Section ES
Executive Summary

ES.1 Major Findings

ES.1.1 Background

When the New Jersey Turnpike was constructed 50 years ago, its purpose was to provide faster, more efficient travel for north-south trips between New York City/points north and Philadelphia/points south, replacing the use of US Route 1 and US Route 130, which were designed and built to older standards. While the New Jersey Turnpike continues to fulfill its role of serving regional transportation needs, US Route 1 remains a favored route for trips between northern New Jersey/New York and southwestern Middlesex County/northeastern Mercer County. In this region, the high traffic volumes and congestion experienced on US Route 1 and on local roads in the area are not effectively relieved by the New Jersey Turnpike, partly because of the lack of a high-speed connection between US Route 1 and the New Jersey Turnpike. Currently there is no high-speed roadway connecting US Route 1 and the New Jersey Turnpike in the study area between Route 18 in New Brunswick and Interstate 195/State Route 29 in southern Mercer County. Only local and secondary (i.e., county) roads are available for east-west travel in this area and they are increasingly burdened with traffic traveling between US Route 1 and the New Jersey Turnpike in the area.

Since 1980, strong population and employment growth has occurred in the communities along US Route 1, around Princeton, New Jersey. This growth has resulted in increased traffic volumes on the area's roads, including US Route 1 and the local and secondary east-west roads. Continued rapid growth is projected in this area over the next two decades. The New Jersey Turnpike Authority (NJTA) has no direct control over the land development review and approval process, which is principally the jurisdiction of municipalities and counties. However, it recognizes that new highway development can be a significant factor in the rate and shape of growth.

NJTA believes that improved highway mobility must be coupled with coordinated efforts on the part of local municipalities and state agencies (through NJ's Smart Growth initiatives) to reshape future developments, so that it will support and sustain traffic relief provided by proposed Route 92. Recognizing this, NJ agencies have affirmed their interest in collaborating closely with local communities to ensure that future development occurs in sustainable patterns.

A new east-west highway would provide a high-speed link between the major north-south highways in central New Jersey, improving east-west mobility, providing access to an alternative route for north-south traffic that now uses US Route 1, and reducing the adverse impacts of through traffic on local communities. The capacity of the New Jersey Turnpike was expanded in central New Jersey in the 1980s, and New Jersey Turnpike Authority (NJTA) studies show that there is currently adequate

capacity on the New Jersey Turnpike to accommodate regional traffic from the congested US Route 1 corridor.

A new east-west highway in southwestern Middlesex County has been discussed by the Middlesex County Planning Board and the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) for many years. In 1992, the New Jersey State Legislature approved a law, Chapter 474 of the Public Laws of 1991, now codified as NJSA 27:23-23.8, transferring authority over the Route 92 project from NJDOT to NJTA.

Since 1992, NJTA has further developed the concept of an east-west toll road pursuant to a series of engineering and environmental studies. NJTA's Proposed Route 92 would be a 6.7-mile limited access toll highway that would serve as an east-west highway link connecting US Route 1 in South Brunswick Township to the New Jersey Turnpike at Interchange 8A in Monroe Township. Proposed Route 92 would be a four-lane roadway, providing two travel lanes in each direction. The proposed project includes connections with existing local roadways at new interchanges with US Route 1, Perrine Road, US Route 130, and Interchange 8A. A proposed toll plaza facility would be constructed within the proposed alignment west of US Route 130.

NJTA applied to the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for a Federal Clean Water Act permit seeking authorization to discharge fill into waters of the United States related to construction of proposed Route 92. USACE has determined that a decision upon this permit application will be a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. This determination, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), calls for the USACE to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to provide information necessary for a permit decision.

This Draft EIS (DEIS) has been prepared to assist the USACE – New York District in reaching an informed decision on Application No. 1999-00240-J1, submitted by NJTA on January 6, 1999, for the proposed Route 92 project. The applicant seeks a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to discharge fill material in waters of the United States. The application submitted to USACE requests authorization to permanently discharge fill material in 12.03 acres of waters of the United States, including wetlands, as a result of construction activities related to proposed Route 92. A further 1.16 acres of wetlands would be permanently shaded by the bridges included in the project design. In addition, 2.92 acres of temporary fill would be required during construction, but removed prior to project completion.

The proposed Route 92 project is the subject of the Section 404 permit application. However, this DEIS, under the guidance of NEPA, analyzes a range of alternatives to the proposed project, including improvements to US Route 1 and many other alternatives that have been identified over the history of this project. Alternative projects that might potentially meet the project purpose and need are outlined in Section 2, and an alternatives analysis is presented to explain which alternatives were

selected, and which alternatives were not selected, for further evaluation in this document.

ES.1.2 Purpose and Need

The main purpose of NJTA's proposed Route 92 project is to:

- Provide an alternative travel route for north-south regional traffic currently using US Route 1 by improving access to the New Jersey Turnpike.
- Achieve a hierarchical east-west roadway system in southwestern Middlesex County and northeast Mercer County by providing a new high-speed connection for through traffic moving between the major north-south corridors (US Route 1, US Route 130, and the New Jersey Turnpike). This also would address the need for roadway network improvements to reduce traffic congestion and maintain mobility in this high-growth region.

Current traffic patterns indicate that growth in the region over recent decades has led to increasing competition between local trips and regional trips for capacity on the roadway network in southwestern Middlesex and northeastern Mercer County. US Route 1 is the principal highway accommodating traffic traveling north-south between the Princeton region and the New Jersey Turnpike (at Interchange 9 in East Brunswick). Projected growth in the region creates significant demand for both north-south and east-west travel capacity, considerably overloading the existing roadway network.

Through the proposed Route 92 project, NJTA seeks to reduce through traffic using the existing local east-west roads in southwestern Middlesex County and northeastern Mercer County to travel between US Route 1 and the New Jersey Turnpike, as well as to reduce the amount of through (north-south) traffic using existing US Route 1 between Princeton and New Brunswick.

NJTA's objectives for the project consist of the following:

1. Establish a road system that acts to reserve local streets for local traffic and circulation, while providing a separate high-speed route for traffic moving between US Route 1, US Route 130, and the New Jersey Turnpike.
2. Provide a connection to alternative routes for north-south traffic that is currently using US Route 1, to relieve congestion and improve mobility while minimizing impacts on the abutting communities.
3. Reduce the presence of non-local truck traffic on the local roadway network and shift such traffic to a connector highway.

