won’t work because bicyclists will force walkers off the pathway. Most of the walkers that I see using the existing pathway are walking their dogs. The dogs’ leads will undoubtedly get tangled up with bicyclists causing injury to both dogs and bicyclists. If there’s a situation of two people or bicyclists coming from opposite directions, someone would have to go out into the road and it wouldn’t be safe. Who has the right of way? A grass buffer between the sidewalk and the curb is a hazard if the bicycle has to veer onto it. If the sidewalk is recessed (lowered) so that there is an edge to the curb, it would be better.*

Response | The proposed 8’ to 10’ wide shared use path is designed to accommodate both bicyclists and pedestrians. In a situation where pedestrians and bicyclists travel in the same direction, bicyclists will pass pedestrians as they have the right of way.

Per Federal requirements for the design of a shared use path, a 5’ wide separate has been included between the active travel lane of Rosedale Road and the shared use path. This separation is to increase safety between bicyclists / pedestrians and vehicles (if the separation is less than 5’ wide, it is recommended to include a physical barrier).

- *The sidewalk on Great Road is not 10 feet wide and is used by pedestrians and cyclists. Why does the sidewalk on Rosedale Road have to be 10 feet wide?*

Response | The proposed features included in this project include an 8’ to 10’ wide shared use path. Per Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements, the recommended minimum width for a shared use path is 10’, with 8’ width present from General Johnson Road to Elm Road (environmental constraints, right of way, grading, etc.).

Proposed segments of sidewalk including in this project will be 5’ wide.

- *Rather than going to the expense and disruption that this whole project will incur, it will just make more sense to repair the existing walkway and let the bicyclists continue to use Rosedale Road. Another alternative is to require the bicyclists to use the proposed new pathway on the south side of Rosedale Road and keep the existing pathway on the north side of Rosedale Road for the use of walkers only.*

Response | An alternative was originally considered to include a shared use path / sidewalk along the south

side of Rosedale Road from General Johnson Road to Elm Road, however, it was determined that such an alternative would result in environmental impacts, right of way, potential utility impacts, and potential tree clearing.

- Although the presenters focused our attention on the pathway, they also provided some information about the proposed roundabout on the Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive intersection and the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road. Apparently the roundabout at Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive will have a raised center. This will cause a problem for school buses entering and leaving General Johnson Drive. Apparently no traffic light is planned for this location. As you know, a walker was killed last year at this location and it would appear to be an appropriate place for a traffic light. There are existing flashing lights on either side of General Johnson Drive. I suggest you convert these to traffic lights which could be timed to both be red at the same time. This would permit buses, etc., to leave the school from General Johnson Drive without having to drive over the raised material in the middle of the “circle”. At the circle at Route 31 in Pennington, there are stop lights a few yards from the circle north and south of the circle. It has made a massive difference for the east and west roads – they now have time to cross. The traffic light that I propose at the intersection of Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive could be timed so that it was green for people leaving the school when the other two (now the flashing lights) are red.

Response | The roundabout will have a mountable center island so buses will be able to make the turns into and out of the school driveway & park parking lot. Please see previous response in Section “1” subsection “c” for additional information on the decision for a roundabout vs a traffic light

- At the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road consideration is being given to eliminating the ‘slip road’ which allows you to turn right onto Elm Road from Rosedale Road. This is a very, very bad idea. This slip road carries a very large volume of traffic and if you are going to require people to make a sharp right hand turn instead of using the slip road it is going to cause a serious traffic backup.

Response | The county is currently in the design phase of improvements at this intersection to see what is feasible. The decision has not been made regarding the removal of the slip ramp.

- It is my opinion the intersection of Rosedale Road and Elm Road works very well as it is currently constituted and should not be altered in any way.

Response | Improvements to the signalized intersection will be required to better accommodate pedestrians.

- Public Meeting? Has there been a public meeting of the Town Council in which this project was discussed? If so, when was it? If there has not been such a public meeting at which we taxpayers may make comments, do you propose to have one and when?

Response | The Safe Routes to School project is funded by a competitive Federal grant which the municipality applied for and had been awarded, which is administered by New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) Local Aid. The purpose of this Preliminary Engineering phase public information center was to serve as a public meeting in which the public can ask questions and provide comments to the design team. Another public information center will be conducted during the Final Design phase of the project prior to construction.

