

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NEW YORK DISTRICT

-----

IN RE:

ROUTE 92 PUBLIC HEARING

-----

Radisson Hotel Princeton

4355 U.S. Route 1 South

Princeton, New Jersey

Thursday, May 20, 2004

B E F O R E:

LT. COLONEL KURT HOFFMANN, Deputy Commander

KOKO CRONIN, Regulatory Project Manager

JAMES PALMER, Assistant District Counsel

RUTHANNE UNGERLEIDER, C.R.R., C.S.R.

1                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Ladies  
2                   and gentlemen, good afternoon. I'm going to ask  
3                   you all to please just pay attention while we go  
4                   through the steps required to ensure that this  
5                   process is carried out accordingly to the  
6                   regulations.

7                   Before I go into the formal  
8                   portions today, I just want to take a minute to  
9                   get informal with you all and just remind you that  
10                  we're about to exercise a process and a right that  
11                  is something we've all worked very hard to be able  
12                  to do, and I ask you to respect each other enough  
13                  to let the comments be presented in a manner that  
14                  can be heard by everybody, recorded, and that  
15                  allows enough time for everyone who is interested  
16                  in making a statement the time to do that.

17                  We'll go through the formal  
18                  proceedings here in a moment, but I'm just asking  
19                  you all to remember this is a right and a process  
20                  we've all worked hard to enjoy, but respect each  
21                  other enough to let everyone enjoy the right and  
22                  the process.

23                  Thanks for that.

24                  Ladies and gentlemen, if  
25                  everyone would please come to order, we'd like to

1 get started.

2 Good afternoon. I'm Lieutenant  
3 Colonel Kurt Hoffmann. I'm the Deputy Commander  
4 of the Corps of Engineers in New York and I'll be  
5 the presiding officer on behalf of my boss at this  
6 hearing.

7 Seated at the dais with me  
8 today, on my right, Ms. Koko Cronin, regulatory  
9 project manager with the district regulatory  
10 branch, on my left, Mr. James Palmer, assistant  
11 district counsel.

12 Today's hearing is the first  
13 session of a public hearing being conducted by the  
14 United States Army Corps of Engineers to assist in  
15 the regulatory review of the Route 92 project  
16 proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.  
17 Any comments that the public would like to make to  
18 be included in the administrative record of  
19 application needs to be presented at this public  
20 hearing or in writing to the Corps of Engineers by  
21 June 14, 2004. This is the closing date of the  
22 comment period.

23 So, that's the 14th of June,  
24 folks.

25 The purpose of this public

1 hearing is to obtain information and evidence and  
2 receive comment on an application submitted to the  
3 Corps of Engineers by the New Jersey Turnpike  
4 Authority. The Turnpike Authority requests a  
5 federal permit to perform construction activities  
6 within the waters of the United States, including  
7 wetlands. The Turnpike Authority proposes to  
8 discharge fill material into approximately 12.03  
9 acres of waters and wetlands for the purpose of  
10 constructing a 6.7 mile highway.

11 The project, known as Route 92,  
12 would be a high speed, limited access, toll  
13 highway, linking Interchange 8A of the New Jersey  
14 Turnpike in Monroe Township, passing through  
15 Plainsboro Township and connecting with U.S. Route  
16 1 in South Brunswick Township.

17 As mitigation for impacts to  
18 wetlands and the waters of the United States, the  
19 Turnpike Authority proposes to create fifty-seven  
20 acres of wetlands and to preserve two hundred two  
21 acres of wetlands and uplands.

22 The project site is located in  
23 waters and wetlands adjacent to Devil's Brook of  
24 the Raritan River basin in Townships of South  
25 Brunswick, Plainsboro and Monroe, all within

1 Middlesex County, New Jersey.

2                   At today's hearing we also seek  
3 comments on the draft Environmental Impact  
4 Statement prepared by the Corps of Engineers to  
5 assist in the regulatory review of the  
6 application. The draft Environmental Impact  
7 Statement discusses a number of alternatives. The  
8 Corps has not identified a preferred alternative  
9 in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. And,  
10 we welcome comments on the alternatives that are  
11 presented.

12                   After review of comments  
13 received in response to the draft Environmental  
14 Impact Statement the Corps of Engineers will  
15 prepare a final Environmental Impact Statement.  
16 Comments on the draft Environmental Impact  
17 Statement will be addressed in the final impact  
18 statement.

19                   Because the proposed project  
20 entails filling activities within waters of the  
21 United States, including wetlands, a permit is  
22 required from the Corps of Engineers pursuant to  
23 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Corps of  
24 Engineers is neither a proponent for, nor an  
25 opponent of the proposed project. Our role is to

1 determine whether this project is in the overall  
2 public interest. This hearing will play an  
3 important part in that determination.

4 This hearing will be conducted  
5 according to the procedures set forth in Title 33  
6 of the code of federal regulations Part 327.

7 Anyone present today may  
8 provide a written statements or proposed findings  
9 and recommendations for the hearing, but must be  
10 on file before the 14th of June, 2004.

11 All written comments should be  
12 directed to the mailing address or electronic mail  
13 address on our public notice and as shown on the  
14 slide.

15 Written comments can also be  
16 handed to Corps of Engineers staff posted at the  
17 registration table in the lobby, and you should  
18 have all seen them already today.

19 At this time I would like to  
20 explain the procedures that will govern the  
21 conduct of this hearing.

22 Anyone may make an oral or  
23 written statement concerning the subject matter of  
24 this hearing. Anyone may appear on his or her own  
25 behalf or be represented by counsel or other

1 representatives to present recommendations or  
2 information. Cross-examination of witnesses will  
3 not be permitted. Procedurally, I will call the  
4 names of those individuals who have registered and  
5 asked for an opportunity to speak. I ask that you  
6 step up to and speak into the microphone, which is  
7 located to my right, your left front. And, I ask  
8 that you start by stating your name slowly and  
9 then spelling it also slowly so that the  
10 stenographer who is making record of your comments  
11 is sure to give you the benefit of addressing your  
12 comments back to you to the final.

13 If you're affiliated with any  
14 organization or group, please state so, so that we  
15 may also enter that information into the  
16 administrative record.

17 It is important to everyone,  
18 whatever your opinion on this matter, that this  
19 hearing be conducted in an orderly manner.  
20 Because of this I must ask that speakers keep  
21 their presentations to five minutes or less. I  
22 can't stress that enough. We don't have a very  
23 large crowd here today, so that shouldn't be an  
24 issue. Five minutes is ample time, and after five  
25 minutes I will ask you to stand down and give the

1 next individual an opportunity for equal time.

2 Please limit your comments to  
3 five minutes.

4 If you have a longer  
5 presentation, please submit it in writing and  
6 summarize it orally. That's enough.

7 Written statements that you  
8 would like to submit for the record today should  
9 be presented directly to the dais, we'll accept  
10 those, or to the registration table at the  
11 entrance to the room. Time permitting, we look to  
12 provide an opportunity for rebuttal to any person  
13 who wants to do so after all the speakers have  
14 been heard.

15 I have the registration forms  
16 that you have completed and I will call for each  
17 speaker by name in the order listed in our public  
18 notice announcing today's hearing. If you wish to  
19 present testimony, you should know that you may  
20 choose to tape record your comments in Kingston  
21 room of the hotel instead of speaking at the  
22 podium. This may become an attractive option for  
23 you if it becomes a burden to wait your turn and,  
24 also, if, in fact, we run out of time.

25 This option was described in a

1           handout that was distributed at the entrance to  
2           this room. If you did not receive that handout,  
3           please ask at the registration table for help in  
4           that regard.

5                               I will first call the federally  
6           elected officials, followed by representatives of  
7           federal agencies and appointed federal officials,  
8           as set forth in the order noted in our public  
9           notice.

10                              A verbatim written record of  
11           this public hearing is being made and a written  
12           transcript will be made of tape recorded  
13           statements taken in the Kingston room. The  
14           hearing transcript will be available for purchase  
15           at the Corps of Engineers at the cost of  
16           reproduction. The cost of a copy will correspond  
17           directly to the number of pages enclosed.

18                              Everyone who has completed one  
19           of the registration forms at the entrance to this  
20           room will be contacted by the Corps of Engineers  
21           in writing when the transcripts are available.

22                              Again, if you wish to speak  
23           this afternoon, you must fill out a registration  
24           form. The comments made here, plus all written  
25           information provided on or before the 14th of

1 June, public comment deadline, will be used to  
2 evaluate the probable impacts, including the  
3 cumulative impacts on the proposed activity on the  
4 public interest. The ultimate decision on the  
5 submitted application will reflect the national  
6 concern for both the protection and utilization of  
7 important resources.

8 As a last bit of administrative  
9 information, I remind everyone that smoking,  
10 eating or drinking is not allowed within the  
11 hearing room. And, yes, I know we have water up  
12 here, but that's because we're special, I guess.

13 I don't know.

14 Anyway, the rest of you can't  
15 have it.

16 Please turn off or mute all  
17 your cell phones and pagers and anything else that  
18 may disrupt the conduct of this hearing.

19 If anyone present wants  
20 additional information on the Route 92 project as  
21 a whole, representatives of the New Jersey  
22 Turnpike Authority are available in the lobby.

23 Now, before we begin taking  
24 your public comments I would like to introduce Mr.  
25 Bill Cesanek of CDM, the environmental consultant

1 assigned to the Corps of Engineers in the  
2 preparation of the draft environmental statement.  
3 Mr. Cesanak will provide a brief overview of the  
4 draft Environmental Impact Statement.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. CESANEK: Thank you,  
7 Colonel.

8 The Corps has asked us to  
9 provide a brief overview of the project and the  
10 Environmental Impact Statement, and this is really  
11 being done to facilitate -- the environmental  
12 impact process is being done to facilitate the  
13 Corps' decision-making process.

14 An Environmental Impact  
15 Statement has several standard sections, and  
16 they're really meant to explore what the potential  
17 effects of the project and the permit application  
18 may be. There's the purpose and needs section,  
19 which explores the objective of the project and  
20 how it will function. There's a close examination  
21 of alternatives to the proposed project. In this  
22 case the New Jersey Turnpike Authority has  
23 submitted a permit application for a proposed  
24 Route 92 and the Corps has examined with their  
25 consulting team a number of alternatives to that

1 project. There is also review of the existing  
2 environment, and that is the characteristics of  
3 the existing environment in the areas of all the  
4 project alternatives.

5 That leads to determination  
6 using a variety of environmental models and  
7 technical analyses. Determination of  
8 environmental impacts and effects that may result  
9 from implementation of any one of the various  
10 alternatives.

11 Once impacts are identified we  
12 also look at potential mitigation actions for  
13 those impacts.

14 And, finally, there is the  
15 public involvement process, which this hearing  
16 today is part of.

17 This is a map of the project  
18 area and, essentially, this is to really just  
19 locate the project. And, what we see on this map  
20 is the location of Route 1, Route 130, and the  
21 Turnpike as three major north/south corridors in  
22 the project area. Also, the municipality of South  
23 Brunswick, Plainsboro, Cranbury are some of the  
24 key municipalities that were studied as part of  
25 the project. In addition, one of the major

1 project alternatives is improvement of the Route 1  
2 corridor up to the New Brunswick area.

3 The project purpose was  
4 evaluated and studied very carefully, and those  
5 elements are to provide linkage for through  
6 traffic moving between U.S. Route 1, Route 130 and  
7 the New Jersey Turnpike. That is, essentially, a  
8 east/west route. They are to provide alternative  
9 routes for north/south traffic currently using  
10 Route 1 to relieve the congestion on Route 1 while  
11 minimizing impacts to the abutting communities.

12 Also, one of the goals of the  
13 project is to reserve the local streets or the  
14 local traffic.

15 And, finally, it's to reduce  
16 the presence of non-local truck traffic on the  
17 local road network.

18 So, most of the project  
19 alternatives were measured against these four  
20 project goals.

21 The alternatives analysis  
22 consisted of three major categories of  
23 alternatives. We looked at existing and local  
24 county roadway capacity improvements. So, those  
25 are, essentially, widening and intersection

1 improvements to existing road system. The second  
2 category were improvements to the existing  
3 regional roadway system. And, those were the  
4 larger major roads that might be able to be  
5 improved in capacity. And, last, we looked at new  
6 roadway facilities of which the Turnpike  
7 Authority's application represents one of the  
8 alternatives.

9 This is an example of a map  
10 depicting several of the existing system  
11 improvements. On this we can see Dey Road  
12 widening, US EPA modified no build alternative, a  
13 relocated Route 22, with extension to the  
14 Turnpike. Some of these have been partially  
15 implemented, Cranbury Neck Road widening.

16 So, this is just an example of  
17 some of the alternatives that were looked at in  
18 the process.

19 Also, new roads were evaluated.  
20 There's the proposed Route 92, there was a Dey  
21 Road parallel alignment looked at, a South  
22 Brunswick modified alignment looked at, and some  
23 US EPA suggested alignments.

24 As part of the alternatives  
25 analysis we collected information on wetlands,

1 farmland preservation, parkland, residential  
2 impacts, commercial impacts, public facility  
3 impacts, and we also evaluated whether each of the  
4 alternatives would meet the project purpose.

5 You can see for this whole list  
6 of alternatives there were measurements and  
7 evaluations performed.

8 Then, the alternatives were  
9 compared and there was a sequence of analysis for  
10 the sixteen alternatives, and the process,  
11 essentially, was a screening analysis to eliminate  
12 alternatives that would have the most impact on  
13 the environment.

14 Projects with high wetland  
15 impacts were eliminated first, with high farmland  
16 preservation impacts were eliminated, parkland  
17 impacts, high dislocation impacts, and projects  
18 that did not meet the stated purpose and need.  
19 And, this resulted in two major alternatives  
20 recommended for future analysis, and those two  
21 major alternatives included a number of sub  
22 options within each of the alternatives. Those  
23 were the Turnpike Authority proposed Route 92 with  
24 terminus at Route 1, and sub alternatives were  
25 evaluated, including a single lane design and a

1 design without an interchange and at Perrine Road.  
2 The U.S. Route 1 widening was also evaluated with  
3 and without signal removal.

4                   Impacts and mitigation were  
5 studied in detail for those alternatives that  
6 passed through the screening process. And, we  
7 looked very closely at impacts to streams and  
8 flood plains, water quality impacts and receiving  
9 streams due to stormwater runoff, impacts to  
10 wetlands, wildlife habitat, residential and  
11 commercial dislocations that might occur as a  
12 result of the project alternatives, noise impacts,  
13 air quality impacts both from the use of the new  
14 transportation facility and from construction,  
15 impacts to land use and development, smart growth  
16 issues are examined in the EIS and traffic  
17 effects. There is a great amount of detail in the  
18 Environmental Impact Statement on this and I'm not  
19 going to summarize that information now.

20                   I would also like to present  
21 Gary Davis, who was part of the consulting team  
22 and who conducted some of the traffic analysis to  
23 summarize some of the traffic issues.

24                   Thank you.

25                   MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Bill.

1                   The traffic analysis was a very  
2                   important part of the studies that underlie this  
3                   draft environmental impact study and statement.  
4                   And, my purpose here is to provide you a brief  
5                   overview of some of the critical findings of that  
6                   study.

7                   I'm going to deal with the  
8                   analysis methods, including the traffic modeling,  
9                   with implications of a no action alternative,  
10                  meaning no construction of Route 92, or the  
11                  alternatives that had been designated. I'm going  
12                  to describe the project purpose and need, and then  
13                  the effect of two of the build alternatives, the  
14                  Route 92 alternative and the Route 1 widening and  
15                  signal removal.

16                  The analysis methods were,  
17                  essentially, a reworking of prior work as well as  
18                  an expansion into very advanced modeling methods  
19                  using a combination of regional modeling and local  
20                  modeling. Once we had the model sets in place we  
21                  did a thorough analysis of each primary  
22                  alternative for the year 2028, preparing travel  
23                  forecasts by traffic component, autos and trucks,  
24                  with an understanding of their origin and  
25                  destination characteristics, and, finally, did an

1 evaluation process using the highway capacity  
2 manual software and various other methods for  
3 analysis.

4 The no action alternative is a  
5 very important part of the study, and we spent a  
6 lot of time with this. This is, as we all know, a  
7 very high growth region. We anticipate that over  
8 the twenty-seven year period from the 2001 base  
9 year to 2028 the population in this five town  
10 region will increase by about nineteen percent,  
11 but that employment will increase by about two  
12 thirds. At the same time, there are various  
13 roadway improvements that have already been  
14 scheduled and some have even been implemented.

15 These are what we call the no  
16 action network assumptions, which are projects  
17 which we included as part of the underlying  
18 assumptions of the system.

19 When we run the models, account  
20 for the various population employment  
21 characteristics and network conditions, we analyze  
22 then the network performance that will result.

23 This is just one image from the  
24 EIS which shows traffic conditions in the morning  
25 peak hour in the year 2001. We see some red spots

1 and purple spots along Route 1, which correspond  
2 with areas where there is extensive congestion  
3 today and along 130 and along the New Jersey  
4 Turnpike.

5 Looking forward into the future  
6 you see much more purple, much more red, not only  
7 on Route 1, not only on the Turnpike, but also on  
8 the cross Dey Road, Plainsboro Road, Cranbury Neck  
9 Road, and the overall east/west local and  
10 secondary roads serving the area. And,  
11 essentially, we see substantially more traffic  
12 growth occurring and congestion resulting from  
13 that. We see increased congestion levels, we see  
14 westbound demand that will exceed capacity overall  
15 by twenty-five percent in the westbound direction,  
16 and in some places the volumes will be more than  
17 double the capacity. Traffic at thirteen into  
18 seventeen locations we analyzed will exceed  
19 capacity. Non-local traffic will more than double  
20 and truck volumes will increase by about a third.

21 So, as a result of that we  
22 moved into determining what the project purpose  
23 was and we identified several elements to the  
24 project purpose.

25 First of all was to provide a

1 linkage for through traffic moving between U.S.  
2 Route 1, Route 130 and the New Jersey Turnpike.

3 Second was to provide  
4 alternative routes for north/south traffic that  
5 currently uses U.S. Route 1, and this would be  
6 designed to relieve congestion on Route 1 while  
7 minimizing impacts to the communities that abut  
8 Route 1.

9 Third was to reserve the local  
10 streets in the region for local traffic,  
11 preserving the character, or attempting to  
12 preserve the character of those sensitive local  
13 communities. And, in parallel with that, reduce  
14 the presence of non-local truck traffic on the  
15 local roadway network as well and shift that  
16 traffic to a connector highway so that the  
17 character of the communities would be preserved.

18 The objectives for this project  
19 then in response to that purpose were a couple.  
20 First of all, to establish a road system that  
21 reserves local streets for local traffic and  
22 circulation that provides a high speed route for  
23 traffic moving between Route 1, 130 and the  
24 Turnpike. To provide alternative routes for  
25 north/south traffic currently using Route 1. The

1 congestion in the future will only be worse than  
2 it is today and the intent of the project is then  
3 to relieve congestion, improve mobility, and  
4 minimize impacts on the abutting communities.

5 Thirdly, reduce the presence of  
6 non-local truck traffic in the local communities.

7 And, finally, to work to ensure  
8 that the created capacity is not eroded by  
9 unsustainable and uncoordinated development.

10 Two of the alternatives that we  
11 looked at then and which progressed to a more  
12 detailed study is the Route 92 development, which  
13 I'll discuss first. If that roadway were to be  
14 constructed as proposed in the EIS, there is  
15 substantial increase in volume shown by the red on  
16 Route 92 itself because of the traffic that would  
17 be attracted to it and an increase of traffic on  
18 Route 1 feeding it and on the New Jersey Turnpike,  
19 and then, accordingly, decreases in traffic at  
20 various locations, particularly on the cross  
21 streets of 522, Dey Road, Plainsboro Road.

22 The results, if you remember  
23 those earlier slides, is that there's considerably  
24 less purple and red, which indicates over  
25 capacity, congested conditions with the

1 construction of Route 92. There continues to be  
2 some congestion on the Turnpike, there continues  
3 to be some congestion in critical locations on  
4 Route 1. Overall, considerably less.

5 The characteristics or result  
6 of this alternative is total traffic on east/west  
7 and local and secondary roads will be reduced by  
8 about eighteen percent. Substantial through  
9 traffic reductions will result on local and  
10 secondary east/west roads. Route 1 volumes will  
11 be reduced at currently constricted locations.  
12 Truck volumes on local and secondary east/west  
13 roads will decrease by about seventeen percent.  
14 And, countering that, truck volumes on Ridge Road,  
15 between Route 1 and 27, towards Kingston, will  
16 increase slightly, but not significantly.

17 The other alternative that we  
18 looked at was the widening of Route 1 and with the  
19 removal of signals. In this alternative, of  
20 course, the improvements are along Route 1.

21 The interesting thing that  
22 occurs is there's substantial addition to the  
23 capacity of Route 1 under the alternative, but at  
24 the same time it attracts traffic to Route 1 so  
25 that we see substantially more traffic on Route 1

1 and less traffic as indicated in the green on the  
2 Turnpike, on 130, and on the cross roads. The  
3 result, however, is that the traffic growth on  
4 Route 1 that results from attracting traffic  
5 really provides no net congestion relief on Route  
6 1. In fact, the congestion is, if anything,  
7 slightly worse on Route 1, and there is little  
8 relief down in the Plainsboro Road/Cranbury Neck  
9 Road area.

10 The final conclusions we  
11 reached are that the total traffic on east/west  
12 local and secondary roads will be decreased by  
13 about ten percent. Not nearly as much as the  
14 Route 92 build alternative. The modest through  
15 traffic reductions will result on those local and  
16 secondary east/west roads, but the Route 1 volumes  
17 will substantially increase. The capacity  
18 increase would be offset by attracted volumes.  
19 And, truck volumes on local and secondary  
20 east/west roads will decrease modestly.

21 That's the end of my  
22 presentation, and we look forward to receiving  
23 your comments throughout this afternoon and  
24 evening, and I'm going to turn it back to the  
25 Colonel at this point.

1                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: All  
2 right, thank you, Bill.

3                   For the benefit of those who  
4 just joined us, I'm going to summarize what we're  
5 supposed to do one more time.

6                   First, I just want to recognize  
7 the fact there is a lot of people in this room who  
8 have, obviously, spent enough time, given enough  
9 interest in this subject, that you came here  
10 today. There are going to be different opinions.  
11 Remember, this isn't a debate, nor is this the  
12 decision brief. You're invited to make comment to  
13 help in that decision, which is still pending.

14                   So, respect each other's  
15 differing opinions. Essentially, you have five  
16 minutes to speak. I ask you to please stay within  
17 the five minutes so that we don't have to  
18 embarrass you publicly. And, shut off those cell  
19 phones, will you, please?

20                   We're going to begin then.

21                   One more thing. For the  
22 record, please state your name clearly before you  
23 begin your comments and then spell your surname so  
24 they can be entered accurately in the record.

25                   All right, today we'll begin

1 with State Assemblyman Mr. Bill Baroni.

2 MR. BARONI: Good afternoon,  
3 and thank you. My name is Bill Baroni,  
4 B-A-R-O-N-I. I'm a state assemblyman for the 14th  
5 District, representing seven communities,  
6 including three of the towns that were mentioned,  
7 Cranbury, Plainsboro and South Brunswick.