4. Work with State agencies and local communities to ensure that the capacity created by proposed Route 92 is not eroded by unsustainable and uncoordinated development.

ES.1.3 Alternatives

NEPA requires a review be conducted of alternative approaches to meeting the need for and objectives of the project (as described in Section 1). Alternatives are assessed in Section 2 with respect to their ability to meet purpose and need, their impacts, and their implementability.

Five types of alternatives are evaluated in Section 2:

1. **No Action.** This alternative is a consequence of USACE not granting a permit for the proposed project. Under this alternative, proposed Route 92 would not be constructed, nor would any other major traffic network improvement beyond those that are currently funded be implemented as part of this project.

2. **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures.** TDM measures are focused on reducing the number of single occupancy vehicles that contribute to congestion on roadways, using measures such as ride-sharing, flex hours, and public transit.

3. **Existing local and county roadway capacity improvements.** This category includes alternatives that improve the capacity of existing local and county roads by widening existing roads and improving intersections. These improvements are also referred to in this document as Transportation System Management (TSM) measures.

4. **Improvements to existing regional system.** This category includes improvements to the existing regional roadway system, specifically US Route 1.

5. **New roadway facilities.** The category includes construction of new roadways.

Within each of these five broad categories, the following specific alternatives are evaluated in Section 2:

1. No Action

    - No implementation of the NJTA proposed action (i.e., no implementation of the proposed regional roadway capacity improvements)

2. Transportation Demand Management

    - Ridesharing-Carpooling/Vanpooling Programs
    - Alternative Work Hours
    - Parking Management

- High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes
- Transit Support Services, Including Park-and-Ride Facilities
- Public Transit Operational Improvement
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- Transportation Management Association Involvement

3. Existing Local and County Roadway Capacity Improvements
   (New Lanes added to Existing Roads, or Intersection Improvements)

   - US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Suggested Modified No-Build Alternative
   - Route 522 Widening (with and without extension to New Jersey Turnpike)
   - Dey Road Widening
   - Plainsboro – Cranbury Road Widening
   - Cranbury Neck Road Widening
   - Composite Local Roadway Improvements Program

4. Improvements to the Existing Regional Roadway System

   - US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick
   - US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick with Signal Removals

5. New Roadway Facilities

   - NJTA Proposed Route 92 with Terminus at Route 1, including sub-alternatives
   - USEPA Suggested Alignment
   - Dey Road Parallel Alignment
   - Plainsboro – Cranbury Road Parallel Alignment
   - South Brunswick Alignment – Modified

NJTA only has authority to implement proposed Route 92 or a modification thereof such as the sub-alternatives discussed in Section 2.6.1.1. Other state or local sponsors would be needed to implement other alternatives.

In this DEIS the following process is used to evaluate the alternatives:

1. Alternatives with comparatively high permanent wetlands impacts are eliminated from further consideration

2. Alternatives with impacts to large areas subject to farmland preservation easements are eliminated from further consideration

3. Alternatives with relatively significant impacts to parklands and preserves are eliminated from further consideration

4. Alternatives causing very substantial residential, commercial, and public dislocation are eliminated from further consideration

5. Alternatives that were judged not to substantially meet the stated purpose and need of the project are eliminated from further consideration

Pursuant to alternatives analysis, those alternatives that best meet the purpose and need, on a comparative basis, and that exhibit fewer adverse environmental and land use impacts, on a comparative basis, are evaluated in additional detail with respect to their impacts, in Section 4 of this DEIS.

The results of the alternatives analysis are summarized in Table ES-1 and discussed below.

Implementation of TDM measures would likely provide some relief from traffic congestion in the study area, but would not substantially address the project need. TDM measures most effectively reduce traffic congestion in areas that are densely populated and located near major employment centers. The implementation of the TDM strategies would not significantly mitigate the existing congestion problems. However, such strategies would be effective as complementary strategies and the combined effect of these measures can offset the potential for additional highway-capacity-induced single-occupancy-vehicle (SOV) trips.

Compared to the other alternatives, the South Brunswick Alignment – Modified and Composite Local Roadway Improvements Program alternatives have greater impacts to permanent wetlands and open water. The Composite Improvements Program alternative also has substantial dislocation impacts, particularly residential dislocations (180). Neither alternative meets the project purpose. Because minimization of wetland impacts was a high priority, these alternatives were identified as the least desirable alternatives.

The Dey Road Parallel Alignment and Plainsboro Cranbury Road Alignment alternatives, while exhibiting lesser wetland impacts, have substantial impacts on legally preserved farmlands and, in the case of the Dey Road Parallel Alignment, has substantial residential dislocation impacts (63). Neither alternative meets the project purpose. Under New Jersey's Farmland Preservation program, use of legally preserved farmland for non-farm purposes is strongly discouraged, and legal impediments largely preclude use of such lands for non-farm purposes. For this reason these alternatives were identified as relatively infeasible.

The USEPA Suggested Alignment alternative has greater wetland impacts than most of the alternatives and, most significantly, substantial direct and indirect parkland impacts (loss of 48 acres of Plainsboro Preserve), while only partially meeting the project purpose. This alternative is identified as relatively undesirable, based on its comparatively significant impacts.

