



Meeting Name:	Kick-Off Meeting	Meeting Date:	August 23, 2017
Facilitator(s):	Ramond Joseph & Tara Paxton	Meeting Time:	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Timekeeper:	Maria Connolly	Recorder:	Geoffrey Gray-Cornelius
Location &/or Dial In:		401 Chambers Bridge Road - Brick, NJ - Council Chambers AB Room	
Invitees/Attendees			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramond Joseph, <i>Local Planning Services (LPS)</i> • Maria Connolly, <i>LPS</i> • Geoffrey Gray-Cornelius, <i>LPS</i> • Bernie Cooke, <i>Brick Planning Board</i> • Michael Fowler, <i>Brick Planning Dept.</i> • Joanne Bergin, <i>Brick Administrator</i> • Andrew Ciesla, <i>Brick State Senator/Bike Shop Owner</i> • Keith Rella, <i>Brick Public Information Department/Environmental Commission</i> • Heather DeJong, <i>Brick Councilwoman</i> • Tara Paxton, <i>Brick Planning Dept.</i> • Elissa Commins, <i>Brick Engineering Dept.</i> • Chief James Riccio, <i>Brick Police Dept.</i> • Sgt. Neal Pederson, <i>Brick Police Dept.</i> • Captain Timothy Boyle, <i>Brick Police Dept.</i> • Thomas Gialanella, <i>Brick Board of Education</i> • David J. McKeon, <i>Ocean County Planning</i> • C. Roberts Mulloy, <i>Ocean County Engineering</i> • John N. Ernst, <i>Ocean County Engineering</i> • Jessica Burrell, <i>Brick Chamber of Commerce</i> • Chelle Hulse, <i>Brick Chamber of Commerce</i> • Jerry Foster, <i>Greater Mercer Transportation Management Association (GMTMA)</i> • Elise Bremer-Nei, <i>New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT)</i> • William Riviere, <i>NJDOT Pedestrian Safety</i> 			

Meeting Goals/Purpose

1. To introduce the NJ Department of Community Affairs(DCA)’s LPS Team to the working committee;
2. Define roles and responsibilities of the working committee;
3. Review the scope of work, schedule & outcomes; and
4. Review conditions on the ground.



AGENDA ITEMS

Item (Facilitator)

1. Welcome & Introductions (*Tara Paxton, Brick Twp*)

- Tara Paxton (TP) gave brief introduction of Brick Township and reasons for applying for Local Planning Services to take on project.
- TP explained that the Working Committee is made up of representatives of the relevant stakeholders who participate/oversee the pedestrian and bicycle community in Brick.

a. About Local Planning Services – Maria

- Maria Connolly (MC) gave introduction of what Local Planning Services (LPS) does.

b. NJDCA Local Planning Services – Team Members

The following people from the LPS project team attended the meeting: Ramond Joseph, LPS; Maria Connolly, LPS, and Geoffrey Gray-Cornelius, LPS.

c. Brick Twp Working Committee Members

The following people from the Working Committee attended the Kick-off meeting: Keith Rella (Brick Environmental Commission); Heather DeJong (Brick Councilwoman); Tara Paxton (Brick Planning Dept.); Elissa Commins (Brick Engineering Dept.); Chief James Riccio (Brick Police Dept.); Sgt. Neal Pederson (Brick Police Dept.); Captain Timothy Boyle (Brick Police Dept.); Rob Mulloy (Ocean County Engineering); Chelle Hulse (Brick Chamber of Commerce); Jerry Foster (GMTMA); William Riviere (NJDOT Pedestrian Safety)

2. Working Committee Roles & Responsibilities (*Ramond Joseph, LPS*)

- a. To provide information and identify available data for Bike/Ped Plan
- b. To provide local “intel” and ideas regarding the project
- c. To offer feedback on LPS proposed concepts
- d. To help with community outreach inclusive of stakeholders for Visioning Session
- e. To champion the results and help move them to implementation
- Ramond Joseph (RJ) went over the materials given to each Working Committee (WC) member (Scope of Services, Brick’s LPS application, the resolution establishing the need for a bike/ped plan and approving scope of services, a questionnaire for WC to fill out, and the meeting agenda).
 - RJ noted that LPS agreed to take on the project contingent upon Brick Township passing the resolution.
- RJ went over roles and responsibilities of WC, which are listed above.