- Conclusion: I think this whole project is completely unnecessary. Perhaps the more appropriate thing to do is to repair the walkway on the north side of Rosedale Road and make it for the exclusive use of walkers. The new pathway being proposed for the south side of Rosedale Road could then be used exclusively for the use of bicyclists.

Response | Comment acknowledged.

- Monday, May 2, 2022 – 1:53PM: Received via Email to Mercer County

Thank you for the Public Information Center Meeting on April 19th. I appreciate the time everyone spent in preparation for the meeting and for engaging in fruitful discussion with the public. Overall, I am in favor of reducing the speed limit in the Rosedale corridor to 35mph and understand the roundabout design will help as a proposed solution.

I am following up over email with the items below.

1. A consultant or municipal official mentioned they would update the county plan roundabout design on the [municipal website](#) and it hasn't been updated since the meeting

2. There is an opportunity to make more people aware there is a school located at the intersection of General Johnson and Rosedale. There are only a few small signs that include school leading up to the intersection and the school signs are set back that the public only sees at the intersection. [Safe Routes to School guide \[http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/engineering/pavement_markings.cfm\]](http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/engineering/pavement_markings.cfm) include markings as a way to increase awareness.
3. I asked at the meeting if there someone could share data for roundabouts and crosswalk accidents for pedestrians.
4. Someone shared that the Alexander and University Place has fewer accidents but I understand this is for cars. Do we have data pre roundabout vs post roundabout?

Response

Deanna Stockton Email – May 17, 2022

Thanks for the reminder regarding the roundabout plan. We will get the plan posted on the municipal webpage very soon.

I'll defer to Mercer County to answer the questions about pavement markings in the school zone and the crosswalk accidents at roundabouts.

Princeton Police's Traffic Safety Officer has reported that crashes post roundabout at Alexander / University are less. We've asked for supporting data if it is available.

Response

- A copy of the mini-roundabout plan have been uploaded to the Municipality of Princeton website.
- General Johnson Road features two existing signs for Johnson Park School, which may require relocation due to potential conflicts with the proposed curb and sidewalk / shared use path. Inclusion of pavement markings denoting school zones will be considered.
- Data for consideration: National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) "The Effects of Roundabouts on Pedestrian Safety", 2002 <https://nacto.org/references/stone-john-r/>
https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/effects_roundabouts_pedestrian_safety_stone.pdf
- The roundabout on Alexander Street and University Place was constructed around 2013-2014. After a review of NJDOT's Safety Voyager site (used for recording crash data throughout the State) for the vicinity of Alexander Street and University Place between 2005 through 2019 indicates that crashes have generally been reduced following the installation of the roundabout (33 accidents records at the intersection between 2011 to 2014, including 2 injuries [no fatalities or pedestrian injuries]; from 2015 through 2019, there were 21 accidents records with 7 possible injuries to 12 persons [no fatalities or pedestrian injuries]).
It can be noted that while there have been no pedestrian related accidents in the area since 2012, there was one bicycle related incident in 2015.

- Tuesday, May 3, 2022 – 9:30PM: Received via Email to Mercer County

Thank you very much for the preliminary proposal of a roundabout at the intersection at Rosedale Road and General Johnson Drive.

Also I am pleased that there will be a reduction in speed limits along this school zone.

While these improvements will slow down the blatant habitual speeding I think that pedestrians- especially the young children who are walking or biking to and from school, and the elderly residents of Elm Court and Harriet Bryan housing who like to walk along the Trolley trail and the D & R Greenway - need an extension of each splitter island on the outside of each leg of the roundabout.

As I look at the conceptual design diagram there is a thin triangle on the outside of each crosswalk. An extension of the splitter islands would also enable pedestrians to cross one direction of traffic at a time. A good example of the way I think the Rosedale roundabout design could be improved is the roundabout at Alexander Street and University Place.

Another question, are there plans to install pavement markings on each approach to indicate the School Zone, or other School Zone treatments?

Please let me know if you need anything more from me. Thanks again for this design,

Response | Mercer County: We requested our designer to consider extending the proposed splitter islands on the Rosedale approaches to encompass the crosswalks and create pedestrian refuge areas. School zone pavement markings will be added into the design.

- Wednesday, May 4, 2022 – 12:01AM: Received via Email

Thank you for provide the proposed plans for improvements to the sidewalks along Rosedale Road between Elm Road and Province Line Road.