Table ES-1
Alternatives Evaluation Summary

Alternative	Permanent Wetland/Open Water Impacts (acres)	Farmland Preservation Impacts (acres)	Parkland Impacts	Residential Impacts	Commercial Impacts	Public Facilities Impacts	Meets Project Purpose?
South Brunswick Alignment – Modified	43.0	n/a	Plainsboro Preserve	n/a	n/a	n/a	No
Composite Local Roadway Improvements Program	20.0	0	0	180	10	6	No
Dey Road Parallel Alignment	3.6	27	0	63	4	0	No
Plainsboro – Cranbury Road Parallel Alignment	5.6	33	Public open space part of Estates at Grovers Mill Subdivision	12	4	0	No
USEPA Suggested Alignment	13.0	0	Direct - 48.2 ac Indirect - 10.1 ac	11	0	1	Partial
Route 522 Widening (with/without extension to New Jersey Turnpike)	2.0 / 7.0	0	Pigeon Swamp State Park	58	1	4	No
Plainsboro – Cranbury Road Widening	0.6	0	0	41	5	2	No
Cranbury Neck Road Widening	4.3	0	0	63	2	0	No
USEPA Modified No-Build Alternative	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	No
Dey Road Widening	7.5	0	0	18	1	0	No
NJTA Proposed Route 92 with Terminus at Route 1	12.0	0	Northern end of Plainsboro Preserve	4	1	0	Yes
Two-Lane Route 92	9.5	0	Northern end of Plainsboro Preserve	4	1	0	Partial
Phased Route 92	12.0	0	Northern end of Plainsboro Preserve	4	1	0	Yes
Route 92 without Perrine Road Interchange	12.0	0	Northern end of Plainsboro Preserve	4	1	0	Yes
US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick	4.0	0	0	3	3	0	Partial
US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick with Signal Removal	7.7	0	0	8	7	0	Partial

The Route 522 Widening alternative (with or without extension to the New Jersey Turnpike) exhibits relatively fewer wetland impacts but has substantial parkland impacts (Pigeon Swamp State Park) and substantial residential and public facility dislocation impacts. Its impacts to the Pigeon Swamp wetland complex, which has been designated as a USEPA Priority Wetland and is included in the National Register of Natural Landmarks, are significant. The alternative does not meet the project purpose.

The Plainsboro-Cranbury Road and Cranbury Neck Road Widening alternatives have relatively less wetland impact than the other alternatives, but exhibit major residential dislocation impacts (41 and 63 dislocations, respectively). These alternatives would exhibit major social impacts to the community. Neither alternative meets the project purpose.

The USEPA Suggested Modified No-Build alternative has few physical and socioeconomic impacts but fails to meet the project purpose. Many of the improvements previously suggested under this alternative have been implemented. The traffic modeling analysis conducted for this DEIS includes these improvements as background conditions, and yet the traffic modeling analysis still identifies significant need for road network improvements (as described in Project Purpose and Need in Section 1 and the Transportation analysis in Section 4) above and beyond these already implemented intersection improvements.

The Dey Road Widening Alternative exhibits moderate wetland impacts (7.5 acres) and moderate residential dislocation impacts (18), but most significantly it uses local roads to carry regional traffic, and does not provide an efficient connection to the New Jersey Turnpike because it increases the burden on local intersections as traffic moves to Interchange 8A. Because this alternative exhibits moderate wetland and residential dislocation impacts and does not meet the project purpose it was identified as less desirable than other alternatives.

The USEPA Modified No-Build alternative and the Route 522, Plainsboro-Cranbury Road, Cranbury Neck Road, and Dey Road widening alternatives would not reduce regional through traffic on the local east-west road system. Increasing levels of local and regional through traffic would create congestion on these roads, make local travel more difficult, discourage walking and bicycling, and reduce the quality of life in adjacent communities and neighborhoods.

The two-lane Route 92 sub-alternative, while reducing wetland impacts by 2 acres and slightly reducing other environmental impacts, would be less effective at removing non-local traffic from local roads. Traffic modeling shows that a two-lane Route 92 would reach 100% of its capacity by 2008. For these reasons, a two-lane Route 92 was determined not to meet the purpose of the project, because it does not adequately address reduction of projected future congestion.

Similarly, a phased two-lane to four-lane Route 92 would be inefficient from a planning perspective, and would ultimately not decrease environmental or socioeconomic impacts, because the second phase would need to begin construction almost immediately upon completion of the first two lanes. Therefore, the phased Route 92 sub-alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Removal of the Perrine Road interchange from proposed Route 92 would reduce the loss of farmland by approximately 5 acres, but would not significantly reduce other adverse impacts. It would also be expected to cause more congestion on US Route 1 and local roads in the area due to fewer access options for the office development area between Schalks Crossing Road and US Route 1 (Forrestal Center and others). Because removal of the Perrine Road interchange would have limited environmental and socioeconomic benefit and would decrease the traffic improvements that would result from proposed Route 92 (and thereby increase congestion and air pollution), this sub-alternative was also eliminated from further consideration.

The US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick (with or without signal removals) and NJTA Proposed Route 92 have moderate wetland and dislocation impacts and minimal park and socioeconomic impacts, while fully or partially meeting the project purpose.

As a result of this screening analysis, four alternatives were selected for more detailed analysis in the DEIS, and are addressed further in Section 4:

- No Action
- NJTA Proposed Route 92 (Terminus at Route 1)
- US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick
- US Route 1 Widening in South Brunswick with Signal Removals

ES.1.4 Affected Environment

Section 3 describes the existing conditions of the environment within the project study area, and is the basis of the impact evaluation of the No Action alternative, proposed Route 92, and the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative. Section 3 documents the environmental, cultural, transportation socioeconomic, and land use settings of the alternative corridors and adjacent areas. The DEIS includes subsections on geology/soils, water resources, wetlands, fish and wildlife, farmland, historic and cultural resources, air quality, transportation noise, aesthetics, known contaminated sites, human health, socioeconomics, land use, and environmental justice.

The Proposed Route 92 Corridor is defined as a 1000-foot-wide study area spanning the centerline of the proposed Route 92 project, reaching from US Route 1 near Ridge Road in South Brunswick to the New Jersey Turnpike at Interchange 8A in Monroe, including the proposed road improvements. The US Route 1 Corridor is defined as a 1000-foot wide swath spanning the centerline of US Route 1 between US Route 130 in North Brunswick and Independence Way in South Brunswick. The general Project

Study Area comprises a larger area of several square miles surrounding the alternatives in southwestern Middlesex County and northeastern Mercer County.

The Project Study Area consists of relatively flat to rolling topography with land depressions generally consisting of water features (wetlands, watercourses, ponds and lakes). The elevation ranges from a low point of approximately 70 feet above mean sea level (MSL) to a high of approximately 260 feet.

The study area is characterized by palustrine wetland systems associated with Devil's Brook, Shallow Brook, Heathcote Brook, and Oakeys Brook (refer to Section 3.3.4). The majority of the Proposed Route 92 Corridor is within and adjacent to the Devil's Brook and Shallow Brook wetlands, while the Route 1 Corridor is within and adjacent to the Heathcote Brook and Oakeys Brook wetlands. Specifically, Devil's Brook supports the majority of the forested wetlands within the Proposed Route 92 Corridor. These wetland ecosystems range from emergent to forested vegetative communities.