8 Before I begin I would like to  
9 give two thanks to the Army Corps. Colonel  
10 Hoffmann, thank you for your balance and the  
11 dignity with which you are conducting this  
12 hearing. I'm grateful for it, and all people in  
13 Central New Jersey.

14 I'd also like to thank Koko  
15 Cronin. Many of you may have spoken with her.  
16 It's my understanding, Koko, this may be your  
17 first full project. You're doing an excellent  
18 job. Colonel, I hope that's reflected in the  
19 record. She is an excellent part of the Army  
20 Corps.

21 Today we will hear a number of  
22 voices. We will hear the voices of people who  
23 seek to drive east and west in Central New Jersey  
24 and are confronted each and everyday by traffic  
25 backups. And, they are right.

1                   We will hear voices today of  
2 people who live in Kendall Park who have to add  
3 forty minutes to their day to drive their kids  
4 across Route 1. And, they are right.

5                   Today we will hear the voices  
6 of those who seek to protect our environment, our  
7 water, our farmland, who worry the impact of this  
8 project. And, they are right.

9                   We will hear today from working  
10 men and women who worry about not having enough  
11 good construction jobs. And, they are right.

12                   And, we will hear from some of  
13 the one thousand seven hundred and six people who  
14 the draft Environmental Impact Statement say live  
15 in the census blocks through which this road will  
16 go. And, they are right.

17                   See, this road, estimated cost  
18 somewhere between three hundred and five hundred  
19 million dollars, raises a question, is it worth  
20 the price? And, I would suggest to the Army  
21 Corps, this analysis can be viewed through four  
22 questions whether or not it's worth the price.  
23 First, will this project actually fix the  
24 transportation problems of this region in Central  
25 New Jersey? Second, will this project so

1       devastate and hurt the environment that it's not  
2       worth it? Third, will this project eliminate or  
3       bring sprawl to a section of New Jersey that has  
4       been inundated by it? And, finally, and equally  
5       important, will this project bring good jobs to  
6       hard working men and women in Central New Jersey?

7                       We need to look at the answer  
8       to these four questions in order to be able to  
9       analyze whether or not it's worth the price and  
10      worth putting the people in South Brunswick and  
11      all of Central New Jersey through the process of  
12      building and running this road.

13                      If I may suggest, respectfully,  
14      to those who disagree with me, the answer is no.

15                      The first question is whether  
16      or not it will fix the transportation problem.

17                      Anyone who lives in Central New  
18      Jersey realizes how difficult it is to go left and  
19      right, north and south, each and everyday. And,  
20      in about two-and-a-half hours, Colonel, you can go  
21      stand outside the lobby and look at Route 1.

22                      The proposed Route 92, and I  
23      thank the engineers for their presentation, if I  
24      may point out very briefly, a table that was not  
25      presented. It's on Page 4-53 of the draft

1 Environmental Impact Statement.

2 One of the longest days in my  
3 career in politics was sitting at the South  
4 Brunswick Library reading the entire draft of the  
5 EIS. One of the charts that jumped out at me was  
6 chart 416. The chart prepared a no action, what  
7 we have now, to Route 92.

8 U.S. 1 and Cozzens Lane fails  
9 now, fails after Route 92. Meaning, the lowest  
10 and worst possible intersection. U.S. 1 and Major  
11 Sand Hill Road fails now, will fail after 92.  
12 U.S. 1 and New Road fails now, will fail after 92.  
13 Scutters Mill Road and Clarke's Crossing fails  
14 now, will fail after 92. Scutters Mill and Dey  
15 Road fails now, will fail after 92. U.S. 130 and  
16 Dey Road fails now, and fails after 92. Dey Road  
17 and County Road 535 fails now, fails after 92.  
18 U.S. 130 and Friendship Road fails now, fails  
19 after 92. Route 522 and Kingston Road fails now,  
20 and fails under 92. U.S. 1 and 522 fails now, and  
21 fails after 92.

22 I am not an engineer, I am a  
23 lawyer, but even I can figure out that's not  
24 success. What's worst, those people who live in  
25 Kingston, the intersection of Route 27 and Raymond

1 Road now does not fail. It gets a B. It fails  
2 after 92.

3 I want to thank the Army Corps  
4 for the opportunity to speak on these issues.  
5 These are important concerns about the sprawl,  
6 protecting our environment and creating jobs. We  
7 can create those jobs, protect our environment and  
8 stop sprawl and do it in a way that does not  
9 destroy the quality of life in Central New Jersey.

10 This is the wrong road, in the  
11 wrong place, at the wrong time.

12 Thank you.

13 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
14 you, Mr. Baroni. And, I apologize for the way I  
15 pronounced your name.

16 I ask the rest of you to handle  
17 it exactly the same way. I'll give it my best  
18 shot. I have my glasses on. When it's your turn,  
19 just get up and correct me for the record. That's  
20 absolutely what you should do. And, thank you  
21 also for setting the tone for the way we'll  
22 conduct this.

23 Our next speaker will be Mr.  
24 Steven Cook, Chief of Staff for the Office of  
25 Senator Inverso.

1 MR. COOK: Thank you, Colonel.

2 I'm here on behalf of Senator  
3 Peter Inverso. I'm the senator's Chief of Staff.  
4 Today the senator had an obligation to be in the  
5 state senate. They are meeting and in session.  
6 He had some very important business that he had to  
7 take care of, but he asked that I present this  
8 statement for the record today, and I'd like to  
9 read this into the record.

10 Before I do, I'd like to also  
11 thank the Army Corps for this opportunity to allow  
12 the public to address their concerns regarding the  
13 draft EIS. This is probably one of the most  
14 crucial parts of any transportation project to  
15 have the input from the community, and I'm sure  
16 the community of South Brunswick very much  
17 appreciates it. I know Senator Inverso does.

18 This is a letter from Senator  
19 Inverso to the United States Army Corps of  
20 Engineers.

21 "Thank you for the opportunity  
22 to discuss the concerns that I have regarding the  
23 proposed Route 92 construction project. When  
24 first proposed I supported the original concept of  
25 the Route 92 project based on a much lower cost

1 projection and less impacts on the environment and  
2 local communities. Since that time a U.S.  
3 Environmental Protection Agency report refused to  
4 support this project, identified environmental  
5 impacts have generated additional concern, and the  
6 cost estimate has skyrocketed. For these reasons,  
7 I have recently opposed this project.

8 "Today I reiterate my  
9 opposition to this project and ask that the  
10 following two issues be addressed specifically by  
11 those preparing the Environmental Impact Statement  
12 for the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

13 "Past studies of the proposed  
14 Route 92 project have called into question the  
15 plan's ability to improve transportation in  
16 southern Middlesex County. It is my understanding  
17 that the New Jersey Department of Environmental  
18 Protection's 1997 study indicated that the  
19 Turnpike Authority did not demonstrate a demand  
20 for the roadway's construction. Likewise, a 1988  
21 study, paid for by the United States Environmental  
22 Protection Agency, concluded that the construction  
23 of Route 92 would only minimally reduce local  
24 east/west traffic.

25 "I would like to understand how

1 two federal agencies, the US EPA and the U.S. Army  
2 Corps of Engineers, can produce significantly  
3 different conclusions based on the same factors.  
4 I would ask that a comparison be performed by an  
5 independent agency of the factors used by both  
6 agencies and then any variation of these factors  
7 identified be reviewed and clarified.

8 "Additionally, after the Route  
9 92 draft Environmental Impact Statement was  
10 released much discussion has been focused on the  
11 review of alternatives discussed in the document.  
12 It has occurred to me that factors relating to the  
13 alternatives to Route 92 have not been fully  
14 vetted during the development of the Route 92 EIS.  
15 The widening of Route 1, improvements to 522, the  
16 use of the proposed Route 1 Bus Rapid Transit  
17 project and other scenarios must be discussed with  
18 more community input to ensure that all legitimate  
19 options are considered prior to endorsing any  
20 course of action. A crucial source of this input  
21 must be the local community and officials of South  
22 Brunswick.

23 "If the outcry by my  
24 legislative office is any indication of today's  
25 response to the DEIS hearing, numerous local

1 residents and the local officials of South  
2 Brunswick will articulate many concerns about a  
3 lack of participation in the development of this  
4 document. The high level of participation in this  
5 hearing should highlight the need for additional  
6 community input into the development of any  
7 recommendation generated by the final Route 92  
8 Environmental Impact Statement. The community  
9 must be engaged in the debate of how to address  
10 the traffic issues we all know exist in this  
11 region.

12 "Public participation and  
13 involvement are an important component of any  
14 proposal or initiative. Considering the magnitude  
15 and scope of the Route 92 proposal, it's  
16 unfortunate that the input of local residents has  
17 not seemed to have been solicited effectively  
18 during this process.

19 "I would ask that the final 92  
20 EIS discuss the option to not build at this time  
21 in favor of a more focused discussion with the  
22 community of the alternatives that have been  
23 identified through this hearing and in the draft  
24 EIS.

25 "I recognize the need to

1 address regional traffic concerns that exist,  
2 however, the serious impact concerns raised by the  
3 residents, combined with these questions raised in  
4 past studies, demonstrate the need for further  
5 dialogue on Route 92's construction. To move  
6 forward with the EIS process and recommend  
7 construction of this proposed roadway at this time  
8 would be unwise."

9 Signed Senator Inverso.

10 Thank you.

11 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
12 you, Mr. Cook.

13 Our next speaker will be  
14 Michael Gerrard, Township of South Brunswick.

15 MR. GERRARD: Thank you,  
16 Colonel.

17 My name is Michael Gerrard,  
18 G-E-R-R-A-R-D. I'm an environmental attorney  
19 appearing on behalf of South Brunswick Township.  
20 We're very pleased that several years ago the Army  
21 Corps of Engineers made the decision to prepare an  
22 Environmental Impact Statement for this project,  
23 but we are dismayed upon reading the draft  
24 environmental statement to find that at least two  
25 major federal laws in our view are violated by the

1 way the project has been pursued.

2 First, the National  
3 Environmental Policy Act, which requires a full  
4 analysis of the environmental impacts of proposed  
5 projects and their alternatives, and second, the  
6 Clean Water Act, which prohibits the destruction  
7 of wetlands unless there is a clear need to do so  
8 and only allows that if there are no practicable  
9 alternatives.

10 Neither of these requirements  
11 has been satisfied.

12 First, with respect to the  
13 National Environmental Policy Act, our technical  
14 consultants are still studying the draft EIS and  
15 will be submitting detailed comments by the June  
16 14th comment deadline, but it is already clear  
17 that the draft Environmental Impact Statement  
18 fails to address many of the issues that we raised  
19 in the scoping hearing a year ago and that we set  
20 forth in our written scoping comments of June 15,  
21 2000, or where it does address them only in a  
22 cursory, inadequate fashion.

23 Some of the examples of that  
24 are, first, the environmental impacts if Route 92  
25 were ultimately to be extended west of Route 1 and

1 to go further west to Route 27 or to Route 206.  
2 We believe that if the road is built, the traffic  
3 pressures would inevitably lead to considerable  
4 pressure to extend the project further west. We  
5 don't think that Route 1 is a logical terminus and  
6 that it is impermissible segmentation not to have  
7 analyzed the environmental impacts, the  
8 destruction of wetlands, farmlands and species  
9 habitat and cultural resources and all of the  
10 other effects that would result from extending the  
11 road further west. We don't think that there was  
12 enough examination of the effects of the berms  
13 involved in the project on stormwater flow,  
14 wildlife movement or visual resources. There  
15 wasn't enough study of the presence of and impacts  
16 on those species of special concern that are known  
17 to be present in the area, such as the river otter  
18 or those where there are suitable habitat, such as  
19 the box turtle, Cooper's hawk, Savannah turtle,  
20 wood turtle, and other species that should have  
21 been much more carefully inventoried during the  
22 course of doing the studies.

23 With respect to the Clean Water  
24 Act, the wetlands regulation of the Corps and EPA  
25 require the establishment of a clear need of a

1 project for this kind of wetlands destruction to  
2 be allowed.

3                   We don't think that case has  
4 been made. The Environmental Impact Statement  
5 does not fully compare the traffic conditions  
6 today to the future, with Route 92 to the future,  
7 without Route 92 side by side. When you compare  
8 them all together it becomes clear that the  
9 proposed highway would create only a trivial  
10 contribution to the relief of congestion and in  
11 some places would, in fact, be counterproductive.

12                   There is a huge disruption,  
13 environmental disruption, at the cost of nearly  
14 half a billion dollars for very little  
15 transportation benefit. We think the economic and  
16 environmental impacts are wholly disproportionate  
17 to any benefit that might be relieved, might  
18 result from the project.

19                   The EIS also justifies the need  
20 for the project by making unrealistic projections  
21 of future growth and projecting from that  
22 congestion, which is utilized in the models, to  
23 say that the project is necessary. The  
24 Environmental Impact Statement prematurely  
25 disregards the benefits of transportation demand

1 management. The EIS at Page 2-10 says that the  
2 potential cumulative reduction in vehicle miles  
3 traveled after an aggressive program of  
4 transportation demand management might be five to  
5 ten percent range. That is, actually, a very  
6 significant set of numbers given the traffic  
7 levels, and in contrast, Route 92 would actually  
8 increase vehicle miles traveled under many  
9 circumstances.

10 We think that focusing on those  
11 aggressive TDM measures is a far better way to  
12 achieve a good result at a much lower cost.

13 Route 522 was recently built in  
14 this area, providing many of the transportation  
15 benefits, and we think as we will set forth in our  
16 written comments that other proposed improvements,  
17 especially widening of Route 1, would achieve the  
18 benefits that are sought at far lower  
19 environmental and economic impact.

20 Thank you.

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you, Mr. Gerrard.

23 We will now hear from Carol  
24 Barrett, Senior Advisory Council, Deputy Mayor of  
25 South Brunswick.

1 MS. BARRETT: My name is Carol  
2 Barrett, B-A-R-R-E-T-T. I'm the Deputy Mayor of  
3 South Brunswick. I am also the liaison to the  
4 Senior Advisory Council. I am also a union  
5 president, representing ten thousand members in  
6 the State of New Jersey.

7 I would first like to read a  
8 resolution from the Township of South Brunswick,  
9 which I will offer to you. It's a resolution,  
10 Township of South Brunswick, New Jersey.

11 "In support of the widening of  
12 Route 1 in South Brunswick Township,

13 "Whereas, Route 1 in North  
14 Brunswick and Route 1 in Plainsboro is three lanes  
15 wide, but in South Brunswick is only two lanes  
16 wide; and

17 "Whereas, as a result, traffic  
18 conditions on Route 1 in South Brunswick continue  
19 to worsen because of the narrowness of Route 1 in  
20 South Brunswick; and

21 "Whereas, for many years, South  
22 Brunswick has repeatedly communicated to the State  
23 of New Jersey that Route 1 in South Brunswick  
24 should be widened; and

25 "Whereas, instead of

1 constructing Route 92, the widening of Route 1 and  
2 other transportation elements instead would  
3 considerably alleviate the traffic congestion  
4 within South Brunswick, as well as in North  
5 Brunswick and Plainsboro; and

6 "Whereas, the widening of Route  
7 1 instead of construction of Route 92 would be the  
8 most beneficial use of funds for efforts to  
9 address traffic conditions in this part of the  
10 state; and

11 "Whereas, improving Route 1  
12 instead of constructing Route 92 would still," and  
13 I emphasize, "would still provide ample job  
14 opportunities for residents of this State seeking  
15 such jobs; and

16 "Whereas, the widening of Route  
17 1 as opposed to the construction of Route 92 is a  
18 much better alternative for relieving traffic  
19 congestion, providing jobs and preserving the  
20 environment, as well as much better use of  
21 taxpayer funds in this State."

22 Before I run out of time I  
23 would also, as a senior advisor, show to you in  
24 just one week what our seniors have gathered,  
25 petitions, letters to you. And, they're still

1 coming. We have probably five hundred here and we  
2 are expecting another five or six hundred.

3 And, I will read this letter  
4 from our seniors in South Brunswick, and it's to  
5 you. And, we also will be forwarding a copy to  
6 Mayor McGreevey.

7 "The South Brunswick Senior  
8 Advisory Council opposes the construction of Route  
9 92 on the grounds that it is detrimental to the  
10 needs and welfare of the families of South  
11 Brunswick. It is designed to run from Exit 8A of  
12 the New Jersey Turnpike, across the southern part  
13 of our township, to the intersection of Ridge Road  
14 and Route 1. Those of us who live in South  
15 Brunswick know that the sections of Route 92 that  
16 are elevated," and I emphasize, this is an  
17 elevated road, "will destroy one of the most  
18 beautiful, natural areas in our township.

19 "In addition, 92 will generate  
20 an enormous increase in traffic on the existing  
21 two lanes in the historic Village of Kingston, as  
22 well as polluting the air across South Brunswick's  
23 entire southern border. But, perhaps the most  
24 important of all, Route 92 will destroy or be  
25 harmful to many of the homes, some of which belong

1 to senior citizens.

2 "Those advocating the  
3 construction of 92 will say it aids commuters  
4 going to Princeton University, Forrestal Village,  
5 and the corporations on Route 1.

6 "Government must decide,  
7 therefore, whom it will serve, commuters in their  
8 cars or South Brunswick families in their homes."

9 Thank you.

10 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
11 you, Ms. Barrett.

12 Our next speaker will be  
13 Matthew Watkins, South Brunswick Township,  
14 Township Manager.

15 MR. WATKINS: Thank you. My  
16 name is Matt Watkins, W-A-T-K-I-N-S. I am the  
17 Township Manager in South Brunswick. I thank you  
18 for this opportunity to speak and to address this  
19 very important issue in South Brunswick.

20 There are many reasons that  
21 have been presented to you that express our  
22 concern for the information provided in this draft  
23 Environmental Impact Statement. Despite our  
24 contention that this roadway is unnecessary, does  
25 not address the problems that have been

1 identified, and has a severe negative impact  
2 environmentally and from a functionality and  
3 quality of life for South Brunswick, I believe  
4 that there are a couple of points that should be  
5 brought out that need to be addressed as the  
6 process continues.

7 First of all, one who knows  
8 this township cannot help but notice that the  
9 mapping, at least that which is provided out in  
10 the lobby, is woefully outdated and inaccurate.  
11 And, I believe that somewhere along the line those  
12 inaccuracies should be addressed.

13 One other aspect that I did not  
14 see in the Environmental Impact Statement was the  
15 address of spillage on the roadway on the proposed  
16 Route 92 as a result of accidents.

17 One statistic that we do have  
18 and can provide to you through this hearing is  
19 that over the last ten years we have had  
20 approximately ninety-four accidents in this  
21 community that resulted in hazardous material  
22 being spilled.

23 So, that leads to the question  
24 as to how will the Route 92 and its construction  
25 handle spillage as a result of accidents?

1                   Clearly, there will be a number  
2                   of traffic, and truck traffic, which is identified  
3                   as being handled through Route 92, will result in  
4                   spillages on an average of seven per year, through  
5                   one of the most environmentally sensitive areas in  
6                   Central Jersey, and we see nowhere in the  
7                   Environmental Impact Statement is this addressed  
8                   on how that's going to be handled.

9                   My responsibilities as the  
10                  Township Manager is the appropriate distribution  
11                  of the work force and resources to handle  
12                  everything, including emergencies. And, through  
13                  my chief of police and the office of emergency  
14                  management we handle these type of issues, and we  
15                  have to provide enough resources to handle such  
16                  incidents.

17                  So, I believe that if in the  
18                  ongoing study, on the Environmental Impact  
19                  Statement and the impact of this roadway, if that  
20                  could be looked at and addressed appropriately, or  
21                  at least reviewed in some aspect so that we have  
22                  some understanding if the road should be built,  
23                  hopefully it won't, but if it should, that we'll  
24                  be able to handle this in the future.

25                  We are concerned about our

1 environment, we are concerned about the health of  
2 what will remain of South Brunswick in this area,  
3 and we do not want to let that go by. So, we want  
4 to make sure that we're prepared. And, I would  
5 appreciate it if that would be addressed in the  
6 future studies.

7 Thank you very much.

8 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
9 you, Mr. Watkins.

10 Our next speaker will be Mr.  
11 Jeff Tittel, the Sierra Club.

12 Mr. Tittel.

13 MR. TITTEL: Thank you very  
14 much. Jeff Tittel, T-I-T-T-E-L, Director of the  
15 New Jersey Sierra Club.

16 I appreciate you allowing me to  
17 come ahead of some other people. I have a  
18 legislative hearing in Trenton at 3:30 I have to  
19 be at. I will try to be brief. We'll have more  
20 detailed written comments and there will be other  
21 members of the Sierra Club who will speak this  
22 afternoon and tonight.

23 We firmly believe that the EIS  
24 is deficient in many ways. Part of what I see as  
25 one of the major flaws is that one of the

1       justifications for the potential roadway and its  
2       different alignments is based on bad planning,  
3       that we're going to be rewarding bad zoning and  
4       bad land use policies by saying because so much of  
5       this area is zoned for office, park and box  
6       stores, therefore, we need to build a highway.

7                       That's backwards. You should  
8       be looking at the needs of a whole region when it  
9       comes to transportation planning and looking at  
10      existing roadways with the potential for widening  
11      or fixing roads, getting rid of lights, things  
12      like that, before you decide to build a new road.

13                      So, I think that just on that  
14      alone it's deficient.

15                      It's sort of like if you build  
16      it, they will come. A lot of those projects that  
17      are out there, or in the pipeline, won't get built  
18      because of the traffic situation in the area.  
19      Once you build a private driveway to places like  
20      Forrestal Center, then they can get marketed and  
21      they can get built. If you don't build a  
22      driveway, it's not going to happen.

23                      So, it's the chicken and the  
24      egg.

25                      Some of the approvals on some

1 of the older projects are running out. We should  
2 be working with the towns regionally and doing  
3 regional planning and doing down zoning and better  
4 smart growth policies, tied to transit, tied to  
5 bus ways, things like that, instead of just  
6 sprawling out throughout the region.

7 I think that's part of the  
8 problem, that we believe that this project should  
9 be held up, this EIS should be held up, and we  
10 should go back to the drawing board and actually  
11 work within the communities around here to come up  
12 with an overall comprehensive plan for the region  
13 before you start looking at what infrastructure  
14 you need to put in to promote growth.

15 One of the concerns we have  
16 also is that, cutting through this slate it would  
17 take, the different scenarios would destroy a lot  
18 of open space where there's been a tremendous  
19 amount of public investment.

20 The whole process with the  
21 state house division and conversion of public  
22 lands isn't addressed anywhere in this EIS.

23 Another real serious problem we  
24 have is that this whole region is out of  
25 attainment for ground level ozone and what will be

1 the impact of this highway to both ground level  
2 ozone and the P-2 standard of particulates? We  
3 believe it will actually increase air pollution  
4 because of the traffic volumes and also potential  
5 for more traffic problems on Route 1 when you dump  
6 a two lane road onto an existing backed up road.  
7 It's not going to get better.

8 To look at ground level ozone  
9 and particulates are two major things that I think  
10 haven't been addressed enough in this EIS and are  
11 deficient.