- RJ emphasized that LPS needs WC help in outreach to the community to ensure adequate participation in the planning process, notably the Public Visioning Session, in order to ensure buy-in from public.

3. Review of the Scope of Work (*Ramond Joseph, LPS*)

- a. Project scope, schedule and outcome
- b. Complete Streets review and survey completion
- RJ went over Scope of Services.
 - RJ explained the project tasks that LPS will do, explaining each facet of the technical work:
 - Data Collection and Review of Existing Conditions
 - Solicit Community Input
 - Draft the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan
 - Prepare a Complete Streets Policy
 - RJ went over the expectations of Brick Township:
 - Adopt a resolution and create a working committee (already completed)
 - Host a community input session with WC, LPS, and other stakeholders
 - RJ noted that a second community input session may be appropriate depending on WC comfort level/interest
- RJ asked WC members to take a few moments to finish questionnaire.
- While filling out questionnaires, TP was asked to explain the main impetus for applying for LPS' help with this project. She explained:
 - Township planners (including her predecessors) have wanted to increase the (non-automobile) connectivity between places the residents want to go, namely the Drum Point Sports Stadium to the beach, but also to the two large conservation tracts in the Township.
 - Township has received 5 Safe Routes to School grants, but there is a limit to how far that type of project will go.
 - TP noted that Brick has an ordinance requiring developers to contribute to a sidewalk fund (if they don't build sidewalks on the property). However, there is a lack of enthusiasm to utilize these funds (and pass supporting legislation) to create a comprehensive network.
 - TP hopes that this study will help to convince relevant agencies/jurisdiction (and public) of the need to implement these changes.
 - TP noted the recent bicyclist tragedy (16 year old boy was killed when struck by a car on State Route 70 the previous weekend) and that it often takes a tragedy to spur public opinion in support of increasing safety measures.
 - TP noted that Brick is a relatively large municipality and is very spread out which makes a single, unified network difficult, so it is her hope that this project can identify key areas to focus on.
 - TP emphasized the need to engage the public to solicit their view on which areas they would like to see ped/bike improvements.



- William Riviere (WR) expressed support for holding a second public meeting as this would increase buy-in from the community and give them an opportunity to comment on the plan once it has become more concrete.
- Heather de Jong (HdJ) advocated for holding the second meeting within the community (go to them instead of having them come to us), possibly tied in to another upcoming community event (possibly Fallfest)
- TP noted that the physical layout of Brick is more akin to an octopus than a spine (downtown used to meet requirements on CAFRA application is not really what she considers a true downtown).
- HdJ noted that her constituents complain of the traffic backup that prevents them from getting to the beach (with a personal vehicle). If there was a safe ped/bike option, they would be able to circumvent this inconvenience (and alleviate some of the traffic congestion).
- WR noted that there are two groups of travelers of concern: recreational (primarily those going to the beach) and commuters. He then asked who was the bigger concern/priority.
 - TP responded that safety was the biggest concern (for all).
- James Riccio (JR) noted that the road shoulders are a major issue (not wide enough to allow for safe use by cyclists and automobiles).
- JR also noted that there is also a safety concern with ped/bike use within the two conservation tracts: these places are large and often nearly deserted so therefore potentially dangerous in the event of an accident/incident (potential for increasing lighting & adding callboxes for safety).
- RJ & TP informed WR as to the reason for pursuing LPS services verses the NJDOT Bike/Ped grant for technical assistance.
- RJ returned group discussion to the agenda.
- RJ went over the timeframe (9 months from WC Kick-Off Meeting to Draft Report):
 - WR expressed concern that the timing of the study would not allow for an accurate reflection of seasonal variations if data does not include summer traffic.
 - MC agreed that LPS should take this into account when determining when to collect data.
 - RJ noted that the timeframe could be extended if necessary.