The wetland systems in the vicinity of the proposed Route 92 project are generally characterized by a vegetative community consisting of an upper canopy of red maple, sweetgum, pin oak and green ash; a shrub canopy consisting of spicebush, sweet pepperbush, common greenbrier, highbush blueberry, and swamp azalea; and a moderately thick herbaceous layer consisting of skunk cabbage, cinnamon fern, sensitive fern and spotted jewelweed. In limited areas, the forested wetland gives way to emergent wetlands, characterized by herbaceous emergent plants with little or no overstory. Several man-made wetlands consist primarily of broad-leaved cattail and woolgrass.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) records had indicated that potentially suitable habitat for the federally listed bog turtle is located in the vicinity of the proposed Route 92 project, along Lawrence Brook. In addition, USFWS noted that Cooper's hawk, savannah sparrow, and wood turtle, all state listed as threatened, are known to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project site. Two surveys were performed in the forested wetlands in the Devil's Brook area specifically for wood turtle and bog turtle; the surveys determined that there is in fact low potential for suitable wood turtle habitat and no potentially suitable bog turtle habitat in the project study area. According to USFWS, the project area is not designated as a "critical habitat" for threatened or endangered species under USFWS regulations.

NJDEP Natural Heritage Program (NJNHP) has records for occurrences of southern arrowhead and low spearwort within the Proposed Route 92 Corridor. Comet darner, American waterwort, tall boneset, soapwort gentian, shore quillwort, slender water-milfoil, humped bladderwort, and Britton's coast violet have been documented near the immediate vicinity of the corridor. A rare plants evaluation was completed for the project; it found that of the species previously reported in the general vicinity of the project, only southern arrowhead was determined to be likely present within the

proposed right-of-way. Tall boneset was not included in the rare plants evaluation, as it was not listed at the time the evaluation was performed. In addition, the Landscape Project, NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife's publicly-available critical habitat mapping program, shows that suitable habitat patches of emergent wetland, forest, grassland and forested wetland occur on the project site, and has records for bobolink, savannah sparrow, and wood turtle in habitat patches within the Project Study Area. Refer to Section 3.3.5 for further discussion on fish and wildlife.

The Traffic Study Area (see Section 3.7) consists of the towns of South Brunswick, Plainsboro, and Cranbury in southwestern Middlesex County; and the townships of West Windsor and East Windsor (including Hightstown) in northeastern Mercer County. The main highways serving traffic passing through this area are all oriented in a north-south direction: the New Jersey Turnpike (with Interchanges 8 and 8A along the area's eastern edge) and US Route 130 on the eastern side of the area, and US Route 1 and NJ Route 27 on the area's western side. NJ Route 32 provides a connection between US Route 130 and the New Jersey Turnpike at Interchange 8A.

A series of east-west local and secondary roads connect to the four north-south highways in the Traffic Study Area, providing access to the towns as well as serving local circulation needs. These roads include County Route 610 (Deans Lane), Major Road, New Road, County Route 522, Ridge Road, Friendship Road, Broadway Road, Dey Road, Scudders Mill Road, Plainsboro Road, Cranbury Neck Road, and County Route 571. The newly constructed Hightstown Bypass (NJ Route 133) is a 3.7-mile, divided, four-lane limited-access highway in the town of East Windsor, allowing east-west traffic passing through East Windsor to bypass the town of Hightstown. The principal peak hour traffic flows in the Traffic Study Area are the north-south flows along the New Jersey Turnpike, US Route 1, and US Route 130. The most serious congestion in the Traffic Study Area, however, occurs on the two-lane east-west roads, such as Ridge Road, Dey Road, and Plainsboro Road. Currently, approximately 16 percent of traffic on these roads is through traffic.

Section 3.12.1 provides demographic information for the four municipalities in the Project Study Area. The population of South Brunswick Township, the largest of the four municipalities, grew by 46 percent between 1990 and 2000. This was the highest growth rate among the four municipalities, and was almost four times greater than the 12 percent growth of the Middlesex County population during that decade. The population of Plainsboro Township grew 42 percent between 1990 and 2000. The Middlesex County Planning Department (MCPD) projects that the population of both South Brunswick and Plainsboro will increase by 50 percent between 2000 and 2020, three times the growth rate projected for the County as a whole. The population of Monroe Township grew 26 percent between 1990 and 2000; MCPD projects that the population of Monroe Township will increase by 35 percent between 2000 and 2020. The population of North Brunswick Township grew 16 percent between 1990 and 2000; MCPD projects that the population of North Brunswick will increase by 22 percent between 2000 and 2020.

Zoning in the project corridor study areas ranges from low-density residential to commercial to light industrial. The Proposed Route 92 Corridor passes mainly through office/research/conference and low-density residential areas. Approximately 3.9 miles of the 6.7 miles of proposed Route 92 would pass through land currently assessed as farmland for property tax purposes. The agricultural land through which Route 92 would pass is somewhat concentrated in the western and central portions of the corridor, but a significant stretch of the eastern portion of the proposed Route 92 would also pass through active agricultural land. The US Route 1 Corridor lies mostly within industrial and commercial areas. Refer to Section 3.13.2 for more information on land use and zoning.

ES.1.5 Environmental Impacts

As discussed in Section 2, the alternatives proposed over the history of the Route 92 project were evaluated to ascertain how well each meets the project purpose and to assess its comparative potential environmental impact. Among the broad set of alternatives considered in Section 2, a subset of alternatives that best met purpose and need with relatively lower levels of impact were recommended for more detailed analysis.

The environmental impacts of the No Action alternative, the Route 92 alternative (and phased subalternative), and the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative are discussed in Section 4. Some of the US Route 1 alternative impact discussion is divided into "widening only" and "widening with signal removal", which helps to segregate impacts by construction element, because a significant portion of the impact of that alternative would be due to intersection alteration rather than the widening of US Route 1.