12 On top of that, I believe it  
13 violates the State's SIP plan that they have with  
14 the EPA for clean air, where we're supposed to be  
15 looking for trip reductions, and this is  
16 definitely a trip generator.

17 The other concern that I have  
18 is that we have priority wetlands. We have an  
19 area that's already been designated that. We know  
20 that there are endangered species also throughout  
21 this region. Especially wood turtles, bald eagle  
22 is not too far away. I don't believe the  
23 environmental assessment goes enough to look at  
24 the impact of this road, especially if it cuts  
25 through something like the Plainsboro Reserve,

1 where we know there's all kinds of documents of  
2 TIE.

3 The EIS seems to be missing a  
4 lot of that.

5 Another major one that I see  
6 is, again, we're not looking at the region, we're  
7 looking very narrowly at a very small piece of it.  
8 We do have 522 in place, which is the alternative  
9 road that EPA Region II thought would be better to  
10 upgrade than to cut through priority wetland.

11 On top of that, there's been a  
12 major new development happening with road policy  
13 and transit in the region, which is the  
14 designation of the Pennsylvania Turnpike extension  
15 off the Turnpike to connect to Route 95.  
16 Currently that connection, New Jersey Turnpike,  
17 Pennsylvania Turnpike, does not have an  
18 interchange at Route 95.

19 Pennsylvania is talking about,  
20 and the D & R Bridge Commission is talking about  
21 putting an interchange at 95, widening the bridge  
22 over the Delaware, connecting 95 to New Jersey  
23 Turnpike in Burlington County just south of here.

24 That's going to make a major  
25 shift in traffic patterns because many of the

1 trucks that go up 95 and come up Route 1 and try  
2 to sneak over to the Turnpike will not do that  
3 now, they can just come from Philadelphia, cross  
4 the river there and go up the Turnpike.

5 It's going to change the  
6 traffic. It's going to change commuting patterns.

7 The concern I have is that's  
8 not even looked at in this EIS as part of the  
9 whole process.

10 So, what we would, basically,  
11 say is that we should go back, work with the  
12 communities and the people involved, do something  
13 similar to the Penns Neck bypass issue, where,  
14 actually, everybody got together, came up with a  
15 pretty good plan to resolve the local traffic  
16 issues, versus a new road that's going to bring  
17 more congestion, more pollution, more sprawl.

18 Thank you.

19 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
20 you, Mr. Tittel.

21 Mr. Ted Van Nessen next,  
22 please, from the South Brunswick Township Council.

23 MR. VAN NESSEN: Thank you very  
24 much. My name is Ted Van Nessen, councilman from  
25 South Brunswick. I appreciate this opportunity to

1 address the Army Corps on this critical issue.

2 By way of background, this is  
3 my fourth term on the governing body of South  
4 Brunswick. I'm a former mayor and have been  
5 employed previously with the New Jersey Department  
6 of Transportation. In both of those roles the  
7 issue of east/west travel through Central New  
8 Jersey is a clear and ever present issue and a  
9 clear and ever present problem. Route 92 alleges  
10 to address that issue.

11 The reality, as many of us  
12 believe, is that Route 92 is a private driveway.  
13 And, those who support it allege it's not.

14 Route 92 must do one of two  
15 things. It's either a private driveway, as we  
16 allege, or it's a regional solution to a regional  
17 problem, as its proponents allege, if Route 92 as  
18 it's originally conceived from the New Jersey  
19 Turnpike to Route 206 can conceivably be a  
20 regional solution to a regional problem.

21 What we have with Route 92  
22 instead is a roadway that goes from the New Jersey  
23 Turnpike and terminates at Route 1.

24 Nowhere in the EIS or in any of  
25 the supporting documents is a discussion of what

1 happens next. What happens to the traffic that  
2 emanates from the New Jersey Turnpike and  
3 terminates on Route 1? Where does it go? One can  
4 only conclude that it is, in fact, a private  
5 driveway and that that traffic terminates at  
6 Forrestal Village.

7                                 Those who argue that it  
8 doesn't, where is it addressed in the EIS? What  
9 happens to towns such as Kingston, Rocky Hill,  
10 Griggstown, Blackwells Mills, East Millstone,  
11 Hopewell, Manville, East Amwell, Pennington? I  
12 think it's only Kingston that's addressed in all  
13 of the EIS.

14                                 Traffic, if it's not a private  
15 driveway and it doesn't terminate at Princeton  
16 Forrestal, needs to go somewhere.

17                                 By all accounts, Route 1 in  
18 South Brunswick is a failed roadway. I believe  
19 there are six, maybe seven, intersections in Route  
20 1 which are deemed F intersections. Something has  
21 to happen.

22                                 It is inconceivable to place a  
23 greater traffic demand, which Route 92 arguably  
24 brings, it's inconceivable to put a greater  
25 traffic demand on Route 1 northbound or southbound

1 north of this proposed interchange between 92 and  
2 Route 1.

3 Locally, South Brunswick and  
4 other communities have been aggressively  
5 addressing the issue of east/west traffic in South  
6 Brunswick. We got Route 522, which is a four lane  
7 highway, indeed, connecting, ultimately, the  
8 exchange to the Turnpike and Route 1. It's in  
9 place. It's here. And, yet, there are elements  
10 of that, including the soon to be constructed  
11 final segment, which connects the last piece from  
12 Route 130 over to Route 535 just above the  
13 Turnpike interchange.

14 It's not addressed in the EIS.

15 Also underway is a redesign of  
16 Route 8A interchange, putting that traffic, in  
17 fact, right onto 535, where it would have easy and  
18 immediate access to the soon to be constructed  
19 last leg of Route 522. Not addressed in the EIS.

20 These all should be.

21 The principle of traffic and  
22 traffic volume is one of dispersion. Route 92 is  
23 quite the antithesis of the principle of  
24 dispersion. It's a concentrator. By any measure,  
25 Route 92 in order to be economically sufficient,

1 in order to be economically self sustainable as a  
2 toll roadway, it has to be a concentrator. It has  
3 to draw that traffic in both directions.

4 The antithesis of traffic  
5 planning and planning traffic engineer.

6 We encourage the Army Corps of  
7 Engineers to make sure that all transportation  
8 elements that are radially affected from this  
9 proposed roadway, both west of its terminus, north  
10 of its terminus, and on the eastern end over by  
11 Exit 8A, up through Route 535 and the appending  
12 Route 522, Route 535 interchange, be addressed, be  
13 reviewed, and that those traffic counts and  
14 traffic indicators be included in the EIS and a  
15 direct response be provided.

16 Secondly, if this is, indeed, a  
17 roadway that is not a private driveway and it's  
18 going to disburse traffic, there has to be a down  
19 line to that, and that down line has got to travel  
20 west.

21 That then raises the specter of  
22 segmentation, is this the first, and then there's  
23 more to follow to get it out to Route 206. Again,  
24 elements that need to be considered.

25 I thank you very much for your

1 time. I could go on for three hours more, but  
2 then everyone else here wants to speak.

3 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
4 you, Mr. Van Hessen.

5 Our next speaker will be Craig  
6 Marshall.

7 MR. MARSHALL Craig Marshall,  
8 M-A-R-S-H-A-L-L. I'm the Planning Director,  
9 Director of Planning and Community Development, if  
10 you want the whole thing, for South Brunswick  
11 Township.

12 Thank you, Colonel, for the  
13 opportunity to speak on the Route 92 DEIS.

14 I recently happened to hear  
15 President Bush give a speech on the radio from the  
16 Rookery Bay Reserve near the Everglades in  
17 Florida. The Rookery Bay ecosystem is a prime  
18 example of a nearly pristine, subtropical mangrove  
19 forested estuary. It represents one of the few  
20 remaining undisturbed mangrove estuaries in North  
21 America.

22 The wetlands proposed to be  
23 disturbed by Route 92 also have national  
24 significance. The draft Environmental Impact  
25 Statement reports the United States Fish and

1 Wildlife Service considers the wetlands in the  
2 vicinity of proposed Route 92 as an aquatic  
3 resource of national importance, in part because  
4 of the presence of neotropical migrant birds.

5 There are also threatened  
6 plants and animals in this area.

7 During his speech, the  
8 President stated wetlands are essential to a  
9 healthy and diverse environment. He mentioned  
10 efforts at all levels of the public and private  
11 sectors to slow the loss of wetlands and his goal  
12 of providing an overall increase in wetlands every  
13 year. The administration is working to restore,  
14 improve and protect three million acres of  
15 wetlands over the next five years.

16 Proposed Route 92 would  
17 permanently disturb over twelve acres of wetlands  
18 and temporarily disturb almost three acres. Over  
19 one acre of wetland would be permanently shaded.  
20 Therefore, about sixteen acres of wetlands are  
21 impacted by this project.

22 President Bush is proposing  
23 three hundred and forty-nine million dollars in  
24 the 2005 budget to accomplish his goal, an  
25 increase of fifty percent over 2001 funding

1 levels. These dollars will continue to fund the  
2 North American Wetlands Conservation Act signed by  
3 President Bush's father on December 13, 1989.

4 This act encourages  
5 partnerships among federal agencies and others to  
6 protect, restore, enhance and manage wetlands and  
7 other habitats for migratory birds, fish and  
8 wildlife. It provides for the maintenance of  
9 healthy populations of migratory birds in North  
10 America that rely on us for the protection,  
11 restoration and management of wetland ecosystems.

12 The DEIS, as I earlier noted,  
13 indicates the Route 92 wetlands as an aquatic  
14 resource of national importance. The  
15 environmental impact of this road is unacceptable.  
16 It runs afoul of the area's federal destination,  
17 as well as the goals of the President and the  
18 North American Wetlands Conservation Act put into  
19 effect almost fifteen years ago.

20 It is up to us to determine the  
21 future. Route 92 should not be a part of that  
22 future. The President and Congress are  
23 encouraging wetlands preservation. We should  
24 follow the pathway laid before us and reject this  
25 roadway.

1 Thank you very much.

2 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
3 you, Mr. Marshall.

4 We will next here from Shirley  
5 Eberle, councilwoman for Franklin Township.

6 MS. EBERLE: My name is Shirley  
7 Eberle, E-B-E-R-L-E. I am representing Franklin  
8 Township.

9 I would like to read our  
10 resolution. It's a little long, so when my time  
11 is up, I won't be able to finish it, but it's  
12 still heart felt in what I'd be able to express.

13 First of all, I want to mention  
14 that Franklin Township is adamantly opposed to  
15 Route 92, and in our resolution that we have sent  
16 you we have all our reasoning outlined.

17 When my time is up, then I'll  
18 just submit it.

19 "Whereas, the following, the  
20 New Jersey Turnpike Authority, NJTA, has proposed  
21 an extension of the Turnpike to Route 1 near the  
22 Village of Kingston, known as Route 92. The  
23 United States Environmental Protection Agency has  
24 three times rejected wetlands permits required to  
25 construct Route 92. The New Jersey Department of

1 Environmental Protection issued wetland permits to  
2 construct 92, contradicting this decision to not  
3 issue these permits. The NJTA has applied to the  
4 United States Army Corps of Engineers to arbitrate  
5 this dispute and issue permits, effectively  
6 overriding the US EPA. The contractor that US ACA  
7 hired to do the Route 92 EIS has done substantial  
8 business with the New Jersey Turnpike Authority,  
9 raising a strong question of serious conflicts of  
10 interest in the preparation of the EIS.

11 "The EIS does not adequately  
12 address the impacts Route 92 would have upon the  
13 region and, particularly, the historic communities  
14 of Kingston, Griggstown, Blackwells Mills and East  
15 Millstone. Traffic sprawl and pollution from  
16 Route 92 would particularly impact these  
17 historical communities.

18 "Route 92 traffic would  
19 increase congestion on the roads in Franklin  
20 Township, making local traffic more difficult,  
21 discourage more people bicycling, and reduce the  
22 quality of life in Franklin Township's communities  
23 and neighborhoods. With or without Route 92, all  
24 but two local intersections in the DEIS study  
25 still fail.

1                    "We believe that Route 92, of  
2                    course, will reach into our underground aquifers,  
3                    which supply our drinking water.

4                    "Alternatives to Route 92 are  
5                    already built, including Route 522, which is  
6                    within one mile of 92, runs parallel to it, and is  
7                    a free multi-tax highway, that can handle high  
8                    speed traffic.

9                    "A study by the Delaware Valley  
10                    Regional Planning Commission concluded that Bus  
11                    Rapid Transit with feeder services, rather than  
12                    this route, is a most viable alternative. Route  
13                    92 would waste gas, New Jersey public funds for  
14                    transportation improvements in a manner which  
15                    would worsen the sprawl.

16                    "Be it resolved by the Franklin  
17                    Township Council of Franklin Township, County of  
18                    Somerset, State of New Jersey, Franklin Township  
19                    renews its opposition to the construction of Route  
20                    92 in its present alignment. Franklin Township  
21                    urges Governor James E. McGreevey to cancel Route  
22                    92 now and instead to use the money to allocate  
23                    for Route 92 to fund transportation which will  
24                    reduce traffic rather than exacerbate these  
25                    problems, involve all the municipalities in no 92

1 coalition in a fair construction process to  
2 relieve traffic congestion in the region, similar  
3 to the successful project used in Penns Neck.

4 "Franklin Township urges the NJ  
5 DEP not to reissue wetland permits to construct  
6 Route 92 and to support the Baroni Inverso bill to  
7 dis-authorize the Turnpike's construction of Route  
8 92."

9 Thank you very much.

10 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
11 you, Mrs. Eberle.

12 We'll next hear from Mr. George  
13 Ververides, Middlesex County Department of  
14 Planning.

15 MR. VERVERIDES: Thank you,  
16 Colonel. And good afternoon, everybody.

17 I will try to express the  
18 County's position, which is somewhat opposite to  
19 everything you heard so far.

20 George Ververides. I'm  
21 Director of County Planning with Middlesex County.

22 Middlesex County has been very,  
23 very concerned about the development that has been  
24 occurring throughout the County, but particularly  
25 to this region. Route 92 goes back some

1        forty-five years. This road initially, in order  
2        to meet the demands we felt back then started on  
3        Route 206, as was explained before, extended  
4        through Middlesex County, through the Townships of  
5        Plainsboro, Cranbury, South Brunswick, and  
6        terminated on Route 33, east of Hightstown. And,  
7        this was supposed to be a regional road, which we  
8        supported.

9                                The road has, through many  
10       years, been modified to the extent where it is now  
11       proposed between the Turnpike Interchange 8A and  
12       Route 1. The Hightstown bypass, so to speak, has  
13       been constructed from 571 west of Hightstown to  
14       Route 33, east of Hightstown.

15                                That's part of the network.

16                                Our concern in development of  
17       course lies around hot spots like Interchange 8A,  
18       where over two, three million square feet of  
19       warehousing is occurring, and our concern is with  
20       the development of the Port facilities in  
21       Elizabeth, Jersey City, that these warehousing  
22       areas are going to become very, very important to  
23       that total project. And, as goods are brought to  
24       these warehouses, they need to be distributed.  
25       And, this is going to cause and compound the

1 traffic situation within our county.

2 We have always felt over the  
3 last forty years that good east/west movement  
4 through this region is paramount. Yes, we have  
5 seen construction of Route 522, a county road,  
6 which extends from Route 27 to 130. And,  
7 eventually, hopefully, over to Route 535. This  
8 helps to serve some of the local traffic needs.  
9 But, the regional needs that we see, truck traffic  
10 and the distribution of goods to our consumer  
11 markets, which I might add we have one of the  
12 largest consumer market areas within this part of  
13 the country, right in this region, and these goods  
14 need to be moved to these areas efficiently and  
15 effectively.

16 The County has always supported  
17 east/west movement within this region, and we feel  
18 that 92 will help to support that. We have good  
19 north/south traffic at the present time, served by  
20 Route 1, the New Jersey Turnpike, Route 130, and,  
21 also, we have the northeast corridor rail line,  
22 which, of course, serves our commutership.

23 The lack of east/west roads to  
24 connect these north/south alignments, of course,  
25 is important to us. And, we have looked at this

1 quite carefully and over the years we've supported  
2 the east/west movement of this county,  
3 particularly Route 92, by the Board of Chosen  
4 Freeholders, or transportation coordinating  
5 committee, which is made up of all the  
6 municipalities within this region and other parts  
7 of the County, our agricultural development board,  
8 which has looked at this from the perspective of  
9 the agricultural lands that might be affected.

10 We find that these areas that  
11 Route 92 traverses are not within the agricultural  
12 designated areas of the County, although they are  
13 agricultural areas, and none of these are under  
14 present protected easement programs.

15 In terms of environment, we  
16 realize and we understand that the Route 92 now  
17 would have to be looked at with the new stormwater  
18 management rules in place, and this will have to  
19 be reviewed as well from that perspective.

20 So, in total, our concerns are,  
21 of course, from the region's perspective. Yes, we  
22 would like -- we are aware of the concerns of  
23 South Brunswick Township because of the traffic  
24 that you feel is going to be generated, but at the  
25 same time to see the developments that are

1 occurring in places like South Brunswick, South  
2 Brunswick, if you review the census for the year  
3 2000, is the fastest growing township within this  
4 region of the County. And, with that increase in  
5 population we have to create proper movement of  
6 these people between jobs, between schools,  
7 between places of work and places of recreation.

8 We thank you for the  
9 opportunity to make this presentation.

10 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
11 you, Mr. Ververides.

12 We'll next hear from Mr.  
13 Christopher Killmurray, South Brunswick Council.

14 MR. KILLMURRAY: Thank you.

15 Good afternoon, everybody.

16 Obviously, by my button you can  
17 tell I oppose Route 92. I have great respect for  
18 my friends at the county, but I do respectfully  
19 disagree with the position you're taking on this  
20 roadway. The study we're looking at is a flawed  
21 study.

22 I don't want to take a lot of  
23 your time here because I feel that it's more  
24 important, it's nice, I appreciate that you're  
25 giving us the courtesy of letting the public

1 officials speak. At the end of the day it's more  
2 important to listen to the people out here, the  
3 residents who pay your salaries.

4 As I reviewed this I had one  
5 simple question that came to my mind. I try to  
6 look at things as simply as possible. I kept  
7 saying to myself, how could one arm of the Federal  
8 Government, the Army Corps of Engineers, ignore  
9 the criticism that another arm of the Federal  
10 Government had, the arm of the Federal Government  
11 that's charged with protecting our environment,  
12 the Federal Environmental Protection Agency?

13 They had legitimate criticism  
14 of this project, and they're the arm that's  
15 charged with protecting the environment.

16 With all due respect to the  
17 Army Corps of Engineers, they tend to be the arm  
18 of the government that's involved in questions  
19 such as this, where they're looking at  
20 developments.

21 I really think we need to focus  
22 on what the EPA has to say about this. I don't  
23 see how we can ignore their legitimate concerns.

24 I have some other concerns as I  
25 reviewed this statement, reviewed this study. I'm

1 not certain if there ever was a real study or an  
2 in depth study of Route 1 traffic, who uses the  
3 road, where they coming from, where are they  
4 going, how can we guarantee that that's just going  
5 to evaporate, disappear, and this road is going to  
6 be the magic cure all for that?

7 I don't see that. I don't see  
8 the study contemplates that.

9 I also saw a flaw in that this  
10 study seemed to end in this area.

11 We all know the impact a road  
12 such as Route 92 will have. It's going to go far  
13 west of this area. How can you not look at the  
14 impact on Kingston and Somerset County towns,  
15 because, guess what, folks, you're next.

16 I appreciate the time you're  
17 giving us, and I hope you look at this and look at  
18 it as simply as I did and look at the legitimate  
19 concerns that the Federal EPA had.

20 Thank you.

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you, Mr. Killmurray.

23 We'll next hear from Jeanette  
24 Kay Muser, Rocky Hill Planning Board.

25 Ms. Muser.

1 All right, we'll move onto Ann  
2 Zeman, Kingston Village Advisory Committee for  
3 Joint Townships of South Brunswick and Franklin.  
4 And, if Ms. Muser comes in, I'll put her back in  
5 order.

6 Ms. Zeman.

7 MS. ZEMAN: Good afternoon. My  
8 name is Ann Zeman, Z-E-M-A-N. I'm the chair of  
9 the Kingston Village Advisory Committee for the  
10 Joint Townships of South Brunswick and Franklin.

11 Kingston is a designated  
12 village center under the state development and  
13 redevelopment plan, and our committee was  
14 established in order to ensure that certain  
15 planning goals of Kingston are incorporated  
16 formerly into the state plan through a planning  
17 implementation agenda, PIA, for the village and  
18 its environs. Our central objectives are  
19 preservation of the historic character of the  
20 village and the establishment of open space around  
21 the village.

22 In the Committee's view, the  
23 Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Impact  
24 Statement fails to address the primary and  
25 secondary impact of proposed Route 92 and its

1 construction on the historic Village of Kingston,  
2 its environs and other nearby historic communities  
3 in Central New Jersey. Particularly, those west  
4 of the terminus at Route 1.

5 The flaws and inconsistencies  
6 of the EIS are substantial and grave. They call  
7 into question the authority and validity of the  
8 entire process.

9 In the EIS scoping meeting of  
10 June 8, 2000 the Army Corps of Engineers requested  
11 input from the public about what to include in  
12 their study. We sent representatives to this  
13 meeting and submitted a detailed memorandum to Mr.  
14 James Haggerty, at the time the lead Army officer  
15 for the Route 92 study. One week later Mr.  
16 Haggerty, on June 15th, after reviewing our  
17 memorandum and visiting Kingston, wrote to the  
18 chair of the Kingston Village task force, and I  
19 quote, "Both Joe Zabo and I have toured Kingston  
20 area. We are keenly aware of the historical  
21 significance of the Kingston community and are  
22 especially sensitive to the community's concerns  
23 regarding the Route 92 project. It is greatly  
24 because of the expression of these concerns that  
25 we are determining that an EIS is necessary for



1 is incomplete and wholly inadequate as an  
2 instrument for decision making. Proceeding with  
3 construction on Route 92 on the basis of this EIS  
4 is unthinkable and unconscionable.

5 The little mention that is made  
6 of Kingston in the EIS is superficial, but the  
7 implications are, nonetheless, sobering and grave.

8 The most expansive treatment of  
9 Kingston we were able to find occurs on page  
10 executive summary thirteen, which states that "the  
11 historic Village of Kingston has expressed  
12 concerns regarding the volume of traffic using  
13 Kingston's local roads, particularly Ridge  
14 Heathcote, a two lane rural roadway without  
15 shoulders, which provides an east/west connection  
16 between Route 1 and Route 27."

17 The report does go on to say  
18 that if Route 92 is built, traffic models show an  
19 additional twenty trucks will use Ridge Heathcote  
20 Road during peak times.

21 This was referred to earlier as  
22 a slight increase.

23 The trucks are the kind of  
24 vehicles so large they can barely negotiate the  
25 turns from Heathcote onto Main Street, but what is

1 peek time? And, as far as trucks are concerned,  
2 there is no peak traffic. Truck traffic doesn't  
3 behave the same way automobile traffic does.  
4 Truckers don't have to be at their desks by nine  
5 a.m. Truck traffic is steady and continuous for  
6 the better part of the workday from six a.m. to  
7 six p.m., and the homes along Ridge and Heathcote,  
8 according to this EIS, can expect to experience  
9 the noise, the exhaust and the vibration of twenty  
10 additional trucks every hour or one truck every  
11 three minutes over and above the volume that  
12 currently exists or would exist without Route 92.