4. Existing Conditions Review (Tara Paxton)

- a. Sidewalks, Paths and Bike Lanes Inventory Map
 - b. Destinations, Corridors, & Barriers Identification
- TP gave overview of Existing Conditions:
 - TP noted that a main area of focus is the hierarchy between different road jurisdictions (municipal to county, county to state, and municipal to state) as the existing conditions at these points are often substandard.
 - TP explained that schools (9 elementary and 2 middle) depend on busing because of the condition of county roads, as well as the perception that walking is unsafe (TP sends her own daughter on the bus even though school is only 1200 feet away).



- WR noted that some parents express concerns that increasing walkability will result in a decrease in busing options.
- TP noted a desire to increase the connections to neighboring municipalities that have better ped/bike networks (improving conditions in Brick to meet those standards).
 - TP explained that Brick has the “bones” for ped/bike culture to flourish, but that infrastructure and policies need to catch up to make this a reality.
- Neil Pederson (NP) noted that the primary impediment is the layout of water bodies.
 - TP agrees and adds that State Routes 88 and 70 are also issues.
- RJ asked WR if there are examples of state roads with bike lanes.
 - WR cited:
 - Avon-by-the-Sea (Rte 71)
 - Ocean City (Bridge/Rte 52)
 - Rob Mulloy (RM) added:
 - Bay Head (Rte 35)
- WR noted that he considers the movie theatre (AMC Brick Plaza) to be Brick’s Downtown.
 - JR noted that Tampa had turned something similar, i.e. a strip mall, into the heart of its downtown or Main Street.
- WR noted that many in the Hispanic community are prominent bicyclists, but that they can be hard to reach (distrustful of public officials).
- In reference to a previous incident of public backlash against bike lanes where Ocean County Planning ended up covering up recently laid lines, RM noted that outreach can preempt public backlash.
- TP explained that Department of Transportation (at varying jurisdictions) are often unwilling to consider changes if the plan is not “by the book,” gave example of improving wide pedestrian crossing that NJDOT refused to entertain because plan did not create a refuge island (because there was inadequate room to do so).
- TP argued that it would be useful for WC to go to some of the problem areas to get first-hand experience riding the routes used by stakeholders.
- Keith Rella (KR) suggested that WC reach out to schools.
 - TP explained that they invited the school superintendent to WC but that he was unable to come.
- KR suggested the use of social media for some aspects of the public outreach process.
 - WR added that Wikimap could be another useful tool.
- Multiple members discussed the prospect of utilizing speed bumps to control vehicle speeding, but that there were drawbacks, namely that residents complained of the noise and that they divert traffic to other streets.
- After most members had left, Jerry Foster (JF) noted that Point Pleasant Borough (bordering Brick Township to the east) is conducting a similar project with NJDOT so it may be useful to coordinate with them.



- RM explained that the County is more likely to take action if there are more municipalities that have passed Complete Streets policies. Municipalities within the county who currently have a Complete Streets program include:
 - Stafford
 - Point Pleasant Borough
 - Point Pleasant Beach Borough
 - Bay Head
 - Toms River
 - Eagleswood
- TP and HdJ provided LPS with a geographic overview of their observations about bike/ped connectivity (on map).
 - Midstream is relatively ped/bike friendly
 - South of Metedeconk River is a disconnected sub-neighborhood lacking in amenities (need to drive to get anywhere).
 - Newer developments with larger lots are located in the north. These are generally car-centric, but some newer developments have good sidewalk coverage.
 - Cedars Bridge Ave and Hooper Ave have issues with bicyclists riding the wrong way on a narrow road (insufficient room for motorists to safely pass)
 - A fence was installed on the median to prevent housing authority people crossing Chambers Bridge Road to reach post office. A HAWK pedestrian crossing signal may help.
 - Beaver Dam Road has wide shoulders.
 - Princeton Ave currently has a bicycle lane.
- TP noted that there is not an ordinance stating that cyclists cannot ride on the sidewalk (a common misconception).