Several types of impacts are presented in Section 4. The Federal Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1508.8 and 1508.7) define the impacts that must be evaluated during the NEPA process. *Direct impacts* are those that are caused by a proposed project and occur at the same time and place. For example, the loss of wetland value and acreage from filling would be a direct impact. *Indirect impacts* are caused by a project, but occur later in time or are removed in distance. Induced development resulting from increased highway traffic is an example of an indirect impact. *Cumulative impacts* result from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future action that may be undertaken by any party. Economic growth in a region after increased development could be considered a cumulative impact.

Through the course of preparing this EIS, several specific impact issues have been identified that combine several environmental and/or socioeconomic parameters, and therefore are better served by an integrated discussion. Included in this list are the following:

- **Devil's Brook Watershed/Wetland Complex.** Most wetland impacts related to the proposed Route 92 project are located within the Devil's Brook wetland complex. This entire forested system is approximately 1650 acres. The proposed Route 92 project would traverse the forested tract near its southerly edge, traveling between a 500-acre area south of the roadway and an 1150-acre area north of the roadway. However, impacts to the hydrology of the Devil's Brook wetlands complex would be minimized by several features of the proposed roadway design, such as culverts and bridges. Specifically, two 500-foot long bridges are proposed to span this wetland complex, preserving the surface and subsurface water hydrology. These structures would also enable the passage of reptiles, amphibians, and larger animals, thus reducing fragmentation effects on these populations. The placement of roadway fill would lead to some localized, minor surface and subsurface changes to the wetlands immediately adjacent to the roadway. Forest fragmentation is also a concern, as this could affect neotropical bird migration. While fingers of forested land crossing the Proposed Route 92 Corridor could be negatively affected by fragmentation, most of the forested Devil's Brook wetland complex would remain undisturbed (approximately 1150 acres north of the proposed roadway and 500 acres south of the proposed roadway). Broadway Swamp, also adjacent to the proposed alignment, consists of a minimum of 2400 acres of forested land south of the proposed roadway. About 12 acres of these wetlands would be filled as part of the construction of proposed Route 92. Impacts to surface and groundwater quality due to highway runoff are also a concern along the proposed project. NJTA has committed to full compliance with stormwater management requirements recently adopted by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), which require significant improvements in the quality of runoff before discharge. A range of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's), including extended detention basins, low velocity overland flow, and bioretention are proposed to control water quality impacts.

- **Plainsboro Preserve.** The proposed Route 92 project would pass through the northern end of the Plainsboro Preserve. Approximately 12.5 acres of the preserve north of the proposed roadway would be separated from the rest of the preserve. As with other parts of the Devil's Brook watershed, habitat and hydrologic fragmentation is a possible result. As discussed above, however, roadway design would allow both surface water and wildlife to cross under the highway. Adverse aesthetic impacts of proposed Route 92 would be diminished by the existing forest present over much of the preserve. Because the proposed roadway is at the northern edge of the Plainsboro Preserve, construction- and use-related impacts would be restricted to a relatively small portion of the preserve. The project would not significantly affect the wildlife and aesthetic value of the entire property.

- **Historic Resources.** The historic Village of Kingston has expressed concerns regarding the volume of traffic using the local roads that would travel to and from Route 92 on Kingston's local roads. Of particular concern is travel on Heathcote

Road, a two-lane rural roadway without shoulders, bordered by residences constructed very close to the road. Together with Ridge Road, it provides an east-west connection between US Route 1 and NJ Route 27. The Heathcote Road intersection with NJ Route 27 is the major intersection in the Village. The network model used for this project estimates that during each peak hour, an additional 20 trucks would use Heathcote Road and the adjacent portion of Ridge Road. If restrictions on truck traffic and traffic calming measures such as speed humps were implemented on this road, the traffic impact of proposed Route 92 on Heathcote Road would be reduced.

- **Consistency with Planning Principles and the NJ State Development & Redevelopment Plan.** Proposed Route 92 would draw regional through-traffic away from local roads. This is expected to make local driving more amenable and efficient and facilitate alternative forms of transportation, such as walking and bicycle riding. Removal of through traffic from neighborhood centers would improve quality of life and would tend to strengthen the identification of residents with their communities while allowing more efficient development designs (such as interconnected developments, which are not desirable at present because they become routes for through traffic).

  The areas in South Brunswick where proposed Route 92 might potentially stimulate development—the interchange areas--are areas the Township has designated for commercial and industrial development. The area in South Brunswick where Route 92 would have no interchanges, and would therefore have little potential to stimulate development, is an area South Brunswick has designated for relatively sparse development. Proposed Route 92 could stimulate development in areas where South Brunswick has planned for commercial and industrial development to occur.

  The Plainsboro Master Plan states that proposed Route 92 is "a priority for the Township," and that the Township supports Route 92 and "encourages [its] timely implementation."

  With respect to the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, proposed Route 92 would begin and end in a Suburban Planning Area, PA2, and would pass through an Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area, PA5. The State Plan "anticipates continued growth throughout New Jersey in all Planning Areas." Development is encouraged in PA1 and PA2 and is accommodated in PA3, PA4 and PA5. The State Plan directs that infrastructure investment decisions should encourage growth in areas that are already developed or are currently developing, and should discourage development sprawl into undeveloped areas. Proposed Route 92 would have no interchanges in the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area, and would therefore not directly enhance access to that area.

Proposed Route 92 interchanges near the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (for example, the proposed Route 92-Perrine Road connection) would indirectly enhance access to that area, and potentially accelerate existing development trends. NJTA believes that improved mobility must be coupled with a coordinated attempt on the part of local municipalities and state agencies (through NJ's Smart Growth initiatives) to reshape existing and proposed developments that support and sustain traffic relief provided by proposed Route 92. State agencies look to collaborate closely with local communities to ensure that future development occurs in sustainable patterns.

- **Induced Development.** Much of the open land within the proposed Route 92 Corridor is currently zoned for residential or commercial development. Growth and development pressures exist independent of the development of proposed Route 92, and much of the development that is proposed would likely occur with or without proposed Route 92.

  Because proposed Route 92 would be a limited access highway, it would not enable linear development along its route. With no interchanges between Perrine Road and US Route 130, it would not connect to cross streets that would make available new lands for development. Secondary development impacts could potentially occur at the interchanges of proposed Route 92 with US Route 1, Perrine Road, US Route 130 and New Jersey Turnpike Interchange 8A. The lands surrounding the interchange areas are already extensively developed, approved, or zoned for development. Control of future development in these locations remains principally under the jurisdiction of the municipal development review process and the guidance of municipal Master Plans.