13 My one last point is that while  
14 the EIS predicts twenty additional trucks per  
15 hour, it is virtually silent on the number of  
16 cars. You have to back into the miles and miles  
17 of appendices at the end and try to add up all the  
18 intersections. And, I don't blame them. I  
19 wouldn't put it in there. I'd gloss over it  
20 because it's thousands of cars. The former study  
21 showed twelve thousand cars into Kingston and the  
22 EPA study showed fifteen thousand.

23 So, what we're requesting is  
24 that we have a round table, much like the Penns  
25 Neck bypass, and that we urge the additional -- we

1       asked this in the original scope, and we ask you  
2       again, to please study the impact west of the  
3       terminus.

4                               Thank you.

5                               LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN:  Thank  
6       you, Ms. Zeman.

7                               We're going to take a  
8       five-minute break.  I'm going to give my  
9       stenographer a chance to get her fingers  
10      uncramped.  I'm going to start right on time  
11      because we still have twenty of you that have  
12      signed up to speak, and if we don't even take a  
13      break for pause, that's a hundred additional  
14      minutes to go yet.  I want to get you all up here.

15                              In five minutes we'll start  
16      again.

17                              LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN:  Mr.  
18      Cohen.

19                              Before we begin, I want to  
20      remind everyone again to state your name, then  
21      spell it, and be aware of where the microphone is  
22      at the stand, and please try to speak into it or  
23      adjust it so that you can only so that the  
24      stenographer is sure to capture accurately the  
25      statements that you're making.  The air

1 conditioning here is causing her to have a problem  
2 hearing some of the commentary today. So, please  
3 speak clearly and into the microphone.

4 We're going to begin now with  
5 Mr. Edward Cohen, transportation coordinator for  
6 Monroe Township.

7 MR. COHEN: Thank you, Colonel.

8 My name is Edward Cohen,  
9 C-O-H-E-N. I represent Monroe Township. The  
10 Mayor and the Township Council has gone on record  
11 several times endorsing the Route 92 concept. I'm  
12 here to specifically address an area around Exit  
13 8A.

14 Exit 8A consists of five  
15 entities, government entities, obviously, the New  
16 Jersey Turnpike, the State DOT with Route 32, the  
17 County of Middlesex with Route 535, the  
18 municipality of South Brunswick and the  
19 municipality of Monroe Township all have parcels  
20 of property around and on the area concerning Exit  
21 8A. The traffic congestion surrounding Exit 8A is  
22 worsening with each passing month. State planners  
23 estimate that each weekday about twenty thousand  
24 cars and twenty-one hundred trucks squeeze onto  
25 the two lane roads that are found in the Exit 8A

1 area. The Exit 8A market continues to evolve as  
2 one of the nation's most dynamic industrial hubs.  
3 At the end of 2003 industrial leasing activity in  
4 the area reached an amazing forty-one million  
5 square feet. Current estimates are that this  
6 industrial development and its accompanying  
7 traffic growth will double by the year 2015.

8 It is more than obvious that  
9 something must be done and done as quickly as  
10 possible.

11 The State DOT recently had a  
12 meeting in Monroe Township called Congestion  
13 Busters, where they invited people of industry and  
14 municipalities and citizen groups to talk about  
15 how do we handle the existing traffic around Exit  
16 8A.

17 The DOT considers the traffic  
18 around Exit 8A as the worst in the State. It is  
19 the number one area where this group, Congestion  
20 Busters, have been trying to reach solutions.

21 A review of the DEIS shows that  
22 there are no environmental impacts on the section  
23 one of Route 92. Section one is the half mile  
24 portion between Exit 8A and Route 130. There are  
25 no wetlands, no environmentally sensitive areas.

1                   All of the entities involved,  
2 both formally and informally, in the area of Exit  
3 8A, the entities that I just described, have  
4 endorsed the concept of expediting the  
5 construction of the section between Exit 8A and  
6 Route 130.

7                   We strongly urge that the Corps  
8 specifically note in the final EIS that there are  
9 no impediments to the immediate approval and  
10 construction of section one of Route 92, the  
11 portion between Exit 8A and Route 130.

12                   Thank you.

13                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
14 you, Mr. Cohen.

15                   Our next speaker will be Damien  
16 Newton, Tri-State Transportation Campaign.

17                   MR. NEWTON: Thank you for the  
18 opportunity to testify today. I am the New Jersey  
19 coordinator for the -- Damien Newton, N-E-W-T-O-N.

20                   Thank you for the opportunity  
21 to testify today. I am the New Jersey coordinator  
22 for the Tri-State Transportation Campaign. The  
23 campaign is the region's leading nonprofit  
24 consortium of experts, planning organizations,  
25 activists, and environmental groups concerned with





1                   Before going into a lot of  
2 detail here of the five principle findings of the  
3 DEIS.

4                   Route 92 won't improve  
5 gridlock. Out of the fourteen local intersections  
6 studied eleven will still fail during the morning  
7 rush in 2028 if Route 92 is built. Ten will also  
8 fail in the evening rush. Few drivers would use  
9 Route 92. Less than twenty percent of westbound  
10 trips in the morning rush will use Route 92 and  
11 less than one-third of evening eastbound through  
12 trips will also use it. Less than two hundred  
13 fifty trucks will use Route 92 during both the  
14 a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Though diverting trucks  
15 from local roads has been a big justification from  
16 the highway, Route 92 will promote sprawl. Route  
17 92 will possibly develop sprawl development.

18                   Route 92 will cost upwards of  
19 three hundred fifty million dollars at a time,  
20 when the State is borrowing hundreds of millions  
21 just to fix its existing roads and bridges.

22                   Clearly, this is a highway that  
23 requires a lot of scrutiny.

24                   The impact of traffic on Route  
25 1, the impact of Route 92 on Route 1 north and

1 south during peak hour and peak period are  
2 important to know so that the project's ability to  
3 meets it's stated purpose and objective of  
4 diverting north/south trips from Route 1, thereby  
5 relieving congestion in the region may be judged,  
6 however, unlike the 1999 application and  
7 supplement by the Turnpike Authority, this DEIS  
8 contains no information about the trips that will  
9 be added to Route 1 by Route 92's construction  
10 south of Ridge Road in either the a.m. or p.m.  
11 rush hour period, nor is any intersection on Route  
12 1 south of Ridge Road analyzed in terms of level  
13 of service or any other criteria in this DEIS.

14 In 1999 the Turnpike admitted  
15 that while Route 92 would reduce traffic on Route  
16 1 north of Ridge Road significantly with traffic  
17 shifting to the Turnpike, "South of Ridge Road  
18 traffic on Route U.S. 1 increases."

19 See the January 6, 1999 Section  
20 404 permit application at 19.

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you.

23 MR. NEWTON: Thank you for the  
24 opportunity to testify. I'll complete my  
25 testimony in the evening testimony period.

1 Thank you.

2 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
3 you, Mr. Newton.

4 Ms. Cathy Dowgin, please.

5 MS. DOWGIN: My name is Cathy  
6 Dowgin, D-O-W-G-I-N. For many years now I have  
7 fought to keep Route 92 from being constructed.  
8 For many years now I have said the same things  
9 that I will say now. Route 92 is not needed, will  
10 cost half a billion dollars, and will devastate  
11 many communities and the environment.

12 It's unclear whether new  
13 traffic studies were performed or not performed  
14 for this EIS. At the start of the process I  
15 questioned the Army Corps on this very issue. On  
16 May 1, 2001 I received an E-mail from Jim Haggerty  
17 at the Corps who said, and I quote, "We fully  
18 expect the contractor and/or their subcontractor  
19 to visit the planned route of the entire road."

20 He continued that the DEIS "is  
21 likely to contain an amalgamation of updated  
22 reports, as well as reports started from scratch.  
23 We would anticipate that, as a minimum, the  
24 traffic report -- at minimum, the traffic report  
25 would be started from scratch, since we are

1        requesting traffic data over a much wider area  
2        than previously examined." But, on August 7th of  
3        the same year he informed me via E-mail, "There  
4        are no scheduled field visits by either us, the  
5        third-party contractor or their subcontractors."

6                                From these exchanges, plus the  
7        lack of new information contained in the DEIS, one  
8        would conclude that the traffic study portion of  
9        the DEIS is sadly out of date. For this reason, I  
10       would request that new traffic studies be  
11       performed that take into account the completed  
12       522, the extension of 522 to 535, and a requested  
13       widening of Route 1 in South Brunswick Township.

14                              Additionally, the study area  
15       must be widened to include towns west of Route 1,  
16       Kingston, Rocky Hill, the Hopewells, Montgomery  
17       Township, Griggstown, Franklin, and, yes, even the  
18       Princetons.

19                              The Federal EPA has thrice said  
20       no to Route 92 using the same information on which  
21       the Army Corps has based their study. After four  
22       years and approximately five million dollars all  
23       we have from the Corps is an unusual and suspect  
24       slant on old information. The reality is that  
25       Route 92 will increase traffic on our local roads,

1 not reduce it. Route 92 will terminate at the  
2 narrowest part of Route 1 in the vicinity of Ridge  
3 Road, with traffic continuing onto Route 1  
4 southbound, causing jams of titanic proportions.  
5 Route 1 is now a commuter's nightmare and will,  
6 according to the New Jersey Turnpike's own traffic  
7 studies, get worse, not better.

8                                 Route 92 is not needed to  
9 facilitate east/west traffic. The Army Corps'  
10 DEIS shows us a grid with fifteen intersections  
11 that are at D or F levels without Route 92. The  
12 number of failing intersections does not change  
13 with the construction of Route 92. There are many  
14 alternatives to Route 92 that will satisfy the  
15 need for better east/west traffic circulation,  
16 including 522, which is less than two miles north  
17 of the proposed Route 92 and will be extended to  
18 535 within a year.

19                                 Most importantly, Route 522 is  
20 free, so truckers are more likely to use it than  
21 Route 92. And, there are enough access points to  
22 make it useful to local residents as well as the  
23 transients. There are many other ways to  
24 facilitate traffic in the Central New Jersey area  
25 and a round table that includes the residents and

1 governing bodies of the affected local towns must  
2 be put together in order to ensure that the best  
3 solution is put into place.

4 Governor McGreevey has pledged  
5 fiscal responsibility and an end to subsidized  
6 sprawl. Route 92 does exactly the opposite.  
7 Route 92 is 6.7 miles in length and is expected to  
8 cost over five hundred million dollars. Almost  
9 seventy-five million dollars per mile. And, that  
10 does not include wetland mitigation or highway  
11 maintenance.

12 The bill from Route 92 will  
13 very likely be even higher when all is said and  
14 done.

15 According to the Army Corps'  
16 study, Route 92 will save, at most, four minutes  
17 of travel time by the year 2028, resulting in a  
18 cost of over a hundred million dollars a minute.  
19 Are four minutes really worth ruining so much of  
20 our environment and wasting so much of our money?

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you, Ms. Dowgin.

23 Our next speaker will be Mr.  
24 Joseph McNamara, New Jersey LECES.

25 MR. McNAMARA: Thank you,

1 Colonel. My name is Joseph McNamara,  
2 M-c-N-A-M-A-R-A. Today I'm representing two  
3 organizations, primarily, though, the New Jersey  
4 Society for Economic and Environmental  
5 Development, where I'm president. SEED is the  
6 acronym. We're a statewide aggregate for  
7 investment both in the economy and environment.  
8 We take a look at the balance approach in what we  
9 need. We feel very strongly, you cannot have a  
10 very good economic foundation or good environment  
11 without the other. They're not mutually  
12 exclusive.

13 Plus, my business office, which  
14 is New Jersey LECES, is located at Interchange  
15 Plaza at Exit 8A. I experienced for the last  
16 eight years some of the growing populations,  
17 business and traffic conditions in the area.

18 I think we can all agree, and  
19 there's some differences here, obviously, that  
20 over the next ten, twenty years, not only in  
21 Middlesex County, but in New Jersey, our  
22 population traffic is going to grow. The question  
23 is, what do we do about it?

24 Some of the choices, some of  
25 the solutions are very difficult. I think forums

1       like this are helpful at least to bring points of  
2       view together.

3                               It's important that we go back.  
4       The role of this hearing is to look at the purpose  
5       and need of this study, the Route 92 study. I  
6       think we can generally agree that we got to  
7       improve traffic flows, cars and trucks, between  
8       east and west in Middlesex County, throughout the  
9       State, but in this area, particularly with all the  
10      industrial development that's happened, that's  
11      planned and it's zoned for. Looking at that, if  
12      that's the purpose. And, the other is to take as  
13      much of the non-local traffic off our local  
14      roadways.

15                              How do we then come to some  
16      solution?

17                              We reviewed -- New Jersey SEED  
18      reviewed all the alternatives in some detail. If  
19      you look at some of the options, alternatives we  
20      have, the first one, no build alternative is going  
21      to increase traffic on local streets. I don't  
22      think there's any question about that. We're  
23      going to have the traffic whether we don't build  
24      92, build 92, improve Route 1. Whatever it might  
25      be, it's going to happen. So, if we don't do

1 anything, traffic on 522, Dey Road, all those  
2 going to the Turnpike, will increase.

3 Same thing with Route 1  
4 improvements.

5 Yes, we got to look at Route 1.  
6 It's independent.

7 Even this DEIS suggests that if  
8 you widen Route 1, if you don't, it's going to  
9 increase traffic on the local roadways, which is  
10 against the purpose of this study and against what  
11 I think most of the people really want.

12 As we view it, Route 92 is the  
13 only one that meets this criteria. I heard  
14 something sort of interesting. I heard if we  
15 don't do anything, we'll increase traffic on local  
16 roads.

17 One of the things that was just  
18 mentioned by some others from South Brunswick,  
19 look at roadway improvements.

20 I know people that live in  
21 developments around 522. To me, if I lived in  
22 South Brunswick, and I don't, but widening of 522  
23 would increase truck traffic and traffic by  
24 thousands and thousands. I think I read in the  
25 DEIS, sixty thousand cars a day. The impact on

1 residents that would have to be taken, impact on  
2 noise and air quality. Far greater than 92.

3 I think the analysis of the  
4 environmental impact is far more in depth than  
5 what's been betrayed here today. I think people  
6 in South Brunswick really should look at that 522  
7 issue. I know people who have.

8 We have a problem. We got to  
9 find it. I have not heard anything in the  
10 comments, and some very good comments and things  
11 that should be taken into account, but I have not  
12 heard any solution to resolving from a regional  
13 standpoint the traffic situation here in Middlesex  
14 County. And, I also, since I have some time,  
15 question the idea of sprawl.

16 This is a regional road. It  
17 has two exit points with some limited accesses we  
18 have said. That is the antithesis of sprawl.  
19 Where you have sprawl is where you have highways  
20 with many exits and entrances. That promotes  
21 housing.

22 This, if anything, is  
23 anti-sprawl.

24 Cost wise, we talked about the  
25 cost. The New Jersey Turnpike, again, this may be

1 outside the scope, but since it's been raised, the  
2 cost of this project has been earmarked by the New  
3 Jersey Turnpike Authority. If, indeed, we do  
4 nothing and all of a sudden 522 has to be widened  
5 to six lanes and you have to do some other  
6 improvements on Dey Road, that will have to be  
7 done by the State, county or local level. That  
8 means the individual taxpayers will have to pay  
9 for that.

10 This has been a carefully  
11 planned, carefully financed program, and I think  
12 you should give it strong consideration. Remember  
13 the alternatives, what may come back to bite you  
14 in the end. Time is everything.

15 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
16 you, Mr. McNamara.

17 Our next speaker will be Edward  
18 Pfeiffer, Central New Jersey Group Sierra Club.

19 MR. PFEIFFER: Thank you. I'm  
20 Ed Pfeiffer, P-F-E-I-F-F-E-R. I'm the  
21 conservation chair for the Central Group Sierra  
22 Club. That's the local Sierra Club. I'd like to  
23 thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak  
24 before you today.

25 I'd like to raise some concerns

1 about the draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
2 and I'm going to restrict myself, basically, to  
3 that in its present form and ask you a few  
4 questions concerning that study as kind of  
5 examples of my concern and our concern, and  
6 realizing that our commentary is going to go  
7 beyond that when you get them in written form.

8                   As we know, the Route 92  
9 project will destroy approximately twelve plus  
10 acres of wetlands, transect the Plainsboro  
11 Preserve, fragment extensive wildlife habitat,  
12 potentially threaten endangered species in open  
13 space lands, specifically mentioned nesting bald  
14 eagles in that area, pave over approximately one  
15 hundred acres of land, and significantly impact  
16 additional public and farmlands. There's a lot at  
17 stake here. So, this makes it all the more  
18 imperative to get the study right, to seek  
19 additional input, and to update with new  
20 information as part of an ongoing process.

21                   Certainly, the round table and  
22 the stakeholders process sounds like a really good  
23 way to go.

24                   At the moment I don't think the  
25 study is complete. I think far from it. The

1 study needs further work. There are bases and  
2 assumptions and methods that I can spot that need  
3 further explanation and clarification.

4 So, anyway, I'd like the Army  
5 Corps of Engineers to consider the following  
6 questions as thoroughly and completely as possible  
7 as part of our commentary:

8 Your group suggested at one  
9 point in your study, alternatives examined, I  
10 believe that's Section 2, that Route 92 will have  
11 less impact on the Plainsboro Preserve than the US  
12 EPA aligned route, and that the US EPA route will  
13 have greater impacts to parkland and open space  
14 than Route 92.

15 That doesn't make sense to me.  
16 Could you explain your conclusions better?

17 In characterization of the  
18 affected environment, Section 3, you apparently  
19 rely on something called an FHWA wetlands  
20 functional assessment system that gave you low  
21 values for general diversity of wildlife habitat,  
22 et cetera. Explain this in more detail. How  
23 accurate, reliable and predictive is this system,  
24 and was this method verified through any  
25 independent observational on-site study?

1                   Generally, speaking of all the  
2 methods used in your wildlife studies, what are  
3 their strengths and weaknesses? What does the  
4 scientific literature say about their use? How  
5 accurate are they?

6                   Regarding SOC, species of  
7 concern, are there other methods to confirm the  
8 methods of species of concern other than using the  
9 Natural Heritage Database. What are the  
10 weaknesses of using this approach to study an  
11 area? How many different methods can be used to  
12 ensure complete confidence in the methodology of  
13 the study? Shouldn't additional wildlife studies,  
14 i.e., surveys be done?

15                   Concerning the destroyed  
16 cultural resources, the Van Pelt-Clark house in  
17 2001, Dey Bayles house, what happened to these  
18 houses? Explain that in more detail. And, the  
19 Ayres-Lane farmstead, can you give us more details  
20 on that? Have you considered the possibility that  
21 there are other cultural resources that your study  
22 may have missed?

23                   In your Section 4, direct,  
24 indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed  
25 project and alternatives, noise impacts on

1 wildlife trying to cross below the bridges, was  
2 this taken into account? What does the scientific  
3 literature say about noise as a deterrent or  
4 barrier to travel between habitats A and B? How  
5 can stormwater management techniques protect  
6 wildlife and wetlands from the pollution of toxic  
7 vehicular related chemicals? What does the  
8 scientific literature tell us about the success of  
9 these techniques?

10 Mitigation action, Section 5,  
11 regarding wetlands mitigation, NJTA wishes to  
12 construct fifty-seven acres of additional acres to  
13 mitigate the loss of wetlands. Why do you think  
14 this will replace lost and fragmented habitat?  
15 Projects in the past have failed to create new  
16 wetlands. Literature suggests this cannot be  
17 done.

18 Finally, some general questions  
19 that I'd like to ask just about the Army Corps of  
20 Engineers. These are kind of the questions that I  
21 got on interviews and things like that.

22 What's your history in this  
23 area? To the best of your knowledge, what has  
24 been the impact of projects similar to this one on  
25 the environment in terms of protecting endangered

1 species, mitigated fragmented wetlands, protecting  
2 wetlands pollution? What have been your past  
3 failures? What do you consider your successes?

4 In conclusion, let's do it  
5 right because we have the potential to destroy  
6 something here that we cannot replace.

7 Thanks again.

8 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
9 you, Mr. Pfeiffer.

10 Next will be Mr. George  
11 Hawkins, Executive Director, Stony Brook/Millstone  
12 Watershed Association.

13 MR. HAWKINS: Good afternoon.  
14 My name is George Hawkins, H-A-W-K-I-N-S. I am  
15 the executive director of the Stony  
16 Brook/Millstone Watershed Association, which since  
17 1949 has been working to improve the environment  
18 and natural resources in Central New Jersey. I'm  
19 grateful for the opportunity to comment on the  
20 environmental draft of the Environmental Impact  
21 Statement and would like to first start with  
22 reminding ourselves what the purpose of an EIS is  
23 under the National Environmental Policy Act, which  
24 it implements.

25 The effort that NEPA was

1       undertaking when it was first passed in 1970 was  
2       to make sure that before any federal funds are  
3       extended that a full range of alternatives are  
4       analyzed so that we can make the best decisions as  
5       a society about how our funds are expended.

6                       One of the efforts of NEPA is  
7       to look at impacts to environmental cumulative  
8       individual secondary impacts, and evaluate them  
9       across a series of alternatives, including no  
10      build.

11                      When considering these impacts  
12      you got to also look, obviously, at the cost and  
13      expense of the various projects at hand.

14                      A quick review of this  
15      document, which is actually difficult to do given  
16      its length, suggests a very complicated analysis  
17      here. The cost has been stated at somewhere in  
18      the range of three hundred fifty to five hundred  
19      million dollars. That is a rather extraordinary  
20      number. Granted, some of these funds, a large  
21      portion, may be from the Turnpike Authority, but  
22      that money doesn't come from nowhere, it comes  
23      from us ultimately.

24                      So, this is an expenditure of  
25      our funds.

1                   So, the question is, in  
2                   comparison to this expenditure what are the  
3                   various impacts and benefits that we might  
4                   receive? And, a reading of the document finds a  
5                   very murky picture. On traffic there is a  
6                   marginal improvement on almost, if any, on almost  
7                   any of the alternatives for an expenditure of this  
8                   size. Granted, a no build situation would yield a  
9                   worse traffic situation in the future, but I don't  
10                  think anybody in this room, any citizen of good  
11                  conscientious, believes we intend to do nothing in  
12                  Central New Jersey. It's an inappropriate phase.

13                         There's all sorts of fix it  
14                         first projects of improving our roadways that can  
15                         be undertaken at far less cost that will improve  
16                         traffic.

17                         So, no build is not quite the  
18                         right phrase, and it's not fair to paint that as  
19                         the alternative. There will be lots of other  
20                         projects that can be done to improve traffic other  
21                         than a non-92. Nonetheless, in all the  
22                         alternatives there's only marginal benefits for a  
23                         great expenditure.

24                         On the environment the impact  
25                         seemed very insignificant. Most of the loss was

1 put on wetlands.