I raised the issue at the meeting on 4/19 at Johnson Park School that there aren't any crossing points from the newly proposed sidewalk on the eastbound side of Rosedale to the wider path on the westbound side. I asked why there wouldn't be at least one crossing point at Constitution Hill. The designer said it wasn't feasible because this was a mid-block crossing. My understanding is that mid-block means at a T-intersection is this correct?

If so, I would like to point out that there are multiple 'mid-block' crosswalks all over Princeton - to name a few:

- Great Road and Winfield Road
- Great Road and Pretty Brook Rd
- Ridgeview Road and Cherry Hill Road
- State road 206 and Birch Ave
- 206 and Leigh Ave

The proposal expected users of the eastbound sidewalk to walk to Elm and cross there and then double back if they are traveling westbound. That is just not human nature.

I urge you to consider a crosswalk at Constitution Hill.

Response | A midblock crossing consists of a crossing between signalized and unsignalized intersections, which would include a crossing of Rosedale Road (Mercer County public right-of-way) at Constitution Hill West (private roadway). A proposed crossing at Constitution Hill West would constitute as a midblock crossing since it would be for a private roadway. If Constitution Hill West were a public road (public right of way), a proposed crosswalk would be allowed by statute, similar to the existing unsignalized T-intersections of public roadways noted above (which are not considered midblock crossings).
Improvements included in this project from Constitution Hill West to Elm Road (improvements by Mercer County) have been designed per coordination with Mercer County.

- Princeton Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) Meeting – May 4, 2022

The following comments were summarized by NV5 based upon a copy of draft meeting notes:

Group was receptive of the following improvements for Rosedale Road

- Roundabout at Gen Johnson
- Widened side path on north side
- Island on crosswalk at Fairway Drive
- New side path on south side (but very short)
- 11 ft lane width (hopefully this is not just striping)

Response | Comments acknowledged

We [PBAC] propose:

- Reduce speed limit to 35 mph as on Mercer St; Reduce design speed to 35 mph, lane striping alone is not enough (see Mercer Street)
- Traffic calming to 25 mph well before the roundabout, e.g. speed table, for extra protection of pedestrians on crosswalks; important as approach to intersection has curve and is downhill from both directions. The roundabout itself is probably taken at no more than 20mph.
- Design so you can't drive over most of the central circle, e.g. with public art
- Signage / road design to make drivers take central circle anti-clockwise; e.g. with proposed curb medians
- 10 ft side path where at all possible, narrowing roadway is necessary
- Extend side path on south side from Gen Johnson to Elm
- Remove slip lane at Elm Road ("Don't give up at the intersection")
- Use pavers for side path

Response |
• Reduction of speed limit for Rosedale Road to be considered by Mercer County
• Designing the mini-roundabout to accommodate a feature in the center island would result in it being a regular roundabout (larger inscribed circle diameter with a center island that cannot

be driven across and accommodate features within the center [i.e., public art, landscape, etc.], likely resulting in additional impacts to adjacent properties, environmental concerns, etc. – to be considered by Mercer County.

- Proposed shared use path is 10' wide from Christopher Drive to the Stony Brook structure, and 8' wide from the Stony Brook structure to Elm Road. The reduction of the width was due to environmental constraints, grading, potential utility and right of way impacts. An alternative to relocate the curb line was considered, however, it would result in additional impacts (primarily drainage and utilities).
- Signage for roundabout movements to be included at the approach roadways (anti-clockwise)
- An alternative for a proposed shared use path along the south side of Rosedale Road from General Johnson to Elm Road was considered, however, due to environmental, utility, and right of way impacts, it was removed from consideration.
- Removal of the slip ramp from Rosedale Road to Elm Road being designed by Mercer County.
- Use of pavers for the shared use path would result in a significant increase in the cost of the proposed shared use path. The proposed shared use path will utilize porous pavement, which is less expensive and easier to maintain than pavers.

Additional notes and general comments (from meeting notes):

- There is significant demand for a bike lane from PHS students living on Christopher Drive; use will increase with better sidepath and advent of e-bikes.

Response | Comment acknowledged. Although the Safe Routes to School project is focused on student pedestrian traffic associated with Johnson Park Elementary School, improvements to the infrastructure will be beneficial to the general public in the area.

- There is a sign asking bikes to dismount at bridge. Saying that there may be a way to widen the side path to make dismounting not necessary. (from 5' to 8'.)

Response | Changes to the existing Stony Brook structure and approach roadway to accommodate a 8'-10' wide shared use path were not included in the scope of the project (structure was recently reconstructed by Mercer County in 2009).