  Proposed Route 92 is designed to maintain mobility on the local and regional road networks. Maintaining this mobility in the road network could have the potential to make undeveloped properties in the area more attractive for development, because their accessibility would remain stable. New development creates the ability to accommodate increased population and economic activity in the local area and the region. Transportation modeling conducted for this EIS indicates that Route 92 would not provide transportation capacity beyond what is currently needed (i.e., no excess capacity is proposed). Rather, traffic modeling indicates that Route 92 would provide only the transportation capacity needed to accommodate growth that has already occurred or is already in the process of occurring. Without improvements such as Route 92, traffic growth would continue and the gap between the volume of traffic and the capacity to accommodate traffic would become steadily larger. The effect of the widening gap is to decrease the quality of life for existing residents as a result of significant congestion.

Because implementation of the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative would do little to facilitate access to undeveloped areas, it would have little impact on "sprawl" development.

The remaining impacts set forth in Section 4 can be summarized as follows:

- **Floodplains.** The construction of the proposed Route 92 project would result in floodplain reduction at Heathcote, Devil's and Shallow Brooks within the Millstone River watershed. For any construction project, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prohibits encroachment within the 100-year flood boundary that will cause an increase in flood heights of greater than 1.0 foot. The State of New Jersey prohibits encroachment within the flood hazard area that will cause an increase in flood heights of greater than 0.2 feet. In general, the hydraulic analyses show that the construction of proposed Route 92 would not have a major impact on the water surface elevation of the affected brooks and tributaries, with the exception of the tributary to Heathcote Brook crossed by US Route 1. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection regulations limit the fill or reduction of floodplain volume below the 100-year flood to a maximum of 20 percent of the flood fringe area within the right-of-way. Three of the proposed floodplain takings or net fills within the Proposed Route 92 Corridor exceed this 20 percent rule. NJTA will request exemptions from the requirement for these two areas when it submits a new Stream Encroachment Permit Application to the NJDEP. NJTA and NJDEP look to ensure that the proposed project does not result in additional flooding impacts, and that it complies fully with recently enacted NJDEP stormwater management rules.

- **Water Quality.** Impacts to the waterways in the region from bridge and roadway construction, vehicular traffic, and application of deicing material could include effects of sediment and particulate matter, petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, solids and floatables, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, and road salt. The estimated pollutant loads from proposed Route 92 would be reduced by use of Best Management Practices (BMP's), such as extended detention basins, low velocity overland flow, and bioretention, to control water quality impacts. Pollutants will be significantly reduced in highway discharges to water bodies by the proposed stormwater management controls . As most of the soils in the Project Study Area are hydrologic group B, C or D, representing moderate, slow and very slow rates of water transmission, infiltration of stormwater runoff generated by proposed Route 92 or its alternatives should not pose an adverse threat to groundwater quality. Pollutant levels will be reduced by the proposed BMPs, and, after discharge, would be taken up by plants, adsorbed by sediments and soil, or broken down by microorganisms in the soil before they reach the groundwater table.

  The creation of additional impervious surfaces along US Route 1 would result in increased stormwater runoff rates compared to current conditions. If

uncontrolled, the additional stormwater from US Route 1 could carry significant amounts of vehicle-related contaminants from the roadway into surface and groundwater resources. The current stormwater system in place along US Route 1 would have to be updated to convey and treat the additional stormwater runoff created by expansion of this roadway. Various state, county and regional agencies have stormwater management regulations with which this construction would have to comply.

- **Wetlands.** As discussed in Section 4.2.3.4, 12.03 acres of wetlands would be permanently filled during construction of proposed Route 92, and an additional 1.16 acres would be permanently affected by shading from elevated sections of the roadway. To mitigate for the impact, NJTA proposes to create 57 acres of wetland extending north and south from the proposed Route 92 alignment east of Haypress Road (see Section 5.3.4). The constructed wetland would be hydrologically connected to the wetland complex bordering Devil's Brook, the same wetland that would experience most of the 12.03 acres of wetland filling associated with proposed Route 92. The replacement wetland would be designed as a wetland complex composed of 0.85 acres of open water, 12.24 acres of emergent marsh and wet meadow, 8.2 acres of scrub-shrub wetland, and 36.7 acres of forested wetland. An additional 202 acres, mostly forested wetland with some forested upland, in the vicinity of Friendship Road and Miller Road will also be preserved by NJTA as part of project mitigation.

  Widening US Route 1 by two lanes (one northbound and one southbound lane) would impact approximately 4.0 acres of palustrine forested wetlands. Construction easements associated with temporary disturbance would increase this estimate. An additional 3.7 acres of wetlands would be lost as a result of roadway improvements needed to grade-separate the five targeted intersections for the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative. Appropriate wetland mitigation would be required.

- **Wildlife.** Implementation of the proposed Route 92 project would not significantly reduce the usable habitat within the proposed Route 92 Corridor. Some interior forest habitat would be lost; however, wildlife ability to travel and the connection of the forest to the north with the forest, lake and grassland in the south would continue to exist. Major tracts of forest north and south of proposed Route 92 would remain unaffected by the project. The post-development grassland habitat should continue to provide suitable habitat for a variety of bird species.

  US Route 1 widening would result in the loss of vegetation and associated wildlife habitat along the new roadway right-of-way. Assuming the US Route 1 widening requires an additional 8 to 10 feet of roadway to accommodate the proposed third north- and southbound lanes, approximately two acres of vegetated habitat would be taken for roadway construction. Additional vegetation would be disturbed

during construction, as staging areas would be required along the approximately 7-mile length of affected roadway. Although revegetation is usually required at the end of a construction period, it takes several decades to recreate forest habitat that might be lost during construction. An additional 8.5 acres of vegetation and associated habitat would be lost as a result of roadway improvements needed to reconstruct the five targeted intersections for the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative.