2 We're grateful that one of the  
3 alternatives does reduce the loss of wetlands from  
4 what it would have been. There's fragmentation of  
5 forest, there's open space, there's farm fields,  
6 some of the more beautiful parts of our community  
7 that this road will go through. There was  
8 something called the big map that Commissioner  
9 Campbell had proposed, which is no longer in  
10 effect, but that was visual representation of  
11 ecological resources.

12 If you plot this road over what  
13 was the big map copying from this administration,  
14 there's almost entire areas that we would call  
15 red, and red meant don't build there because of  
16 significant environmental consequence.

17 Third is on the community.

18 There, certainly, is division  
19 in the communities here about pro and con on the  
20 road. I understand Plainsboro is very much in  
21 favor, we heard from South Brunswick and Kingston  
22 and other areas which are greatly opposed. There  
23 seems to be tremendous conflict.

24 So, what conclusion would you  
25 come from this?

1                   First, we would recommend  
2                   strongly, as have others, that a round table  
3                   system be employed like we did for the Millstone  
4                   bypass. John Coxton, of the Delaware Valley, far  
5                   exceeded any other EIS in this region in obtaining  
6                   the involvement of state, regional, county and  
7                   local officials, as well as local and advocacy  
8                   groups and other interested parties at the  
9                   thirty-five round table meetings held since June  
10                  2001.

11                  That was in two years. That  
12                  was a shorter period of time than we waited for  
13                  the EIS.

14                  So, the round table did not  
15                  take longer, it took shorter, and it had more  
16                  opportunity for those of us that will forever have  
17                  consequences of this road to understand its  
18                  strengths and weaknesses and maybe come up with a  
19                  set of solutions that would be in common.

20                  So, we strongly suggest, as  
21                  John Coxton supported, that a far more engaged  
22                  public process for a road of this size and with  
23                  this level of uncertainty and with this level of  
24                  disagreement among communities, that one public  
25                  comment period four years ago and then one today

1 is simply not enough to seek a consequence and a  
2 series of decisions. Maybe a lot of smaller ones  
3 instead of one big road, that might achieve our  
4 objectives.

5 I'd also like to mention once  
6 again, which you already heard me say, which is  
7 the fix it first idea.

8 There has been a great effort  
9 that what we really need in this state is constant  
10 improvement to many of the roadways that we  
11 already have. You can see them crumbling all  
12 around us. You would probably get agreement of  
13 everybody in this room. There would be no  
14 disagreement if we focused our attention and  
15 construction dollars and all sorts of jobs and  
16 improvements of traffic on improving  
17 infrastructure. We have to function as well as it  
18 could, along with improvements here and there,  
19 which would allow for transportation, rather than  
20 the permanent and massive expansion of a new road  
21 with such uncertain consequence and uncertain  
22 benefits.

23 So, we're hopeful that what  
24 tonight is is the beginning, this afternoon and  
25 tonight, of an extended public comment period

1 before such a very important decision is made on  
2 behalf of this state.

3 Thank you kindly.

4 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
5 you, Mr. Hawkins.

6 Before I introduce the next  
7 speaker, we're down to one hour for this session.  
8 Remember, there is another session tonight. There  
9 are eighteen speakers left. We're not going to  
10 get you all in. You can consider submitting  
11 written record, you can also consider taping your  
12 comments in the Kingston room in this building.  
13 I'm going to have to cut this off in just about an  
14 hour.

15 I'd like to next introduce Mr.  
16 Michael Paquette, Chief of Police, South Brunswick  
17 Police Department.

18 MR. PAQUETTE: Thank you,  
19 Colonel. Members of the Army Corps. Michael  
20 Paquette, P-A-Q-U-E-T-T-E. I'm the Chief of  
21 Police in South Brunswick Township. I'm also a  
22 resident of South Brunswick. And, I, like many of  
23 the other speakers, recognize that traffic is a  
24 monumental problem that must be broached. The  
25 question is how best to broach this regionalized

1       problem?

2                               Is Route 92 going to do what  
3       the conceptual plan says it's going to do?  And,  
4       if that was to become a reality, that means,  
5       within a half hour, as you look out on your dinner  
6       brake, we won't see backup on Route 1 anymore,  
7       there will be no traffic on Old Ridge Road, and  
8       all the local roads will be empty so that police  
9       cars and emergency services can go back and forth  
10      unimpeded.

11                            I think everyone in this room  
12      knows that that is not, in fact, true.

13                            When we talk about Route 92 and  
14      whether or not what is proposed will become the  
15      reality, one of those proposals is the truck  
16      traffic will now leave Route 1 and go on Route 92  
17      to get to the Turnpike.

18                            If you're like me, not too many  
19      years ago when the Turnpike raised the tolls on  
20      the Turnpike, within two weeks of that raised toll  
21      the truck traffic doubled in South Brunswick.  It  
22      has only gotten worse over time.

23                            Now, being a realist, I would  
24      say that means people have an aversion to paying  
25      tolls.  Route 92 being a toll road, is not going

1 to put the truck traffic on that road.

2 When we also talk about the  
3 impacts on the infrastructure in South Brunswick,  
4 I can tell you, at best, in the morning, a mile  
5 from here, from Ridge Road down to Raymond, we  
6 have localized gridlock every morning. For a mile  
7 south of that, at best, we have stop and go  
8 traffic. Have one accident, and we have  
9 regionalized gridlock.

10 I don't understand how,  
11 depending on which report you read, when they say  
12 that twelve to fifteen thousand more vehicles can  
13 be accommodated because of Route 92, it is not  
14 going to have an impact on South Brunswick, where  
15 that South Brunswick can afford this potential  
16 impact.

17 People may not know in the  
18 State of New Jersey where South Brunswick is, but  
19 all you have to tell them is that South Brunswick  
20 is where there's two lanes on Route 1. They know  
21 exactly where we are.

22 You are proposing fifteen  
23 thousand more cars in the throat of the hourglass.  
24 I can tell you as a law enforcement professional  
25 with almost twenty-seven years of experience in

1 dealing with a multitude of matters, but traffic  
2 being one of the primary ones, that there is no  
3 way that this region, not just South Brunswick,  
4 this region, is going to be able to accommodate  
5 twelve to fifteen thousand more vehicles,  
6 regardless of whether they're automobiles or truck  
7 traffic.

8 We need to find an option  
9 that's viable. Are there options out there that  
10 are viable, because I started off by saying I'm a  
11 realist, and I know we have to deal with the  
12 traffic problems and the traffic issues.

13 I think it's a mistake not to  
14 look at 522. 522, as a resident of South  
15 Brunswick, was a well thought out plan. It is a  
16 multi-lane highway. It accomplishes all the  
17 things that Route 92 is supposed to accomplish  
18 with none of the down sides that we just talked  
19 about from IS statement and all the other reports.

20 See, being that realist I have  
21 to look at things in a cost benefit analysis.  
22 What is the cost to 92? What is the benefit to  
23 Route 92? And, when I make decisions for the  
24 police department, as "a businessman," what do I  
25 have to do? I have to say, do the benefits

1       outweigh the negatives?

2                               I can look at you, and I am  
3       looking at you straight in the eye and telling you  
4       with thirty-three years as a resident,  
5       twenty-seven years as a police officer, the  
6       benefits do not outweigh the negatives. The  
7       reverse is what is true.

8                               This is a monumental mistake.  
9       This is a formula for regionalized gridlock.

10                              I know you're on a time limit.  
11       I guess the best way to put it is, I would  
12       challenge you during your dinner break, I know,  
13       Colonel, you said that you traveled the area at  
14       least sometimes. I don't know how frequently, but  
15       I'm glad you admitted it, so you're going to know  
16       at least some of what I'm asking you to do. Take  
17       your time, take a look outside in about a half  
18       hour, at five o'clock, because that will be  
19       better. Take a look outside at five o'clock on  
20       Route 1 and tell me that as people come home from  
21       work that Route 92 won't have an impact on Ridge  
22       Road, Raymond Road, Independence Way.

23                              My final comment is this, when  
24       we talk about the infrastructure affect and the  
25       safety of our citizens, from Raymond Road and to

1 Independence Way, north of us is Ridge Road, south  
2 of us is Independence Way, in the last four years  
3 we have had approximately two hundred accidents on  
4 Route 1 in those particular areas. I don't see  
5 Route 92 improving that. When those accidents  
6 occur, this whole town, Franklin, and all the  
7 other towns around us, shut down for a multitude  
8 of hours.

9 I would ask you to look hard  
10 and fast at what Route 92 has to offer and then  
11 make the right decision as a viable offer for  
12 Route 522.

13 Thank you.

14 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
15 you, Chief Paquette.

16 Our next speaker will be  
17 Jeanette Muser. She was called earlier. Is she  
18 present now?

19 That one is out now.

20 Mr. Harold Switsgable.

21 Harold Switsgable?

22 Carolyn Peucker.

23 MS. PEUCKER: Hi, I'm Carolyn  
24 Peucker, P-E-U-C-K-E-R.

25 I didn't expect to get called

1       so quick, so I'm not really ready. And, this is  
2       my son, Max. He's ten months old, and, hopefully,  
3       you'll be good for five minutes.

4                       I've lived here for four years.  
5       I'm a scientist by training. I'm a graduate of  
6       Cook College Rutgers University, and I'm an  
7       environmental person by heart, and from the  
8       experiences that I had when I was in college.

9                       I really think the environment  
10       is the most important thing to consider here, and  
11       I think the study -- I did not read it. I'll be  
12       honest with you. I have a very sick mother, and I  
13       have a young child, but from what I heard and what  
14       I read in the papers, it doesn't show that it's  
15       going to help, and it shows that it's going to  
16       hurt the environment.

17                      That really should be the most  
18       important thing that we consider. And, I would  
19       just ask that you also consider all of us who live  
20       here, who are going to have to live with this.  
21       And, you guys don't, and we do, and I guess that's  
22       really all I have to say.

23                      Thank you.

24                      LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
25       you, Ms. Peucker.

1                                   Our next speaker will be  
2 Elizabeth Sherer.

3                                   MS. SHERER: Thank you.

4                                   Hi, my name is Betsy Sherer,  
5 S-H-E-R-E-R. I'm from the Perrine Road Residents  
6 Association.

7                                   I grew up in northeastern New  
8 Jersey and saw firsthand the burgeoning sprawl of  
9 the '60s and beyond. Perhaps, we didn't know any  
10 better in those days, but we should know better  
11 now.

12                                  I applaud Governor McGreevey's  
13 smart growth initiative and the State's efforts to  
14 identify and protect the few remaining open spaces  
15 and environmental sensitive areas in this state.

16                                  Building Route 92 runs  
17 completely counter to both of these professed  
18 aims, as it would not only destroy the only  
19 remaining farmland and wetlands in Middlesex  
20 County, it would also encourage sprawl already  
21 designated by the State and federal government as  
22 environmental sensitive.

23                                  The fundamental issue here is  
24 not the false choice between doing nothing and  
25 building Route 92. Everyone knows how the area

1 has grown and resulting traffic problems. Actions  
2 do need to be taken. However, there are several  
3 more affected and far less evasive, destructive  
4 and expensive ways to address these problems.

5 The DEIS does not identify  
6 several of these options or even properly define  
7 some of those that they do. For example, why was  
8 Route 522 not evaluated at its true length, which  
9 ends at Route 130? Why are current plans to  
10 extend it all the way to Route 535 near Turnpike  
11 8A not taken into account? How could you dump the  
12 Route 92 traffic onto Route 1 without addressing  
13 Route 1?

14 Instead of taking a broader and  
15 more realistic approach, the DEIS evaluates each  
16 of the few alternatives it does manage to identify  
17 in isolation and then rejects them one by one as  
18 if only one thing can be done at a time.

19 This is insanity. Has the  
20 concept of multitasking somehow passed the Army  
21 Corps by? The rights of solution should be a  
22 combination of actions, taking into account  
23 improving existing roadways and public  
24 transportation options without further destroying  
25 our environment and diminishing our quality of

1 life.

2 We can do better than Route 92.  
3 We need to start with a fair community based  
4 constrict process that works for the whole area.

5 The Route 92 DEIS makes no  
6 mention of community involvement in the decision  
7 making, yet, it is we, the community, that must  
8 live with whatever is built.

9 A local newspaper, South  
10 Brunswick Post, had an editorial last week. Here  
11 are some excerpts from the editorial and those  
12 questions for the record. The question is to  
13 phrase responsiveness to project purpose and need.  
14 In its draft EIS the Army Corps never asked if the  
15 road is needed, but assumed that it is. Its no  
16 action plan ignores the federal environmental act  
17 and it downplays the environmental impact of the  
18 highway. It is on this wobbly foundation that the  
19 Army Corps constricts its report. What the Army  
20 Corps did not ask are these questions, no less  
21 important than the ones they did ask.

22 One, how is the study area  
23 determined? Why were Kingston and the towns in  
24 Somerset County not considered? The highway is  
25 likely to channel cars and trucks towards Route

1 206 and 31, putting a new strain on local roads in  
2 the region.

3 Two, how were the traffic  
4 models used in the study developed?

5 Three, has anyone conducted a  
6 study of who is using Route 1 and the local road  
7 network now, where they are going and where are  
8 they coming from? If not, how can we be sure  
9 there will be a reduction in traffic?

10 Four, did the Army Corps factor  
11 in the car's toll. A toll may act as a deterrent  
12 for drivers, negating supposed benefits of the  
13 highway.

14 Five, has the possibility that  
15 Route 92 might attract new traffic been  
16 considered, and if not, why not?

17 Ultimately, though the final  
18 decision on this road is not the Army Corps, the  
19 Army Corps is only responsible for determining the  
20 faith of environmental permits, it is the  
21 political decision makers of New Jersey, Governor  
22 McGreevey, state legislature, New Jersey Turnpike  
23 Authority, will have to decide whether to spend at  
24 least four hundred million, or almost sixty  
25 million dollars per mile, it all depends on who

1 you talk to. But, whatever it is, it's a huge  
2 number.

3 We residents need to make our  
4 case to the Army Corps today. We also need to  
5 light a fire under a political establishment that  
6 is powerful enough to turn plans for the highway  
7 into ash.

8 Thank you.

9 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
10 you, Ms. Sherer.

11 Our next speaker will be Edith  
12 Neimark, League of Women Voters. I can't read the  
13 rest, but League of Women Voters.

14 MS. NEIMARK: My name is Edith  
15 Neimark, N-E-I-M-A-R-K. I'm speaking for the  
16 League of Women Voters of the Princeton area and,  
17 parenthetically, I live in a development that is  
18 bisected by the divided highway, dual lane, newly  
19 built, Route 522.

20 The League of Women Voters of  
21 the Princeton area urges the U.S. Army Corps of  
22 Engineers to reject the permit application of the  
23 New Jersey Turnpike Authority to fill in wetlands  
24 for the purpose of building a roadway known as  
25 Route 92.

1                   The League of Women Voters of  
2           the Princeton area represent seven municipalities  
3           in the greater Princeton area, including both the  
4           Borough and Township of Princeton, Plainsboro,  
5           West Windsor, South Brunswick, Rocky Hill and  
6           Montgomery. All of these townships will be  
7           affected by the proposal to grant a permit to fill  
8           in wetlands for the proposed Route 92.

9                   The League of Women Voters has  
10          a long standing position to "promote an  
11          environment beneficial to life through the  
12          protection and the wise management of natural  
13          resources in the public interest by recognizing  
14          the interrelationship of air quality, energy, land  
15          use, waste management and water resources." We  
16          endorse land use policies and procedures and their  
17          relationship to human needs, population trends and  
18          ecological and socioeconomic factors.

19                  The League feels strongly that  
20          this permit to fill in wetlands and the impact it  
21          will have on the environment does not achieve  
22          optimal balance between human needs and  
23          environmental qualities.

24                  Our reasons are as follows:

25                  One, Route 92 would bisect

1 through one of Middlesex County's largest and most  
2 fragile pieces of remaining open land. Thirteen  
3 acres of wetlands and three hundred acres of  
4 farmland will be destroyed. Route 92 would also  
5 cut through a nature preserve, endangered species  
6 habitat and preserved open space.

7 The League strongly opposes any  
8 development that compromises lateral habitats or  
9 degrades freshwater wetlands.

10 Two, the New Jersey State plan  
11 is compromised. Proposed Route 92 bisects an area  
12 around Devil's Brook, designated in the New Jersey  
13 State Development and Redevelopment Plan as PA-5,  
14 the status New Jersey applies to its most  
15 environmental sensitive areas. According to the  
16 State plan, this means it should have the highest  
17 degree of protection from development. Destroying  
18 thirteen acres of wetland and designated open  
19 space and farmland is inconsistent with the intent  
20 of the state plan and redevelopment plan.

21 The League supports the New  
22 Jersey State plan and does not support its  
23 violation or compromise.

24 Three, this area is the site of  
25 two aquifer recharges from which approximately

1 fifty percent of South Brunswick Township's water  
2 supply depends. The groundwater flow of these  
3 aquifers could be radically altered by the one  
4 hundred three acres of impervious surface and  
5 wetlands fill. In addition, the draft  
6 environmental impact study, DEIS, fails to address  
7 the increased non-point source pollution,  
8 including road salt, to the watershed and water  
9 supply, which would be caused by the additional  
10 traffic this proposed roadway would generate.

11 Four, the DEIS fails to  
12 adequately address the transportation issues for  
13 all areas that will be affected.

14 The League of Women Voters  
15 states in its transportation position of 1977 that  
16 the transportation planning process plays a high  
17 priority on energy conservation and social and  
18 environmental costs and benefits. The DEIS does  
19 not address conservation issues fully, stating  
20 that further analysis of public transit  
21 operational improvements is recommended, section  
22 2.9, nor does it address the impacts on all  
23 communities within and surrounding the designated  
24 area, including abutting communities west of the  
25 terminus.

1                   Without conservation, social or  
2                   environment benefits, we receive little to offset  
3                   the extremely high cost of the estimated four  
4                   hundred million dollars for this plan. Therefore,  
5                   the League of Women Voters of the Princeton area  
6                   urges the Army Corps of Engineers to reject the  
7                   application of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority  
8                   and to continue to promote wetlands protection,  
9                   open space preservation and sound transportation  
10                  planning.

11   Thank you.

12   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
13                   you, Ms. Neimark.

14   Our next speaker will be Jack  
15                   Boekhout, South Brunswick Code Enforcement.

16   MR. BOEKHOUT: My name is Jack  
17                   Boekhout, B-O-E-K-H-O-U-T. I live at 111  
18                   Friendship Road in South Brunswick, in the path of  
19                   the roadway. If they build the road, they're  
20                   going to take my house away. But, I'm not here to  
21                   talk as a person for myself, I'm here to talk  
22                   because the manager asked me to say a few comments  
23                   about what I know in my office. I'm also the  
24                   building subcode official for the Township of  
25                   South Brunswick, and I've been working in that



1       these sites come in, and they all say, "Well, this  
2       is great. The water level is three, four foot  
3       below the foundation elevation. Go ahead and  
4       build your project." We go out there for a  
5       footing inspection, the foundation is full of  
6       water.

7                               On Miller Road, less than a  
8       mile away from where this roadway is going, the  
9       last foundation come in, stayed full of water for  
10      a week-and-a-half.

11                              What happens to the runoff for  
12      the road that goes into this water that's sitting  
13      there?

14                              If you look at 111 Friendship  
15      Road, where I live, four hundred foot off  
16      Friendship Road, it's under water, but in three  
17      weeks it's going to be dry as a bone, because it  
18      rained last week, it's full of water.

19                              I had a foundation blow out  
20      less than a mile away. Poured the concrete walls,  
21      steel in the walls, it rained, the water filled  
22      up, crashed the foundation in. The engineers  
23      couldn't figure it out. Scratched their head,  
24      said, "I don't know how this happened. Our water  
25      level is way below this foundation. How come the

1 water level crashed the foundation in?"

2 I don't know, but it happened.

3 I had another project come in,  
4 the engineer did his study, he says water table is  
5 well below the foundation.

6 I've been living here all my  
7 life, I've been going by there every winter, the  
8 farmer gets his tractor stuck in the field because  
9 it gets muddy, he can't get it out. The guy gives  
10 me the report, engineer, very high qualifications.  
11 He says, "Well, gee, there's not water out here.  
12 We can build all these homes." I looked at him.  
13 I said, "What, are you nuts? This guy's tractor  
14 sat there all winter every year for eighteen  
15 years. How can there be no water if he can't get  
16 his tractor out of the mud? No water?" I said,  
17 "I'll tell you what, I'll accept your report."

18 They started doing the work,  
19 five houses in the middle of the project, dug the  
20 footings, guess what, that water was supposed to  
21 be three foot below the footing, happened to be  
22 four foot higher than the footing. Filled it  
23 right up.

24 What I'm really trying to say  
25 is, engineer fancy studies are studies. Guy sits

1 down with a scientific approach, says what is it.

2 Let's look at the real world.

3 What's there? Go look at the properties, walk  
4 around, stick a stick in the ground, dig a hole.

5 What do we have? Right now if you take a look,  
6 you have perch water that don't go away for a  
7 period of time, and if this roadway is built, the  
8 runoff is going to go in there and it's really  
9 going to screw up the environment.

10 Thank you very much.

11 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
12 you, Mr. Boekhout.

13 Our next speaker will be  
14 Paulette Pitrak.

15 MS. PITRAK: My name is  
16 Paulette Pitrak, and I'm a resident of the area,  
17 and I am located in an area known as the  
18 vegetative edge according to the study. I look  
19 right out on beautiful vegetation.

20 I live at the end of Turkey  
21 Island Road, which is a fairly new development,  
22 and I will be able to watch 92 go up if it is so  
23 approved.

24 I don't like that idea.

25 I'm going to speak from the

1 heart, but I want it on record that I support  
2 totally the comments of Mr. Farber, Mr. Hawkins  
3 and Ms. Sherer, and I will submit a written report  
4 before the deadline period.

5 I watch Osprey land on the  
6 trees. I watch two mating red-tailed hawks. I  
7 watch all that. And, for me to have to watch a  
8 road to go up over those wetlands is just going to  
9 crush the area. And, I know it will cause harm to  
10 all the residents.

11 Thank you.

12 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
13 you, Ms. Pitrak.

14 Our next speaker will be Dr.  
15 Deborah Cutchim.

16 MS. CUTCHIM: My name is Dr.  
17 Deborah Cutchim. I live with the person you just  
18 heard crying.

19 Yeah, as I listen to the  
20 people, various people offer you a view of Route 1  
21 during your dinner hour. You can come home with  
22 us and have dinner and watch the hawks and the  
23 foxes and the deer and everybody else who happens  
24 to live in our backyard, which won't live in our  
25 backyard if this goes through.

1                   I have a Ph.D. in political  
2 science, and I'm familiar with the commonly  
3 accepted research techniques and procedures used  
4 to evaluate large scale projects of this sort.

5                   Perhaps, the most disturbing  
6 aspect of this study was its use of relatively old  
7 data. Census data represented the 2000 census  
8 data levels, traffic levels represented even older  
9 periods, some extending back as far as 1995. Use  
10 of 1995 aerial photos to analyze Route 1 is  
11 clearly inappropriate. Moreover, much of the  
12 information that was used in this report was taken  
13 from the New Jersey Turnpike Authority's own  
14 documents that clearly favored the building of the  
15 road. In fact, much of the information presented  
16 here is little more than a cut and paste of the  
17 wide variety of other studies with varying  
18 purposes, authors, scientific validity and  
19 timeliness.