5. Next steps (*Ramond Joseph*)

- a. Data Collection and Review of Existing Conditions
 - b. Community Input/Public Outreach
- NP said he will provide LPS with crash data.
 - RM will check if Ocean County Planning has a sidewalk inventory more recent than 2008 and provide LPS with copy of GIS files.
 - RJ will schedule bicycle ride for WC to experience the problem areas and incorporate summer traffic in data collection/existing conditions review
 - WC agreed to next meet on October 19th at 2:00 pm in the same location (to be confirmed).
 - WC agreed to hold the Public Visioning Session on November 29th at 6:00pm (location to be determined).



DRAFT PLANNING TASK & SCHEDULE

Planning Tasks/ Follow-ups with responsible Party				
Date Opened	Planning Task	Assignee	Due	Status
11/4/2016	Draft and finalize Scope of Work with Township contact	Project Team: Ramond Joseph et al	12/14/2016	Complete
11/4/2016	Adopt resolution designating the Working Committee and approving the Scope of Work	Tara Paxton et al	2/7/2017	Complete: Resolution No. 98-17
6/26/2017	Schedule Kick-Off Working Committee Meeting and LPS Site Visit	Ramond Joseph & Tara Paxton	8/23/2017	Complete
8/23/2017	Share crash data for Brick to project team	Sgt. Neal Pederson, Brick Police Dept.	8/30/2017	Pending
8/23/2017	Share GIS layers of most recent Sidewalks, Paths and Bike Lanes Inventory map	C. Roberts Mulloy, Ocean County Engineering	8/30/2017	Pending
8/23/2017	Data Collection and Review of Existing Conditions - WC bicycle ride through problem areas	Ramond Joseph & Tara Paxton	8/30/2017	Schedule Pending
8/23/2017	Data Collection and Review of Existing Conditions Report Draft	Project Team: Ramond Joseph et al	10/12/2017	Review initiated
8/23/2017	Data Collection/Existing Conditions Review and Visioning Session Prep Meeting	Project Team & Working Committee	10/19/2017	Working Committee meeting scheduled
8/23/2017	Visioning, Goals & Objectives (Community Input) Session (s)	Project Team & Working Committee	11/29/2017	Visioning session scheduled



11/29/2017	<i>Vision, Goals & Objectives Report Issued</i>	<i>Project Team</i>	12/13/2017	<i>Pending visioning session</i>
10/19/2017	<i>Issues and Needs Analysis</i>	<i>Project Team & Working Committee</i>	12/20/2017	<i>Working committee meeting schedule proposed</i>
11/19/2017	<i>Network Development: Evaluation Criteria; Policy Changes; Network Identification; Facility Types & Design; Recommendations; Performance; & Monitoring</i>	<i>Project Team & Working Committee</i>	1/31/2018	<i>Working committee meeting schedule proposed</i>
1/31/2018	<i>Draft Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan & Complete Streets Policy</i>	<i>Project Team & Working Committee</i>	3/11/2018	<i>Working committee meeting schedule proposed</i>
3/11/2018	<i>Planning Board presentation of draft Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan & Complete Streets Policy</i>	<i>Project Team</i>	4/16/2018	<i>Planning Board agenda date proposed</i>
4/16/2018	<i>Final Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan & Complete Streets Policy</i>	<i>Project Team, Working Committee, & Planning Board</i>	<i>A month after Planning Board adoption</i>	<i>TBD</i>