- **Threatened and Endangered Species.** USFWS lists habitat for federally listed bog turtle in the vicinity of the Proposed Route 92 Corridor (along Lawrence Brook), as well as state listed Cooper's hawk, savannah sparrow, and wood turtle. NJDEP also notes habitat for several other state listed species. Field surveys determined that suitable habitat for bog and wood turtles is not present within the proposed Route 92 right-of-way along Devil's Brook. Since Lawrence Brook drains to the north and Devil's Brook drains to the south, construction of Proposed Route 92 would not affect any listed bog turtle habitat located along Lawrence Brook. Several field surveys were previously conducted to confirm the presence or absence of individual threatened or rare plant species within the proposed right-of-way; only southern arrowhead was discovered within the right-of-way. Surveys were also conducted for Species of Concern (SOC) as identified by the New Jersey Division of Fish, Game and Wildlife (NJFGW). Although some of the SOC are not present within the project area due to lack of suitable habitat, some SOC might utilize habitat within the project area.

  No threatened or endangered species habitat would be expected to be affected by the US Route 1 Widening alternatives, since the vegetated area affected would consist of relatively narrow bands on both sides of developed US Route 1. Additional studies would be required to determine if these species inhabit this area, but the long history of US Route 1 as a major travel route and the habitat fragmentation caused by existing development indicate a low potential for suitable habitat, especially at the roadway fringe.

- **Farmland.** The proposed Route 92 roadway and associated interchanges would displace approximately 210 acres of active agricultural land. In addition, the proposed roadway would interfere with access to an additional 78 acres of agricultural land. None of the agricultural land that would be displaced or made inaccessible is in an agricultural development area (ADA), and none of the land is subject to preservation easement under the New Jersey Farmland Preservation Program.

  Because the widening of US Route 1 from four lanes to six would take place within the existing right-of-way, no significant impacts to farmland along US Route 1 would occur. However, it is likely that portions of three of the five interchanges would have to be constructed on land assessed as farmland for the Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal Alternative. Construction of a new

interchange at Beekman Road and Northumberland Way could require acquisition of several acres of farmland east of US Route 1 and south of Northumberland Way. Construction of a new interchange at New Road could require acquisition of two narrow lots apparently used to access a large area of agricultural land east of US Route 1 and New Road. It is likely that a new interchange at Route 522 would be built primarily in farmland-assessed woodland south of Route 522 on both sides of US Route 1.

- **Historic Resources.** Neither of the historic structures previously judged to be affected by proposed Route 92 (the Van Pelt-Clark House and the Dey-Bayles House) still exists. A cultural resources assessment concluded that there is a low probability that proposed Route 92 would affect archaeological historic properties.

  Most of US Route 1 between Trenton and New Brunswick, known historically as the Trenton and New Brunswick Straight Line Turnpike, is potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The interchange between US Route 1 and proposed Route 92 would fall along this stretch of US Route 1. Construction of the interchange would not change the historic alignment of the primary roadway of US Route 1, but would alter the character of the roadway at the new interchange.

  A cultural resources assessment identified five small areas near the US Route 1 interchanges that have a moderate to high probability for the presence of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Further background research, site assessment and subsurface testing to evaluate the potential impacts of interchange construction on prehistoric and historic archaeological resources would be required to assess the impacts of the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative. No structures exist in the vicinity that appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It is therefore unlikely that construction of the interchanges would affect historic architectural resources.

- **Air Quality.** Emissions loading data show that all four alternatives are predicted to induce lower study area volatile organic compounds (VOC) loadings and higher carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) loadings in 2028 as compared to existing loadings of these pollutants in 2001. Proposed Route 92 would induce a 23% VOC reduction compared to an 11% reduction with the No Action scenario. The smallest increases in CO and NO_x loadings, 13% and 8% respectively, occur with proposed Route 92. Analysis shows that proposed Route 92 would result in emissions of VOC, CO, and NO_x that are all significantly less than the 2028 No Action scenario. Based on the above information, proposed Route 92 is expected to meet USEPA's conformity regulations.

- **Transportation.** The construction of proposed Route 92 is expected to reduce the amount of peak-hour through traffic on the local and secondary east-west roads by 18 percent in 2028, as compared with the No Action alternative. Through

traffic may decrease by more than 60 percent on several of these roads. In addition to reducing peak-hour traffic levels on the existing east-west roads in the Traffic Study Area, modeling indicates that construction of proposed Route 92 would generally reduce peak-hour traffic volumes along the most constricted portion of US Route 1 in South Brunswick and North Brunswick.

The model also indicates that the construction of Route 92 would result in a 17 percent reduction in peak-hour truck volume on the local and secondary east-west roads in the Traffic Study Area, and along NJ Route 27 in Kingston. Peak-hour travel times between representative points are projected to decrease by an average of 10 percent as a result of the construction of proposed Route 92. Peak direction travel times between US Route 1 in Plainsboro and New Jersey Turnpike Interchange 8A are expected to improve by about 30 percent. The model demonstrates that construction of Route 92 would meet the objectives of this project.

The US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal alternative would be expected to reduce the amount of through traffic on the local and secondary east-west roads by 10 percent, as compared with the No Action alternative. Modest reductions in peak-hour traffic volumes on the local and secondary east-west roads in the Traffic Study Area, including in the sensitive areas listed in Section 1 (Plainsboro Center, South Brunswick Center, and Princeton Junction Center), would be expected. More significant reductions in peak-hour traffic volumes would be expected along NJ Route 27 in Kingston.

While the traffic-carrying capacity of US Route 1 would substantially increase, this increase would attract to US Route 1 a large number of vehicles that would otherwise use alternate routes to avoid congestion on US Route 1. As a result, US Route 1 would be expected to remain heavily congested in the peak hour in the peak direction. Most of the new traffic attracted to US Route 1 would be rerouted away from US Route 130 and the New Jersey Turnpike, which would likely be left with spare capacity.

Peak-hour truck volumes on the local and secondary east-west roads would be expected to drop by 8 percent, as compared with the No Action scenario. The severe peak-hour congestion that is expected to occur in the Traffic Study Area due to the large amount of development expected over the next 25 years is not expected to be relieved. Most of the trips that would be diverted to US Route 1 would come from other north-south routes that are relatively uncongested. Peak hour travel times between representative points are projected to decrease by an average of 5 to 6 percent as a result of this alternative. Peak direction travel times between US Route 1 in Plainsboro and New Jersey Turnpike Interchange 8A would be expected to improve by 10-15 percent. The model demonstrates that US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal would partially meet the objectives of this project.