20                   This makes for a very sloppy  
21 analysis base.

22                   As a resident of first  
23 Plainsboro and now South Brunswick since 1987 I  
24 can attest to the vast changes that are occurring  
25 in these communities on an annual basis. Current

1 data is available on many of these aspects from  
2 the local planning departments. You heard from  
3 the local service departments in our communities,  
4 as well as the many highly respected research  
5 institutions, all of which exist within a fifteen  
6 mile area.

7                   There seems to be very little  
8 use of that information to make this report.

9                   The failure to use current data  
10 in a report of such importance seems to be  
11 inexcusable.

12                   A related issue is the entire  
13 parameter of the study. The reader is struck by  
14 the fact that for each alternative offered in the  
15 study, despite the overall impact of many of the  
16 options being less than the proposed Route 92,  
17 each was rejected as "not meeting the objectives  
18 of the project."

19                   It is unclear to me who set the  
20 parameters of this study as outlined in the three  
21 objectives, reserving local streets for local  
22 traffic, finding alternative routes for  
23 north/south traffic and dealing with non-local  
24 truck traffic.

25                   The nature of these objectives

1 is important because each of them were used to  
2 reject the conclusions for each alternative  
3 pathway in favor of 92. Each local street option  
4 was rejected using the same language, "does not  
5 fulfill the project purpose," because it uses  
6 local roads to carry regional traffic.

7 While the options that were  
8 studied presented generally less problems and had  
9 more promise to resolve the issues of the traffic  
10 congestion and flow in a less obtrusive manner  
11 than building Route 92, Alternative A acts  
12 effectively to block all alternatives suggested in  
13 the study.

14 My question is, does that mean  
15 that there are no alternative routes given the  
16 study parameters?

17 Likewise, looking at Objective  
18 B, the only alternative route, north/south route  
19 in the area is Route 1 or Route 130.

20 Those of us who have lived in  
21 the community for some time will remember both  
22 when Route 130 and Route 1 were considered and  
23 largely used as the alternative north/south routes  
24 to the Turnpike when the Turnpike raised their  
25 fees in the mid 1990s, particularly by the

1 non-local truck traffic. This had a major impact  
2 on making Route 1 being voted as the highway that  
3 most frustrates New Jersey motorists, as reported  
4 in the Star Ledger on November 7, 2003. Keep New  
5 Jersey moving Coalition of New Jersey Alliance  
6 conducted this non-scientific report for action.  
7 During the same period of time the New Jersey  
8 Department of Transportation determined that Route  
9 1 is the most dangerous highway in New Jersey.

10 Based on this prior behavior,  
11 it seems unlikely that making it possible for  
12 trucks to pay a toll to simply be put onto an  
13 already over taxed road seems to make Option B  
14 unattainable with a proposed Route 92.

15 My question is, does this mean  
16 that there is really no alternative route?

17 The rest of my comments I'll  
18 put into writing and send to you, I just want to  
19 make one final statement.

20 I started studying political  
21 science in 1969. One of the first teachers I had  
22 taught me a term based on studying the TVA and the  
23 Army Corps of Engineers. It was boondoggle.

24 I never thought that  
25 thirty-five years later I'd be standing in a

1 boondoggle hearing.

2 Thank you.

3 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Our next  
4 speaker will be Mr. Bill Wymer.

5 MR. WYMER: My name is Bill  
6 Wymer, W-Y-M-E-R, and I don't represent any  
7 groups, I just represent myself.

8 My wife and I moved to South  
9 Brunswick in 1988. We purchased a home in Dayton  
10 Center, where we had started a family and lived  
11 there for fifteen years. In 2003 we moved to  
12 Cranbury, where my wife, two children and I  
13 currently reside. During this time we watched as  
14 the area underwent significant development, all  
15 the townships in the area, South Brunswick,  
16 Plainsboro, Cranbury, West Windsor, Princeton,  
17 Franklin, and others approved zoning that allowed  
18 the building of large residential tracts,  
19 businesses and warehouses and warehouse space in  
20 and around our communities. These townships made  
21 these zoning approvals with the full knowledge and  
22 understanding that the supporting infrastructure  
23 would be required, including roadways appropriate  
24 for the volume and nature of the anticipated  
25 traffic. Everyone knew that existing roadways

1 were inadequate for the growth they were  
2 anticipating and some solution needed to be done.

3 In addition to the local roads,  
4 many passenger cars, commercial vehicles and heavy  
5 trucks, including dump trucks and tractor-trailers  
6 hauling municipal waste from the New York area,  
7 are cutting through our little suburban  
8 neighborhoods because of the lack of adequate  
9 east/west connectors between the New Jersey  
10 Turnpike and Route 1.

11 Anyone that travels on or lives  
12 near the roads that we are using that lives near  
13 these roads that are being used as a cut through  
14 knows that the decision is long past the point of  
15 deciding whether or not appropriate infrastructure  
16 is needed. That decision was made, with all due  
17 respect to the politicians that were here before,  
18 that decision was made when they approved the zone  
19 to build these things in the past. Now we're  
20 stuck with the problem.

21 I'm not criticizing or passing  
22 judgment on the zoning decisions that were made in  
23 the past. Some residential building is  
24 appropriate, and there are benefits to businesses  
25 and warehouse space. I'm not criticizing that.

1                   For example, when living in  
2                   South Brunswick I benefited from the property  
3                   taxes generated when South Brunswick encouraged  
4                   the building of warehouse space along Route 130.  
5                   That may have been a good decision, I don't know,  
6                   but these decisions have consequences. Namely,  
7                   the need for appropriate roads to support the  
8                   traffic generated from these zoning decisions that  
9                   were made.

10                   Ignoring the need that is  
11                   created by these local zoning decisions simply  
12                   deteriorates the quality of life that we are  
13                   trying to maintain. For example, in my  
14                   neighborhood we have bermed hills and sidewalks to  
15                   enhance the quality of life in the community,  
16                   unfortunately, Dey Road is being used as a cut  
17                   through by tractor-trailers hauling municipal  
18                   sludge from New York, tractor-trailers hauling  
19                   goods to and from the Route 130 distribution  
20                   factories, dump trucks, and commuters cutting  
21                   through to New Jersey Turnpike and Route 1. This  
22                   creates dangerous traffic conditions in our  
23                   neighborhood, not to mention the noise and  
24                   congestion. As a result, I do not allow our  
25                   children to use the walkways near our house or

1 near the heavy traffic. Ignoring a situation is a  
2 decision that, clearly, negatively impacts our  
3 quality of life.

4 So, for me the need for some  
5 type of solution to the east/west connector  
6 problem between New Jersey Turnpike and Route 1 is  
7 appropriate and necessary. It is clear and  
8 unmistakable, but we have to do something. The  
9 real question here is, what are we going to do?

10 I took the time to read through  
11 the draft report from the Corps of Army Engineers.  
12 As you heard Mr. Baroni say, it took quite a  
13 while. It is a thick document, which you've seen  
14 out there. I compliment the Corps of Engineers  
15 for all the information that they have collected  
16 and put into this, and I realize that it's come  
17 from many, many different successive analyses that  
18 have been done. It is a comprehensive amount of  
19 work.

20 As I understand the report,  
21 there is no option that has all positive and no  
22 negative impact, however, there are alternatives  
23 where the positive outweighs the negative. No  
24 action is not an option. The decision to do  
25 nothing was eliminated once all those zones were

1 passed to build the development that we have now.  
2 Trying to reduce demand with flex hours is a good  
3 idea and maybe something we should do, but it's  
4 not sufficient in and of itself.

5 When I look at the options for  
6 simply widening roads, such as Route 522, making  
7 it even wider in South Brunswick, widening Dey  
8 Read in Cranbury, or widening Plainsboro Road, as  
9 the report accurately reflects, this has  
10 significant negative impact for the residents.

11 I have to say that's obvious.

12 I'm going to skip the rest of  
13 this since time is up. Let me just say that in  
14 reading the report I noticed -- I think Route 92  
15 is the best alternative that's been presented to  
16 us in this report. If there's something else  
17 that's better, I'd like to hear about it, but I  
18 don't see it in this report. So, I am encouraging  
19 the building of Route 92 since I don't see any  
20 other alternatives.

21 Thank you.

22 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
23 you, Mr. Wymer.

24 Our next speaker will be Harold  
25 Bellizio, former mayor and resident of South

1 Brunswick.

2 MR. BELLIZIO: Thank you,  
3 Colonel. That's Harold Bellizio, B-E-L-L-I-Z-I-O.

4 I probably started on this  
5 project as mayor in 1984, before a lot of people  
6 ever got involved in it. We supported it. We  
7 supported it in a route. Members of my township  
8 committee at that time walked it, the former mayor  
9 walked it. Herb Wright has now passed away, but  
10 he was good enough to take people out there to see  
11 the way through.

12 We recognize, there are friends  
13 of mine and acquaintances of mine, et cetera, that  
14 were there, some of which would be in the way of  
15 it. When we did this we looked at it from the  
16 standpoint that we wouldn't drag this thing on  
17 forever. If they were going to have to be  
18 relocated or moved, that you should do it swiftly.

19 It's twenty years later. We're  
20 still here.

21 I remember talking to your  
22 predecessor at an earlier meeting at the Marriott.  
23 I told the Colonel at that particular point, one  
24 point that people are missing in this is that  
25 right now Route 1, between Bakers Basin, or the

1 Delaware River, and the Raritan River, are,  
2 basically, 95.

3 I spoke to the Turnpike  
4 Authority and said, why aren't you making that  
5 point?

6 The point was, and Mr. Tittel  
7 said it earlier -- which brought up a very strong  
8 point. I wish our politicians and everybody would  
9 get behind this and say, connect 95 to the  
10 Turnpike, where it was supposed to be, which I  
11 believe was Exit 6, if Tittel is right, we should  
12 do it and we would take the traffic that's coming  
13 through and using 95 between the Raritan River and  
14 the Delaware River on U.S. 1, of which seven miles  
15 of it is in South Brunswick.

16 Mike is right, we put up with  
17 this. The hourglass effect was given to us, we're  
18 two lanes in South Brunswick, with three lanes  
19 coming in on both ends, north and south, from four  
20 to six we go in North Brunswick and four to six  
21 into Plainsboro, and we're stuck with what we have  
22 at the largest point of U.S. 1.

23 I would say that there's  
24 conditions on this. I really wanted 92 to be  
25 built not as a toll road and to be built all the

1 way through to 206. That's not happening because  
2 we have the blockage to the west.

3 Now I hear the west hollering  
4 about what it's going to do for them. So, I feel  
5 for them, but I'm here on U.S. 1, and I'm here  
6 sixty-one years. I see U.S. 1 change. U.S. 1 is  
7 a problem. We are putting up with all the  
8 interstate traffic, not only through New York, but  
9 also from the northern ends, Middlesex and Union  
10 Counties, every bit of traffic going through from  
11 here to Pennsylvania and Ohio, convoys of garbage  
12 trucks. The politicians are remiss not to put  
13 them on trains and put them out on the rail.

14 U.S. 1 is being destroyed. We  
15 can't move on it. It's a traffic nightmare with  
16 one of those trucks coming down, they pile into --  
17 Mike knows as chief of police that we have a mess  
18 to pick it up.

19 I think if 92 is going to be  
20 built in its present stage as a toll road, these  
21 are the points that I think we have to look at if  
22 it's going to be, then I think we have to have  
23 some positive things from it.

24 Widening of U.S. 1 through  
25 South Brunswick all the way to make it three lanes

1 each way.

2 Two, excess lands that are  
3 along the Turnpike which were garnered by them  
4 from the New Jersey Department of Transportation  
5 was sold out to balance a budget many years ago,  
6 with the Florio administration. They got the  
7 problem now. Under their problem right now they  
8 are going to pay it from bonds that go through  
9 there and not through taxation to us.

10 If they're going to build it,  
11 we should get 95 designated from here over until  
12 the new connection is there so that they force the  
13 trucks by state law or whatever, and secondly,  
14 that the interchanges out here that Chief Paquette  
15 asked you to look at in front of the Radisson here  
16 be upgraded to a standard situation so that it's  
17 an overpass that interconnects all of South  
18 Brunswick with a great separation and not be just  
19 the Turnpike's access. The Turnpike's tolls  
20 should be back from it.

21 If we don't have that, then  
22 that's just another problem, a thorn in our side  
23 if it is built. It should be built so that it has  
24 access, and included in that, and Mr. Ververides  
25 knows, I went after him years ago to put a

1 pedestrian walkway over there to connect our rails  
2 to trails over here, give people bike access, et  
3 cetera, from here all the way down to Princeton,  
4 down into Middlesex County.

5 I think if we're going to get  
6 anything, the excess property should be dedicated  
7 to the local communities that are not going to be  
8 used for the Turnpike's own use, so they can be  
9 used for passive and active recreation, the ponds  
10 for fishing, et cetera, and that we have the  
11 overpass properly included as an access not just  
12 for the Turnpike.

13 Thank you.

14 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
15 you, Mr. Bellizio.

16 Our next speaker will be Joe  
17 Camarota.

18 MR. CAMAROTA: Good afternoon.  
19 My name is Joe Camarota, C-A-M-A-R-O-T-A.

20 I'd like to thank you for this  
21 opportunity to speak today and, basically, what  
22 I'd like to do is to read for the record the Home  
23 News editorial from April 24th of this year.

24 "Route 92 is a bad idea for any  
25 time to come. This week the Army Corps of

1 Engineers released its long awaited Environmental  
2 Impact Statement on Route 92, the controversial  
3 New Jersey Turnpike extension that would connect  
4 Interchange 8A with Route 1. Its conclusions are  
5 disturbing.

6 "By some form of voodoo logic  
7 the study boosts construction of the highway as a  
8 means of relieving Route 1 traffic when just the  
9 opposite would occur.

10 "Researchers go on to amenably  
11 minimize the disastrous effects that the roadway  
12 would have on the region's environment.

13 "Kingston resident, Steve  
14 Masacola, a long-time fighter against sprawl, put  
15 it best when he labeled the findings a green  
16 washing of facts.

17 "Among its numerous defects,  
18 Route 92 was sliced through one of Middlesex  
19 County's largest and most fragile pieces of  
20 remaining openland. Fourteen acres of wetlands  
21 and eighty acres of farmland will be destroyed.

22 "The Environmental Protection  
23 Agency has already weighed this data and found it  
24 damning. The EPA has deemed the roadway  
25 unnecessary, rejecting the application numerous

1 times. Nor is there proof Route 92 would ease  
2 congestion. Quite the contrary, Route 92 would  
3 simply generate more cars and more sprawl, making  
4 congestion worse.

5 "Historically significant and  
6 fragile communities, clustered near Route 1, will  
7 face irreparable harm, Masacola's Kingston  
8 neighborhood, and Dayton, among them.

9 "The plan is fiscally peril  
10 less, if not downright irresponsible as well. The  
11 six mile long connection was projected to cost  
12 four hundred million dollars two years ago. That  
13 price tag has surely climbed. The cash strapped  
14 Turnpike Authority would be hard pressed not to  
15 raise tolls or seek help from the State. A state,  
16 by the way, that has a transportation funding  
17 crisis of its own.

18 "But, money interests want to  
19 see the roadway become reality. Princeton  
20 University is one of those sponsors. The school  
21 decided in the 1970s to beef up its endowment by  
22 going into the land development business. The  
23 university owns more than thirteen hundred acres  
24 in Middlesex County, and since the 1970s the  
25 institution has become one of the areas most

1 active land developers. Princeton can expect a  
2 windfall if Route 92 is finished.

3 "So, too, can Plainsboro's  
4 Mayer Peter Cantu, a staunch advocate of Route 92,  
5 whose township would cash in on commercial  
6 ratables of enormous proportions.

7 "Support for Route 92 is all  
8 about profit taking, nothing more, but the public  
9 has other concerns in mind. Its health, its home  
10 and its collected piece of mind.

11 "On those scores, every bit of  
12 evidence points to one inconvertible fact, the  
13 highway should not be built now, later, or ever."

14 And, as a resident of South  
15 Brunswick, I plead with you to reject the  
16 application for Route 92. And, once again, I  
17 thank you for your time.

18 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
19 you, Mr. Camarota.

20 Our next speaker will be Nancy  
21 Bialler.

22 MS. BIALLER: Ladies and  
23 gentlemen, Colonel, thank you very much. My name  
24 is Nancy Bialler, B-I-A-L-L-E-R, and I hope any  
25 negative comments you will not take personally.

1                   When you first read the Army  
2 Corps of Engineers' DEIS for proposed Route 92 it  
3 seems apparent that the road should be built,  
4 however, when you examine it closely you realize  
5 it is like those adds for pills that promise to  
6 cure anything.

7                   Recent studies show that brand  
8 blank is recommended by four out of five doctors,  
9 but when you read the fine print you discover that  
10 blanks are intended just for sinus headaches.

11                   The study was done by the  
12 manufacturer. The leading brands were designed  
13 for something entirely different, and blank pills  
14 have rather nasty side effects.

15                   The same can be said for Route  
16 92 and this report. The problem has been  
17 misdiagnosed. The research data is faulty and has  
18 been misused. There are very, very nasty side  
19 effects, and worst of all, it doesn't work.

20                   First, misdiagnosis.

21                   The initial premise of Route 92  
22 is favorably flawed, the objectives are too  
23 narrow, the Turnpike Authority proposes that the  
24 only solution to traffic congestion in the region  
25 is limited access east/west highway.

1                   This effectively removes other  
2 possible solutions from consideration.

3                   For example, Bus Rapid Transit  
4 not considered. Why? Extending the truck lanes  
5 of the Turnpike further south, not considered.  
6 Why? Widening Route 1, rejected. Route 522 as an  
7 alternative, rejected using old data and species  
8 assumes that the road would have to be widened.  
9 Why does the road have to be widened?

10                  As for the data, apparently, a  
11 great deal has been recycled from earlier studies,  
12 but more worrying is that facts and figures are  
13 manipulated to prove a point, and in some areas  
14 significant data has not been gathered at all.

15                  Take the simple example, Route  
16 92 corridor has been classified as suburban rather  
17 than rural so that lower emission standards  
18 prevail? Would the Corps please provide the  
19 rationale for this classification? Or the  
20 question of added truck traffic.

21                  In section one, future  
22 increases in truck traffic are used to justify  
23 building Route 92, but in section four, Page 10,  
24 the added traffic that would occur on Heathcote  
25 Road in Kingston by building Route 92 is dismissed

1 as something that can be mitigated. Would the  
2 Corps please explain?

3 We also need to look at data  
4 that has not been gathered.

5 The Corps assumes that roads  
6 are just for driving, but they are not. I live on  
7 Perrine Road, which is rural in character, and all  
8 day long people walk, jog, bike, and simply stroll  
9 along. There's the stocky but determined man out  
10 running every morning, the 86-year-old retired  
11 plumber who takes a four mile constitutional, the  
12 four men from Dow Jones on their lunch break, the  
13 engineer's wife, the men and women gathering wild  
14 mushrooms, the cyclists, bird watchers, kids doing  
15 projects, the proposed Route 92 and concomitant  
16 changes on Perrine Road would put all this to an  
17 end.

18 Studying the habits and the  
19 needs of the residents should be in the scope of  
20 DEIS. Why is it not? How can you evaluate the  
21 impact of a project on a community if you do not  
22 talk to the people in it?

23 From the very beginning this  
24 project has been one of non-inclusion. The very  
25 language of the report betrays this bias. See

1 section one, Page 6. This EIS describes the  
2 project purpose and examines the benefits and  
3 impacts. Benefits and impacts. Why not benefits  
4 and detriments? Benefits and damages?

5 Many of these impacts read  
6 nasty side effects, have and will be discussed by  
7 others.

8 As for the conclusions, others  
9 will treat these at length, but let's look at two  
10 points in the DEIS.

11 First, if Route 92 is built,  
12 eleven out of fourteen intersections will not be  
13 improved.

14 Second, and even more  
15 astonishing, is an admission in the executive  
16 summary, Page 15, that there is no provision for  
17 excess capacity.

18 Please explain.

19 Three hundred and fifty million  
20 dollars in 1994 dollars to improve three  
21 intersections, and it doesn't provide for excess  
22 capacity? Wasn't the whole point of this project  
23 to accommodate the future growth?

24 Ladies and gentlemen, with all  
25 due respect, they are trying to sell us snake oil.

1 The project is misconceived, poorly researched,  
2 and even by the standards set by its proponents,  
3 it does not succeed. However, this does not mean  
4 we should do nothing to remedy the serious  
5 transportation problems in this area. With  
6 community input we can devise a plan that will  
7 improve our road system for the present and future  
8 without destroying the natural habitat and local  
9 character that attracted us to Central Jersey to  
10 begin with.

11 I call on the panel and  
12 Governor McGreevey -- Governor McGreevey, not the  
13 panel to keep his campaign promises, but I call on  
14 the governor to keep his campaign promises and  
15 reduce the sprawl and damage to the environment.

16 Thank you very much.

17 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
18 you, Ms. Bialler.

19 We're at our limit, folks, but  
20 I did insert the ten-minute break, so I'm going to  
21 try to get two more speakers in.

22 I remind you all that if you  
23 don't get a chance to speak here, you can record  
24 your comments, you can provide a written record.  
25 You can also re-register for the seven p.m.

1 hearing.

2 We'll now here from Jennifer  
3 Teacher.

4 I can't read the handwriting.

5 Tescher, perhaps.

6 Sandra Shapiro?

7 Ms. Shapiro?

8 Joan Murray.

9 Joan Murray?

10 MS. MURRAY: Thank you. I  
11 appreciate your enabling me to speak this  
12 afternoon because I don't like to drive after  
13 dark.

14 I live just off of Raymond Road  
15 in Kingston area, and I am very concerned about  
16 what 92 would do to the Kingston area. I  
17 completely support Ann Zeman's testimony and Kathy  
18 Dowgin completely. I don't want to be redundant,  
19 but I would support them completely, and the same  
20 with Chief Paquette.

21 So, I just want to add my  
22 opposition to Route 92 as a taxpayer, and I've  
23 lived here for forty-five years. We moved down  
24 here because we liked the area and my husband  
25 worked at RCA at the time. But, I hope that the

1 area will remain as pleasant as it has been and  
2 not have to tolerate a 92.

3 Thank you very much.

4 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
5 you, Ms. Murray.

6 Marcia Pollack.

7 MS. POLLACK: My name is Marcia  
8 Pollack, P-O-L-L-A-C-K. I'm a resident of  
9 Kingston.

10 Currently the traffic between  
11 Route 206 and Route 1 east takes a variety of  
12 routes through Princeton and West Windsor, through  
13 Kingston and Plainsboro, through Kendall Park and  
14 Dayton. Once you provide this excellent road all  
15 traffic from the 206 area will come through  
16 Kingston, a village with a 17th or 18th century  
17 road plan, a village where George Washington  
18 stopped on his way to winter in Morristown, a  
19 village with roads, including the road nearest to  
20 the terminus of Route 92, whose width is so  
21 restricted that one mile from this hotel the road  
22 squeezes to just twenty-five feet between the wall  
23 of the old Union Line Hotel and the wall of the  
24 house across the road.

25 How many lanes of Turnpike

1 traffic are you aiming here?

2 To do this to our village,  
3 founded in 1675, and it's irreplaceable history,  
4 to do this to our wetlands and our aquifer, to do  
5 this while other state agencies are fighting  
6 sprawl, to do this when New Jersey has tough  
7 budget problems ahead, to do this when the  
8 multi-lane Route 522 is less than a mile away and  
9 performs the same function, makes no sense.

10 Thank you.

11 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
12 you, Ms. Pollack.

13 Our final speaker then will be  
14 David Southgate?

15 Is Mr. Southgate present?

16 I'm going to go back and check  
17 these one more time.

18 Mr. Southgate, Jennifer  
19 Shapiro, Jennifer Tescher, Mr. Switsgable or Ms.  
20 Muser?

21 All right, that concludes this  
22 session. The next session is at seven p.m.

23 Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the afternoon  
25 session is concluded.)

1                                    E V E N I N G   S E S S I O N

2

3                                    LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Ladies  
4 and gentlemen, if everyone would please come to  
5 order, we would like to get started.

6                                    Good evening. I'm Lieutenant  
7 Colonel Kurt Hoffmann, Deputy Commander of the New  
8 York District of the United States Army Corps of  
9 Engineers. I am the presiding officer on behalf  
10 of my boss, who couldn't make it today.

11                                   Seated at the dais with me  
12 today, on my right is Mrs. Koko Cronin, regulatory  
13 project manager of the district regulatory branch,  
14 and on the left would be Mr. James Palmer, my  
15 assistant district counsel, and he will shortly  
16 join us, but I'm not going to wait.

17                                   Today's hearing is the second  
18 session of a public hearing to be conducted by the  
19 United States Army Corps of Engineers to assist in  
20 the regulatory review of the Route 92 project  
21 proposed by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.  
22 Any comments the public would like to make to be  
23 included in the administrative record of the  
24 application need to be presented at this public  
25 hearing or in writing to us at the Corps by June

1 14th.

2 I want to stress that again, by  
3 the 14th of June, please, because that does close  
4 the comment period.

5 The purpose of this public  
6 hearing is to obtain information, evidence and  
7 receive comment on an application submitted to the  
8 Corps of Engineers by the New Jersey Turnpike  
9 Authority. The Turnpike Authority requests a  
10 federal permit to perform construction activities  
11 in the waters of the United States, including  
12 wetlands. The Turnpike Authority proposes to  
13 discharge fill material into approximately 12.03  
14 acres of waters and wetlands for the purpose of  
15 constructing a 6.7 mile highway. The project  
16 known as Route 92 would be a high speed, limited  
17 access, toll highway linking the Interchange 8A of  
18 the New Jersey Turnpike in Monroe Township,  
19 passing through Plainsboro Township and connecting  
20 with U.S. Route 1 in South Brunswick Township.

21 As mitigation for impacts to  
22 wetlands and waters of the United States, the  
23 Turnpike Authority proposes to create fifty-seven  
24 acres of wetlands and to preserve two hundred and  
25 two acres of wetlands and uplands.

1                   The project site is located in  
2                   waters and wetlands adjacent to Devil's Brook of  
3                   the Raritan River in the Township of South  
4                   Brunswick, Plainsboro, Monroe, all within  
5                   Middlesex County, New Jersey.

6                   At today's hearing we also seek  
7                   comments on the draft Environmental Impact  
8                   Statement prepared by the Corps of Engineers to  
9                   assist in the regulatory review of the  
10                  application.

11                  The draft Environmental Impact  
12                  Statement discusses a number of alternatives. The  
13                  Corps has not identified a preferred alternative  
14                  in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and  
15                  we welcome comments on the alternatives presented.

16                  After review of comments  
17                  received in response to the draft Environmental  
18                  Impact Statement the Corps of Engineers will  
19                  prepare a final Environmental Impact Statement.  
20                  Comments on the draft Environmental Impact  
21                  Statement will be addressed in the final  
22                  Environmental Impact Statement.

23                  Because the proposed project  
24                  entails filling activities within waters of the  
25                  United States, including wetlands, a permit is

1 required from the Corps pursuant to Section 404 of  
2 the Clean Water Act.

3 The Corps of Engineers is  
4 neither a proponent for, nor an opponent of the  
5 proposed project. Our role is to determine  
6 whether this project is in the overall public  
7 interest.

8 This hearing will play an  
9 important part in that determination. This  
10 hearing will be conducted according to the  
11 procedures set forth in Title 33 of the code of  
12 federal regulations, Part 327.

13 Anyone present today may  
14 provide written statements or proposed findings  
15 and recommendations for the hearing to be placed  
16 on file so long as you get it to us by the 14th of  
17 June. All written comments should be directed to  
18 the mailing address shown or to the electronic  
19 mail address on the public notice.

20 Written comments can also be  
21 handed to Corps engineer staff, posted today at  
22 the registration table in the lobby, and you all  
23 should have met them already.

24 At this time I would like to  
25 explain the procedures that will govern the

1           conduct of this public hearing.

2                                 Before I go any further, I just  
3           want to recognize the fact that there are a lot of  
4           good people in this room. All of you took time to  
5           study this issue, all of you sacrificed time  
6           tonight that you, clearly, would have otherwise  
7           used some other way. There's going to be a  
8           difference of opinion here, but, remember, this is  
9           not a debate. This is not a decision brief. This  
10          is not a question-and-answer period. This is an  
11          opportunity for each of you to go on public record  
12          to assist in the final determination.

13                                Please respect each other's  
14          differing opinions. State your case and then be  
15          respectful enough to allow enough time for  
16          everyone else to do the same, and I promise you  
17          that everyone will benefit. But, respect each  
18          other and the fact that you're all good people  
19          that spent a lot of time waiting for the  
20          opportunity to address this issue.

21                                Thank you.

22                                Anyone may appear on his or her  
23          own behalf or be represented by counsel or other  
24          representatives to present recommendations or  
25          information. Cross-examination of witnesses will

1 not be permitted. Procedurally, I will call the  
2 names of those individuals who have registered and  
3 asked for an opportunity to speak. I ask that you  
4 step up to and speak into the microphone at the  
5 podium to my right, to your front left, and speak  
6 so that everyone, including our stenographer, can  
7 hear you.

8 We request that you begin your  
9 presentation by stating your name and correcting  
10 it if I mispronounce it, and I'm prone to do that,  
11 so I don't mind, but correct at least your surname  
12 when you get to the podium and then spell it.  
13 This is for your own benefit so that when you see  
14 your comments later recorded in the findings  
15 you'll recognize your name at least.

16 State also any affiliation with  
17 an organization or group, if any, so that we may  
18 also have that information in our administrative  
19 record.

20 It is important to everyone,  
21 whatever your opinion on this matter, that this  
22 hearing be conducted in an orderly manner.  
23 Because of this I must ask that speakers keep  
24 their presentations to five minutes or less. Ms.  
25 Cronin will run a timer and at the one minute mark

1 will subtly hold up a sign that the speaker should  
2 be able to see.

3 We're going to do our best not  
4 to interrupt you or embarrass you, but I assure  
5 you that as we get close to five minutes I will  
6 have to stop you so that everyone here has an  
7 opportunity to get that same shot at the five  
8 minutes.

9 If you have a longer  
10 presentation, please submit it in writing and  
11 summarize it orally. That's an option.

12 Written statements that you  
13 would like to submit for the record today should  
14 be presented directly to the dais, or to the  
15 registration table at the entrance. Time  
16 permitting, we look to provide an opportunity for  
17 rebuttal to any person who wants to do so after  
18 all speakers have been heard.

19 I have the registration forms  
20 that you've completed, and I will call for each  
21 speaker by name in the order listed in the public  
22 notice announcement of today's hearing. If you  
23 wish to present testimony this evening, you should  
24 note that you may instead choose to record your  
25 comments in the Kingston room of this hotel, which

1 is on the same floor as we are on, out the doors,  
2 keep going, instead of speaking at the podium.

3 This may become an attractive  
4 option for you if it becomes a burden to wait, as  
5 this is a five hour session.

6 If you did not receive the  
7 handout, please ask at the registration table for  
8 help in that regard.

9 I will first call federally  
10 elected officials, followed by representatives of  
11 federal agencies and appointed federal officials,  
12 as set forth in the order noted in the public  
13 notice.

14 A verbatim written record of  
15 this public hearing is being made and a written  
16 transcript will be made of the tape recorded  
17 statements taken in the Kingston room. The  
18 hearing transcripts will be available for purchase  
19 from the Corps of Engineers at the cost of  
20 reproduction. The cost of a copy will correspond  
21 directly to the number of pages enclosed.  
22 Everyone who has completed one of the registration  
23 forms at the entrance to this room will be  
24 contacted by the Corps in writing when the  
25 transcripts are available.

1                   Again, if you wish to speak  
2                   this evening, you must fill out a registration  
3                   form available at the table outside so we can put  
4                   you in the cue.

5                   Comments made here, plus all  
6                   written information provided on or about the 14th  
7                   of June, plus anything that's recorded next door,  
8                   will be used to evaluate the probable impacts,  
9                   including the cumulative impacts on the proposed  
10                  activity on the public interest. The ultimate  
11                  decision on the submitted application will reflect  
12                  a national concern for both protection and  
13                  utilization of important resources.

14                  As a last bit of administrative  
15                  information, I remind everyone, no smoking, no  
16                  eating, no drinking, and, yes, we have drinks up  
17                  here. I'm not sure myself why. I guess because I  
18                  can't leave.

19                  Anyway, the rest of you can.

20                  Please turn off your pagers,  
21                  your cell phones and anything that might disrupt  
22                  the other speakers because we should all expect  
23                  the same minimum amount of respect. That will  
24                  certainly help with an efficient manner in  
25                  conducting this.

1                   If anyone present wants  
2 additional information on the Route 92 project as  
3 a whole, representatives of the New Jersey  
4 Turnpike Authority are available in the lobby.

5                   Now, before we begin taking  
6 your public comment I would like to introduce Mr.  
7 Bill Cesanek of CDM, the environmental consultant  
8 that assisted the Corps of Engineers in the  
9 preparation of the draft Environmental Impact  
10 Statement. Mr. Cesanek will provide a brief  
11 overview of the draft Environmental Impact  
12 Statement.

13                   MR. CESANEK: Thank you,  
14 Colonel.

15                   The Corps has asked us to  
16 provide a brief overview of the Environmental  
17 Impact Statement. This will be very short. I  
18 will confine my comments really to the structure  
19 and some of the principal ideas, and my comments  
20 will be followed by those of our traffic analyst,  
21 and then we'll turn it over to public comment.

22                   The Environmental Impact  
23 Statement that has been prepared for this project  
24 contains a number of standard sections. Those  
25 include the purpose and needs analysis. This is a

1 review of the function of the proposed project and  
2 a measurement of the various alternatives in terms  
3 of their opportunity to perform that function.

4 A wide range of alternatives  
5 have been considered for the project, and I'll  
6 talk about them in just a minute.

7 The existing environmental  
8 conditions in the area of each of the alternatives  
9 has been analyzed, data has been collected about  
10 wetlands and streams and residential locations.  
11 Then, from that the directing cumulative impacts  
12 of the various alternatives have been analyzed and  
13 discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement.  
14 Where there are significant environmental impacts  
15 we then evaluate the opportunity to mitigate those  
16 impacts to reduce them or offset them, and then  
17 there is the public involvement process, which  
18 tonight's hearing is a part.

19 This is the project area in  
20 Central New Jersey, and I just wanted to point out  
21 that this is the Route 1 corridor, this is the  
22 Route 130 corridor, and the Turnpike. The project  
23 would run approximately through this area in South  
24 Brunswick, and three of the key municipalities  
25 that we have studied as part of the project

1 include South Brunswick, Plainsboro and Cranbury,  
2 as well as the adjacent municipalities.

3 What you just saw was the  
4 project purpose. That will be summarized by the  
5 transportation consultant.

6 The alternatives analysis included three  
7 categories of improvement alternatives,  
8 improvements to existing local and county roads,  
9 improvements to the existing regional roadway  
10 system, that is, improvements to major highways,  
11 and then, also, a consideration of new roadway  
12 facilities. Of which the proposed Route 92 is  
13 one.

14 This is a map just depicting  
15 some of the improvements to the existing roads  
16 that were analyzed. You see Dey Road widening,  
17 potential widening of Cranbury neck, of Plainsboro  
18 Cranbury. So, there are a whole series of  
19 analyses that were conducted on improvements to  
20 the existing transportation network.

21 In addition, again, an example  
22 analysis was performed on potential new highway  
23 routes to achieve the project purpose. Proposed  
24 Route 92, a parallel road alignment for Dey Road,  
25 parallel alignment for Plainsboro Cranbury Road.

1                   As part of the alternatives  
2                   analysis the consulting team collected information  
3                   on wetland impacts, farmland preservation,  
4                   parkland, residential, commercial impacts, public  
5                   facilities, and whether the particular alternative  
6                   would meet project need. And, then, for all the  
7                   alternatives they were measured and compared.

8                   There was a screening process  
9                   employed and alternatives were comparatively  
10                  evaluated, and those demonstrating the greatest  
11                  impacts were eliminated from future consideration  
12                  or for additional consideration. Those were high  
13                  wetland impacts, farmland impacts, parkland  
14                  impacts, high dislocation impacts were eliminated  
15                  from additional consideration, and that resulted  
16                  in two major alternatives, groups of alternatives  
17                  being recommended in addition to the no action  
18                  alternative.

19                  Again, there's the no action,  
20                  the proposed Route 92 with terminus at Route 1 and  
21                  U.S. Route 1 widening, there are a series of sub  
22                  alternatives that were also considered within each  
23                  of those primary alternatives.

24                  And, for these principal  
25                  alternatives detailed information was collected on

1 the environmental effects to streams, water  
2 quality, wetlands, wildlife habitat, residential  
3 and commercial dislocation, noise, air quality  
4 effects, both during construction and during the  
5 operation of the facility, land use development,  
6 smart growth issues, and traffic effects on local  
7 communities. And, details of all these are  
8 presented in the Environmental Impact Statement.

9 For this part I'd like to turn  
10 it over to Gary Davies. Thank you.

11 MR. DAVIES: Thank you, Bill.

12 The traffic analysis was a very  
13 important part of this study and a key component  
14 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15 I'm going to very briefly talk  
16 about some of the work that was done in the  
17 traffic analysis and some of the key findings of  
18 the analysis.

19 The methods that we used were  
20 to use what we call travel modeling, where we use  
21 computerized methods to forecast traffic  
22 conditions. It's a merger of both regional  
23 modeling techniques based on NJTPA and DVRPC,  
24 coupled with the very detailed local traffic  
25 model.

1                                   Underlying this was a  
2                   substantial set of new data and inventories that  
3                   are very current, origin destination surveys,  
4                   traffic counts, travel time studies, land use  
5                   analysis, reappraisal land use quantities and  
6                   forecast.

7                                   All of this lead to the ability  
8                   to analyze each of the primary alternatives that  
9                   Bill described.

10                                  We looked at the year 2028 as  
11                   our design condition, and for each of those we  
12                   prepared travel forecasts by component of autos  
13                   and trucks and then we evaluated the results using  
14                   highway capacity manual software and other  
15                   analytic methods for forecasting or evaluating how  
16                   well the transportation system would perform.

17                                  First of all, the no action,  
18                   meaning no construction related to the Route 92  
19                   project, we looked at what the affect of growth  
20                   would be. And, underlying that, of course, is  
21                   population and employment growth in the region.

22                                  Population over the  
23                   twenty-seven year period is expected to increase  
24                   at a fairly aggressive. That is about, overall,  
25                   about a nineteen percent increase. But, compared

1 to the employment, it's more modest.

2 Employment will increase over  
3 that twenty-seven year period by about sixty-seven  
4 percent, over what we see on the ground today.

5 We're at substantial expansion.

6 Also, as we look at the effects  
7 of change and growth we have to account for the  
8 changes in the highway system. So, we looked at  
9 and accounted for all of the committed  
10 transportation improvements in the vicinity of the  
11 project and those that are funded. Some of these  
12 have already been constructed. Most decision  
13 documents are in place and are ready to go.

14 What results from this is an  
15 estimate of traffic conditions in the future.

16 Now, this is the 2001. We are  
17 just looking at the morning peak hour in this  
18 particular slide. And, you can see where the  
19 purple and red areas are. Those are congested  
20 areas today, and as time goes on, that means in  
21 2028 those will change into more purple, more red,  
22 implying that along the Turnpike, along Route 130,  
23 and especially along Route 1 and across east/west  
24 highways, Cranbury Neck, Plainsboro, Dey Road, all  
25 of the local system will begin to experience

1 substantial congestion over the twenty-eight year  
2 period.

3 Congestion levels are expected  
4 to get higher and demands are going to generally  
5 increase and produce more congestion in the study  
6 area.

7 Based upon this analysis then  
8 the purpose of the project was defined. And, the  
9 purposes are really four. One is to provide a  
10 linkage for through traffic moving between U.S.  
11 Route 1, U.S. Route 130, and the New Jersey  
12 Turnpike. And, then to provide alternative routes  
13 for north/south traffic that currently uses Route  
14 1 to relieve congestion, particularly on the  
15 northern stretches of Route 1 through South  
16 Brunswick and North Brunswick, while minimizing  
17 impacts to those abutting communities.

18 A very important purpose was to  
19 reserve the local streets in the region for local  
20 traffic and to, by implication, direct regional  
21 traffic, through traffic, to regional facilities.  
22 Put the traffic where it belongs.

23 And, finally, to reduce the  
24 presence of non-local truck traffic on the local  
25 network and shift such traffic to some sort of a

1 connector highway.

2 In order to accomplish those  
3 purposes we defined the objectives for the  
4 project. One was to establish a road system, as  
5 I've said, that reserves local streets for local  
6 traffic while providing a higher speed route for  
7 traffic moving between Route 1, 130 and the  
8 Turnpike. Secondly was to provide alternative  
9 routes for north/south traffic. Thirdly, to  
10 reduce the presence of non-local truck traffic in  
11 those sensitive community areas that have a lot of  
12 residential activity and pedestrian activity and  
13 the community centers. And, finally, to work to  
14 ensure that the capacity that we create isn't  
15 eroded by unsustainable and unworthy in the  
16 development.

17 Now, we focused on two specific  
18 alternatives, the primary alternatives as Bill  
19 described it, and these pictures from the dais  
20 documents show the results. As you can see, the  
21 red indicates locations where traffic volumes will  
22 increase. And, of course, on Route 92 alignment  
23 traffic volumes will increase, on Route 1 down  
24 through Plainsboro and West Windsor traffic  
25 volumes will increase, and on the Turnpike traffic

1 volumes will increase.

2 By implication, traffic volumes  
3 on Route 1 north of the Route 92 alignment through  
4 South Brunswick and through North Brunswick will  
5 decrease, as will volumes on Dey Road, Plainsboro  
6 Road, Route 522, the east/west local and secondary  
7 roadways through the study area will all decrease,  
8 thereby mitigating many of those congested  
9 conditions that we saw on that previous no action  
10 slide.

11 We see that Route 1 volumes  
12 will be reduced at many constricted locations,  
13 truck volumes will decrease and, generally, the  
14 system will benefit.

15 The other alternative that we  
16 looked at in great detail was the Route 1  
17 widening, which would place an extra lane on Route  
18 1 through South Brunswick and North Brunswick and  
19 remove the traffic signals as well. That  
20 additional capacity would do two things, it would  
21 improve travel conditions, but it would also cause  
22 much additional traffic to be attracted to Route  
23 1. The benefit is that where we see the green,  
24 volumes would decrease on the cross east/west  
25 streets and on 130 and on the Turnpike, but the

1 impact of that would be that on Route 1 the travel  
2 conditions would actually not be relieved because,  
3 in fact, the widening on Route 1 would attract so  
4 much traffic from other facilities, such as the  
5 Route 27 and 130, that it would more than  
6 compensate for the additional capacity. And, as a  
7 consequence, we felt that there are some  
8 significant issues with respect to this Route 1  
9 alternative, but, at the same time, we would be  
10 left with problems in the local cross streets.

11 We're looking forward to your  
12 input tonight. The project team is anticipating  
13 many comments from you that will be useful, and I  
14 will turn it back to the Colonel now.

15 Thank you.

16 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: First I  
17 want to announce that we found a set of keys.  
18 They appear to be for a Volkswagen. So, if any of  
19 you are operating a Volkswagen and don't have your  
20 keys, you might want to go out and check with our  
21 folks at the registration table.

22 I want to remind you all again  
23 that there's no eating or drinking here. If you  
24 happened to have made a mistake and brought a  
25 drink in, I appreciate you disposing that as fast

1 as you can. It's a hotel room. I ask you to  
2 respect it.

3 All right. I'm going to  
4 summarize one more time, you have five minutes.  
5 Don't get into debate, don't take anything  
6 personal. Be clear when you speak into the  
7 microphone. State your name clearly and then  
8 please spell for us your surname.

9 We have no more public service  
10 announcements, therefore, at this time we'll begin  
11 with our first speaker, Mayor Peter Cantu,  
12 Township of Plainsboro.

13 MR. CANTU: Good evening. My  
14 name is Peter Cantu. I'm the Mayor of Plainsboro  
15 Township. I have served as Mayor of Plainsboro  
16 for twenty-four of the last thirty years.

17 Few, if any, public officials  
18 have been part of the Route 92 issue or other  
19 regional transportation issues as long as I have.  
20 I recognize clearly the challenges presented by  
21 the construction of a new highway and the  
22 important responsibilities carried by state and  
23 federal environmental agencies in protecting  
24 important environmental resources. In Plainsboro  
25 Township we take these issues very seriously.

1 And, our long record of open space farmland and  
2 woodland preservation speaks for itself. In fact,  
3 not far from here is the new Plainsboro Preserve.  
4 This is land that we preserved to ensure that the  
5 eventual Route 92 would not encourage growth in  
6 that part of Plainsboro Township.

7 We believe that Route 92 is a  
8 roadway essential not just to Plainsboro's future,  
9 but also to that of the region. This is a  
10 position that's not been arrived at cautiously or  
11 emotionally, but one born of independent careful  
12 evaluation.

13 It's clear from all the studies  
14 that have been done that Route 92 is not only  
15 needed, but it's critical to the transportation  
16 circulation system of this region. Without Route  
17 92 most of our major local intersections would  
18 fail, if not in the not too distant future. In  
19 fact, it seems the future traffic scenarios are  
20 here already in many cases.

21 It is this sobering evaluation  
22 and observations of existing and future conditions  
23 that have lead our township committee to vote  
24 consistently over the years to support the  
25 construction of Route 92. This region cannot

1       afford to wait any longer for this critical  
2       transportation to be built. The construction of a  
3       6.7 mile limited access highway to serve the  
4       east/west transportation link must move forward as  
5       presently planned.

6                       The draft Environmental Impact  
7       Statement comprehensively addresses the advantages  
8       and disadvantages of all the transportation  
9       alternatives for this area, including a no build  
10      option. It looked at all the transportation  
11      alternatives and how they conformed to smart  
12      growth policies of the State, the County and the  
13      townships that are affected. The study found that  
14      the Route 92 alternative is the alternative that  
15      most effectively meets smart growth principles  
16      when compared to other alternatives, including the  
17      no build alternative.