- **Noise.** Under the Route 92 alternative, eight receivers (defined in Section 4.2.8) would experience noise levels exceeding the applicable noise abatement criteria (NAC). The comparison of 2028 Route 92 Alternative projected traffic noise levels with existing and 2028 No Action noise levels indicates that projected noise levels do not exceed the existing noise levels by 10 dBA or greater. Proposed Route 92 would increase the Existing and 2028 No Action traffic noise levels by up to 9 and 7 dBA, respectively. Under the No Action alternative, two residential receivers and one institutional receiver would be impacted by noise exceeding the applicable NAC in 2028. Under the Route 92 alternative, five residential receivers would be impacted in 2028. Under existing (2002) conditions, the applicable NAC is exceeded at one residential receiver and one institutional receiver.

  Noise modeling results for the five US Route 1 intersections redesigned as contemplated in this DEIS indicate that for two interchanges a 67-dBA noise contour would extend approximately 300 feet from the center of the interchange on either side of US Route 1. For the other redesigned interchanges the 67-dBA-noise contour would extend approximately 200 feet from the center of each interchange on either side of US Route 1. One residential receiver would be impacted for three of these interchanges and none would be impacted at the other two interchanges. Since these are not new interchanges, but are only redesigned, the number of potential receivers that would be impacted compared to not redesigning these interchanges should be similar.

  Nomograph modeling results indicated that during peak AM traffic conditions the No Action US Route 1 alternative traffic volumes and speeds would generate noise level of 66 dBA or greater approximately 150 feet from the edge of US Route 1. There are 16 residential receivers within or close to 150 feet from the edge of US Route 1. Therefore, these residences would most likely experience noise levels that would approach or exceed the 67 dBA NAC. Adding a lane of traffic to both sides of US Route 1 would increase noise levels at 150 feet from the edge of US Route 1 by approximately 2 dBA. This increase in noise level is considered barely perceptible. Both US Route 1 Improvement alternatives would generate a 67-dBA-noise level approximately 200 feet away.

- **Socioeconomics.** Construction of proposed Route 92 could potentially complicate access to a small number of business establishments, primarily near the eastern and western ends of the alignment. These include approximately seven businesses on NJ Route 32 east of US Route 130. The affected businesses are not the types that draw their customers from among passing motorists. Therefore, the economic impact is expected to be relatively small.

  Proposed Route 92 is expected to draw traffic off local roads, and would be patrolled by the New Jersey State Police. Route 92 would not increase the burden on local police departments, and could reduce that burden by reducing traffic and traffic-related incidents on roads for which the local police are responsible. Local

fire companies and rescue squads would provide services on proposed Route 92. Although proposed Route 92 would increase the total miles of roadway to be covered by local fire companies and rescue squads, this increase would be offset by a reduction in traffic on local roads. In addition, by improving traffic movement on local roads, Route 92 would reduce the time required to respond to emergencies on local roads.

Implementation of the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal Alternative would increase the capacity of the local and regional road networks. This would increase the population and the level of economic activity that could be accommodated in the local area and the region. A widened and signal-free US Route 1 would draw traffic from local roads. This would discourage growth of traffic-related business activity on local roads to some degree, and encourage growth on US Route 1. Because US Route 1 would not be a limited access highway, the tendency for growth to concentrate at the new interchanges would be relatively weak.

- **Land Use.** Acquisition of the right-of-way for proposed Route 92 and associated interchanges would displace four residential properties, all in South Brunswick Township. Acquisition of the right-of-way for proposed Route 92 and associated interchanges would displace one business directly in the path of the proposed ramp from southbound US Route 1 to Ridge Road. A building owned by NJTA would also be displaced. Two vacant commercial/industrial buildings would be displaced because they are at the point where the ramp connecting proposed eastbound Route 92 would merge with northbound US Route 1. Realignment of Research Way at the proposed Perrine Road-Route 92 interchange would displace three ball fields on a 20-acre recreational facility owned by Princeton University. The eastbound service road for proposed Route 92 would pass through the northern end of four developed commercial properties on the south side of NJ Route 32 between Cranbury-South River Road and Herrod Boulevard in South Brunswick. Alternate access would have to be provided for two of the properties.

  US Route 1 is a long-established major highway exhibiting linear (principally commercial) development. Widening with signal removal would reinforce its character as a regional business-oriented highway.

  The widening of US Route 1 to six lanes would occur within the existing right-of-way. Therefore, the US Route 1 Widening Alternative would not have significant impacts on existing land use. The potential land use impacts of the five new interchanges included in the US Route 1 Widening and Signal Removal Alternative include displacement of approximately 5 residences, impacts (including displacement) to 6 businesses, and the loss of up to 18 acres of agricultural land.

ES.2 Relationship to Environmental Protection Statutes and Other Environmental Requirements

Proposed Route 92 requires a permit from USACE allowing filling of wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344). This permit is commonly called a "Section 404 permit." NJTA submitted an application for a Section 404 permit for proposed Route 92 on January 6, 1999. USACE conducted a public hearing on the application on March 29, 1999. This EIS will assist USACE in determining whether to issue a Section 404 permit for the project. The EIS process is following USACE procedures for implementing NEPA, 33 CFR parts 230 and 325.

NJTA submitted an application for a freshwater wetlands individual permit (FWIP) for proposed Route 92 to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in September 1996. On March 29, 1999, NJDEP issued the FWIP and Water Quality Certificate for proposed Route 92. The FWIP and Water Quality Certificate expired March 29, 2004.

Because implementation of proposed Route 92 would involve construction in flood plains, the project also requires a stream encroachment permit from NJDEP. NJTA submitted an application for a stream encroachment permit for proposed Route 92 on November 21, 1996. Six revisions and supplements to the application have been submitted, the last of which was submitted on April 21, 1999. NJDEP has not acted on the application.

The Freehold Soil Conservation District must certify the soil erosion and sediment control plan for proposed Route 92. The plan was submitted for certification on July 30, 1997 and was certified on April 6, 1998. The certification expired on October 6, 2001. The soil erosion and sediment control plan will have to be resubmitted for certification.