18                      One of the most frequently  
19      supported alternatives advocated by opponents of  
20      Route 92 is the expansion of 522 through South  
21      Brunswick. The EIS tells us that expanding Route  
22      522 to six lanes would have a much greater human  
23      impact by necessitating destruction of some  
24      fifty-eight homes, making local travel more  
25      difficult, discouraging walking and bicycling, and

1 reducing the quality of life for adjacent  
2 neighborhoods. There are also wetland impacts  
3 that directly impact on Pigeon Swan State Park.

4 Add to that the fact that  
5 making 522 into six lanes will not reduce regional  
6 through traffic on east/west road systems. It is  
7 clear this is not a viable alternative.

8 The Township of Plainsboro  
9 consistently support a solution to this area's  
10 transportation problems. They'll be sensitive to  
11 both manmade and natural environments.

12 With that in mind, the New  
13 Jersey Turnpike Authority has proposed  
14 construction of approximately fifty-seven acres of  
15 wetlands as a mitigation. In addition, the  
16 Turnpike Authority proposes further mitigation in  
17 the form of the permanent preservation of two  
18 hundred two acres of existing forest and wetland  
19 and uplands in the vicinity of Friendship.

20 The DEIS is clear in stating  
21 that the construction of 92 will have the most  
22 benefit with the least amount of impact.

23 As mayor, it is my  
24 responsibility to safeguard Plainsboro's quality  
25 of life. We pride ourselves on the fact that

1 through successful long-term planning we have  
2 created a key balance between development, the  
3 preservation of open space and the creation of a  
4 strong economic base. We adhered to the  
5 principals of smart growth and the guidelines of  
6 state plan. Smart growth cannot be accomplished  
7 solely by local municipalities.

8 The Route 92 project has been  
9 key to many of the land use decisions that have  
10 been made and implemented during the past  
11 twenty-five years. It is time for the State to  
12 move forward by providing the appropriate missing  
13 link, this important missing link to the regional  
14 and state transportation system.

15 There is only so much a  
16 community can do alone, and Plainsboro works with  
17 its neighbors to find common ground and solution  
18 to transportation problems. We are an active  
19 participant and member of the Central Jersey  
20 Transportation Forum. This regional body has  
21 consistently supported the construction of Route  
22 92. This forum has been held up in New Jersey as  
23 the example of how to accomplish comprehensive  
24 transportation planning in a multi-jurisdictional  
25 region.

1                   It's important that we do not  
2                   make the mistake of avoiding a decision that while  
3                   difficult, it's critical to the future of this  
4                   region and residents.

5                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
6                   you, Mayor Cantu.

(Let the record indicate booing in the audience.)

7                   Folks, I'll close this thing  
8                   right now. I told you you're going to have  
9                   differing opinions, but you're going to respect  
10                  each other or expect the same. We will treat each  
11                  other as we expect to be treated, and that was  
12                  unacceptable. And, I'm a little bit surprised  
13                  because the class of people that I've seen  
14                  operating here this afternoon was not what I just  
15                  saw displayed, and we won't have that again.  
16                  You'll speak and you'll sit down. You may  
17                  applaud. That's the end of it, folks.

18                  I really appreciate you taking  
19                  that to heart.

20                  Now, we'll try in again.

21                  Mr. Arthur Lehrhaupt, Planning  
22                  Board Chairman, Township of Plainsboro.

23                  MR. LEHRHAUPT: Good evening.

24                  My name is Arthur Lehrhaupt, L-E-H-R-H-A-U-P-T.

25                  I'm the chairperson of the Planning Board for the

1 Township of Plainsboro and have served in this  
2 capacity for over fifteen years.

3 Over the years Plainsboro's  
4 Planning Board has given careful consideration for  
5 the need for this critical east/west limited  
6 access transportation route. As the record shows,  
7 Route 92 is a road that has been planned and  
8 studied for over fifty years.

9 Plainsboro is becoming known  
10 throughout New Jersey as the smart growth  
11 township. Our master plan has taken a  
12 comprehensive view of transportation and land use  
13 planning. A major accomplishment has been open  
14 space preservation, where we have been able to  
15 preserve over fifty percent of the entire  
16 community through such methods as farmland  
17 preservation, clustering and outright purchases.  
18 Through aggressive planning and preservation we  
19 have concentrated our residential and commercial  
20 areas along major transportation corridors and  
21 have limited growth in areas that do not have good  
22 access. Our community is served by mass transit  
23 and we have planned for and built a comprehensive  
24 bicycle and pedestrian network throughout the  
25 entire community. This year we have the ground

1 breaking for our new village center, a mixed use  
2 development in a walkable environment. Familiar  
3 features of downtown, such as angled parking and a  
4 town green, all adjacent to existing transit, will  
5 be part of the Plainsboro Village Center.

6                   Critics of Route 92 have stated  
7 that the existing roads with minor changes can  
8 handle the projected regional traffic. The no  
9 build scenario and other scenarios that increase  
10 the use of Dey Road, Plainsboro Road and Cranbury  
11 Neck Road run counter to all the good planning  
12 that has been accomplished and implemented. The  
13 increase in volume that is projected on these  
14 corridors and in the other scenarios that don't  
15 include Route 92 would completely destroy and  
16 bifurcate the community. Dey Road is being turned  
17 into the de facto Route 92. Garbage trucks from  
18 New York City use this route everyday, all day, to  
19 get to their destination in Pennsylvania. The  
20 speed and volume of vehicles along Dey Road are  
21 steadily increasing and divide the community. In  
22 order for our children to get to our community  
23 park, to their new elementary school, or to our  
24 new environmental education center in the  
25 Plainsboro Preserve, they need to cross Dey Road.

1                   Cranbury Neck Road, which goes  
2                   to the southern part of Plainsboro, is our  
3                   farmland preservation zone, where we have been  
4                   very successful in ensuring that it will be farmed  
5                   for generations to come. And, any increase in  
6                   interstate traffic will do damage to this  
7                   sensitive area.

8                   And, Plainsboro Road has  
9                   recently been redesigned to make it pedestrian and  
10                  bicycle friendly.

11                  All three of these roads are  
12                  inappropriate for carrying regional traffic. It  
13                  would not be smart planning. The fact is that  
14                  Route 92 is consistent with the overall planning  
15                  goals of Plainsboro Township, the County of  
16                  Middlesex, and the State plan. Route 92 will  
17                  connect the New Jersey Turnpike, Route 130 and  
18                  Route 1. Hierarchy of roads is essential to  
19                  ensuring that our existing infrastructure is used  
20                  for the types and volumes of traffic for which it  
21                  was designed and planned.

22                  Dey Road, Plainsboro Road, and  
23                  Cranbury Neck Road were never planned or designed  
24                  to have increasing volume they receive as a result  
25                  of Route 92 not being built.

1                   For the sake of twenty years of  
2                   good planning and thoughtful land use decisions,  
3                   it is imperative that this permit is approved and  
4                   that this critical east/west road connection  
5                   finally is built. This will empower the  
6                   communities of Central New Jersey to be able to  
7                   address the local transportation needs and  
8                   problems that have been put off because of the  
9                   delay of this decision.

10                   Please act now for the sake of  
11                   transportation mobility and good planning and  
12                   approve this permit and allow this road to be  
13                   built.

14                   Thank you.

15                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
16                   you, Mr. Lehrhaupt.

17                   Our next speaker will be Robert  
18                   Sheehan, Township Administrator, Plainsboro.

19                   MR. SHEEHAN: Good evening. My  
20                   name is Robert Sheehan, S-H-E-E-H-A-N. I'm the  
21                   Township Administrator for Plainsboro Township.  
22                   Prior to being appointed administrator I served as  
23                   community development director and have been  
24                   involved with the Route 92 issue for nearly eleven  
25                   years. As such, I'm familiar with the many

1 studies that have been done during that time.

2 From the standpoint of good  
3 planning, Route 92 is needed for the overall  
4 fiscal health of Plainsboro Township and the  
5 region.

6 In the early 1980s the New  
7 Jersey Department of Transportation undertook the  
8 State's first comprehensive corridor study to  
9 determine how best to invest in this area. It  
10 recommended construction to improve Route 1 and a  
11 variety of other measures to better manage the  
12 region's transportation infrastructure. This  
13 study concluded that Route 92 was so essential to  
14 the region that its construction was taken as a  
15 given in every analysis that the DOT has conducted  
16 since then.

17 Plainsboro Township embraced  
18 the study and implemented many of the study's  
19 recommendations. In fact, Route 1 in Plainsboro  
20 is the only portion of Route 1 in Central New  
21 Jersey that does not have an at grade  
22 intersection.

23 Plainsboro has faithfully  
24 followed good planning in this corridor and now  
25 asks that the State be allowed to do their part.

1                   Plainsboro did not just stop at  
2                   the DOT study. The Township also had three  
3                   independent professional evaluations conducted.  
4                   One in 1992, another in 1994, and a third in 1996.  
5                   All three came to the same conclusion, which is  
6                   that construction of Route 92 would not only be  
7                   beneficial, but that it is absolutely essential  
8                   for Plainsboro from both a transportation and  
9                   financial viewpoint. The study showed that absent  
10                  92 the extent of road construction required at the  
11                  local level just to maintain minimum levels of  
12                  service would be financially impossible. In  
13                  addition, the resulting local roadway network of  
14                  four and six lane roads will destroy our  
15                  community.

16                                   Any deterioration in our  
17                                   quality of life would adversely impact many  
18                                   existing businesses in Plainsboro. This business  
19                                   base is a major contributor to the regional job  
20                                   base and a major reason why many people moved to  
21                                   this area and live here. Plainsboro has been able  
22                                   to maintain its tax base and keep its property  
23                                   taxes low because of the careful and thoughtful  
24                                   planning that has been accomplished over the last  
25                                   twenty years.

1                   The Route 92 project has been  
2                   key to many of the land use decisions that  
3                   Plainsboro has made. There have been a number of  
4                   alternatives that have been proposed and studied.  
5                   The draft EIS is very clear on the impact of these  
6                   alternatives. The Dey Road parallel alignment and  
7                   the Plainsboro Cranbury Road alignment may have  
8                   less wetlands impact, but they would have  
9                   substantial impacts on preserved farmlands. And,  
10                  in the case of Dey Road, the parallel alignment  
11                  would cause the removal of over sixty homes.

12                  Ironically, the US EPA  
13                  suggested alignment has a greater wetlands impact  
14                  than the other alternatives and has a substantial  
15                  parkland impact as well, while only partially  
16                  meeting the project purpose. The Dey Road  
17                  widening alternative will have wetlands impacts  
18                  and loss of homes, but most significantly, it  
19                  would continue to use our local roads to carry  
20                  regional traffic. It does not provide an  
21                  efficient connection to the Turnpike. It also  
22                  increases the burden on already stressed local  
23                  roadways.

24                  In conclusion, Plainsboro has  
25                  actively pursued regional solutions to

1 transportation problems. All studies that have  
2 been done to date have endorsed Route 92. It is  
3 now time to build the last piece of our regional  
4 transportation puzzle. The review process for  
5 this project has been exhaustive, but as a result  
6 we have a design that meets the region's  
7 transportation needs, while minimizing  
8 environmental impacts. It's time to act. It's  
9 time to build this road.

10 Plainsboro requests the U.S.  
11 Army Corps of Engineers New York District issue a  
12 permit to allow the construction of Route 92 to  
13 proceed.

14 Thank you.

15 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
16 you, Mr. Sheehan.

17 Before we proceed I'm going to  
18 ask everyone, I realize it's late, you may need to  
19 take breaks independently, please use the door to  
20 the rear right and not the ones closer, because it  
21 is disrupting the speaker. I wouldn't do that to  
22 you, don't do it to the next guy.

23 Please use the back door only.

24 Our next speaker will be Jon  
25 Edwards. He is from the Hopewell Township

1 Committee.

2 MR. EDWARDS: Thank you for  
3 this opportunity to speak. Jon Edwards, 178  
4 Pennington Heart Road, Hopewell Township.

5 One town's interest is not  
6 necessarily the region's interest. It's certainly  
7 not our interest.

8 In terms of smart growth, we've  
9 certainly done our part. Since I've been elected  
10 in 1999 we've eliminated ten million square feet  
11 of industrial office park zoning. Our residential  
12 zoning has moved from two and three acre to six  
13 and thirteen acre zoning. We have, certainly,  
14 been at the forefront of smart growth.

15 I rise in steadfast opposition  
16 to the Route 92 project precisely because it will  
17 be disruptive to the region and certainly to areas  
18 west of Route 1.

19 Permit me to focus on that.

20 We have spent a tremendous  
21 amount of time reducing the amount of truck  
22 traffic on our local roads, notably Route 31.  
23 We're down twenty to forty percent.

24 I note the gentleman from  
25 Plainsboro talking about Dey Road. We have been

1 at the forefront, not simply focusing on our  
2 roads, but all roads. He's right that those  
3 trucks have no business being on those roads. You  
4 should join our effort in making certain that the  
5 ban on trucks is extended to 96-inch wide trucks,  
6 that we give our municipalities the right to  
7 enforce all of this legislation, and that local  
8 deliveries, those garbage trucks that are  
9 delivering New York City garbage, have no business  
10 being on his roads, our roads, or your roads.  
11 They should be on interstates.

12 Those are defined under New  
13 Jersey statutes as local deliveries. They are,  
14 clearly, not local deliveries. They are long haul  
15 trucks. It simply winds up pitying one community  
16 against another when we need to get together and  
17 find solutions that don't involve roads like this.

18 The draft Environmental Impact  
19 Study does not address the potential impact 92  
20 would cause to the communities west of Route 27,  
21 including communities within Hopewell Township.

22 The DEIS statement of purpose  
23 and need excludes viable alternatives to Route 92  
24 for relieving regional traffic.

25 With or without 92, all but two

1 local intersections in the DEIS study area still  
2 fail according to the Army Corps' latest study in  
3 the EIS.

4 Route 92 would potentially  
5 cause a significant degradation of service on our  
6 Route 518. Alternatives to Route 92 are already  
7 built, including 522 and I-95, a free,  
8 multi-access highway that can handle high speed  
9 traffic.

10 Another alternative, bus rapid  
11 transit, is a viable alternative to help address  
12 the serious congestion problems along Route 1  
13 which 92 purports to address.

14 Route 92 would waste scarce New  
15 Jersey public funds for transportation  
16 improvements. These are funds that are very badly  
17 needed to repair existing transportation  
18 infrastructure.

19 The Regional Planning  
20 Partnership has already expressed an interest in  
21 extending Route 92 through property owned by NJ  
22 DOT to Montgomery Township. Such an extension to  
23 Route 92 would greatly worsen all of our problems  
24 in Hopewell Township, which Route 92 in its  
25 present alignment would cause, including traffic,

1       sprawl, pollution, noise, loss of open space, and  
2       loss of quality of life.

3                       Hopewell Township has  
4       consistently opposed this project in resolution  
5       1999 and 2000. We have renewed our opposition  
6       unanimously.

7                       I want to tell you, in Hopewell  
8       Township, getting a unanimous vote is quite a  
9       thing, and we've done it.

10                      And, I offer a copy of that  
11       resolution into the record and I thank you for the  
12       opportunity to speak here.

13                      Thank you.

14                      LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
15       you, Mr. Edwards.

16                      Next up will be Deborah  
17       Johnson, former Mayor of South Brunswick.

18                      MR. JOHNSON: Good evening.

19       Deborah Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N.

20                      Good evening. Again, my name  
21       is Deborah Johnson. I grew up in South Brunswick  
22       and currently reside in South Brunswick Township.  
23       For approximately ten years I have been involved  
24       with the no 92 initiative, and this experience has  
25       been long and challenging.

1                   My understanding is that the  
2                   purpose of this hearing is to solicit comments  
3                   from the public in order to consider and evaluate  
4                   the impacts of proposed Route 92. In order to  
5                   determine a proposed Route 92 is in the overall  
6                   public interest and not just in the interest of  
7                   institutional power brokers, such as Princeton  
8                   University.

9                   It is my understanding that the  
10                  benefits which reasonably may be expected to  
11                  accrue from the construction of proposed Route 92  
12                  must be balanced against its reasonably  
13                  foreseeable detriments.

14                  As articulated, the  
15                  benefits/objectives of proposed Route 92 is to,  
16                  one, establish a road system that acts to reserve  
17                  the local streets for local traffic.

18                  In reality, once Route 92 dumps  
19                  its traffic onto Route 1, the traffic will have no  
20                  place to go but through the local roads of South  
21                  Brunswick, including Kingston and Princeton, Rocky  
22                  Hill, Griggstown, Montgomery and Hopewell. An  
23                  entire chain of unique and special historic  
24                  communities.

25                  In addition, the Turnpike's own

1 studies have shown that proposed Route 92 will  
2 increase traffic southbound on Route 1.

3 The loss of historic villages  
4 and the astronomical cost of construction, some  
5 estimates up to a half billion dollars in current  
6 dollars, and the reality of worsening traffic in  
7 some areas tips the scale heavily against Route  
8 92.

9 Another articulated objective  
10 of Route 92 is to provide a connection to  
11 alternative routes to north/south traffic that  
12 currently use Route 1. A town that hosts Routes  
13 1, 27, 130, and the Township can reasonably  
14 articulate it has its fair share of regional  
15 traffic roadways, yet, South Brunswick has  
16 contributed to the east/west connector 522.

17 South Brunswick has, like other  
18 communities in the region, they have done more  
19 than its fair share to attempt to relieve  
20 congestion and improve mobility and circulation of  
21 the area roadway system. We have even endeavored  
22 to work with the State to widen Route 1 in order  
23 to alleviate congestion. In return for these  
24 efforts we as a community for many years have had  
25 to live with the very real concern that the State

1 will, yet, and still build a roadway, Route 92,  
2 that will clearly destroy the character of our  
3 community and considerably damage our quality of  
4 life in order to create a driveway for large  
5 corporate interests in Plainsboro.

6 The scale here, again, heavily  
7 tips against the construction of Route 92.

8 Finally, the third stated  
9 objective of proposed Route 92 is to reduce the  
10 presence of non-local truck traffic on the local  
11 roadway network.

12 Trucks will not leave free  
13 roads to pay tolls on a Turnpike spur, they will  
14 continue to use the routes they are currently  
15 using, for when they do a cost benefit analysis  
16 they will find that the three seconds they could  
17 possibly save under the best circumstances on  
18 proposed Route 92 is not worth yet another toll.  
19 However, proposed Route 92 will destroy pristine  
20 wetlands, cause toxic wetlands to leach into South  
21 Brunswick aquifers, which will affect the drinking  
22 water of our town, would be built on the smallest  
23 and vulnerable aquifer in the State of New Jersey.

24 These are the very real  
25 concerns that the communities involved have lived

1 with for years. Not to mention those among us who  
2 would lose homes and businesses.

3 The loss of pristine wetlands,  
4 the poisoning of our drinking waters, the economic  
5 burden on taxpayers to build this costly toxin,  
6 for our children, our families, our way of life,  
7 this is what we've been living with for over many  
8 decades.

9 The scale tips sharply against  
10 Route 92.

11 In conclusion, when I was  
12 privileged to serve the Township of South  
13 Brunswick in an elected capacity there were many  
14 challenges to be faced, dangerous fires at such  
15 places as Iron Mountain, financial challenges, the  
16 anthrax scare, and our losses during 9/11. Yet,  
17 the residents of South Brunswick stayed together  
18 and pulled together and moved on. In 1997, when  
19 the EIS came out, we thought long last we could  
20 also move on from the Route 92, as well. But, no  
21 such luck, large cooperate institutions needing to  
22 make even more money continue to press their  
23 cause.

24 So, those living in the  
25 effected areas continue to daily face the ever

1 present threat of the loss of the quality of life  
2 we have worked for to build for ourselves. It is  
3 amazing that we still stand with such strength in  
4 the face of our daily terror, but we will because  
5 we have to. To be destroyed because of the greed  
6 of the few is not an option.

7 I hope today that the Army  
8 Corps of Engineers will listen to us and offer us  
9 the ability to have an inclusive community process  
10 such as the one you placed with the Penns Neck  
11 bypass, which would, among others, include the  
12 community, expert consultants, unions and various  
13 government representatives.

14 Once an inclusive round table  
15 is established, once one is established, I am sure  
16 it will be clear to all that there are better  
17 alternatives than Route 92 and Route 92 should not  
18 be built and the permits not issued.

19 Thank you this evening for your  
20 time.

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you, Ms. Johnson.

23 Our next speaker will be Rob  
24 Wolfe, Princeton Forrestal Center.

25 MR. WOLFE: Bob Wolfe,

1 W-O-L-F-E. I'm the general manager of Princeton  
2 Forrestal Center.

3 We would like to compliment the  
4 Army Corps of Engineers on the draft Environmental  
5 Impact Statement. The document is comprehensive,  
6 professionally impressive, and quite readable. It  
7 thoroughly addresses all the items mandated by the  
8 National Environmental Policy Act and it addresses  
9 directly the important smart growth and state  
10 planning issues that have been so widely bandied  
11 about by supporters and detractors. The report  
12 thoroughly explores the affected environment and  
13 the impacts of Route 92 and all of the  
14 alternative. The study identifies sixteen road  
15 alternatives and various demand strategy, that  
16 cover just about any idea that anyone has ever  
17 tossed out. The draft clearly establishes that  
18 whatever we do or do not do there are  
19 environmental consequences. Even the no action  
20 alternative is negative environmental impacts.

21 I believe it is clear that  
22 Route 92 as proposed has been carefully located  
23 and designed to minimize the inevitable  
24 environmental impacts. Most impressive is the new  
25 traffic study, which has been totally revised and

1 expanded to reflect current traffic data. The  
2 study thoroughly and professionally assesses the  
3 projected growth in population and employment and  
4 the traffic therefrom. It demonstrates  
5 conclusively that Route 92 will substantially  
6 reduce traffic on most existing local roads and it  
7 will do so far better than any of the  
8 alternatives. The average traffic reduction is  
9 eighteen percent. On average, almost one out of  
10 every five cars will shift from the local road  
11 system.

12 The report directly addresses  
13 Route 92 in the context of the state plan and  
14 smart growth. The highway connects two major  
15 developed areas, Exit 8A and the Route 1 corridor.  
16 These areas are designated planning area two in  
17 the state plan in which growth is to be  
18 encouraged.

19 Because the highway must go  
20 through an area that is designated environmentally  
21 sensitive, it was deliberately designed to have no  
22 intersections in that area. The only places one  
23 can get on and off the highway is in already  
24 highly developed areas that are designated  
25 planning area two to encourage growth.

1                   The highway design is  
2 responsive to and consistent with the state plan  
3 and it was designed with smart growth principals  
4 in mind.

5                   Smart growth does not mean no  
6 roads should ever be built any time, anywhere, it  
7 means that when roads are built they should  
8 separate regional from local traffic, discourage  
9 development in environmentally sensitive areas,  
10 and help sustain development where it's planned to  
11 be.

12                   This may be one of the few  
13 advantages in the intolerably long delay in this  
14 project. The delay enabled us to learn from past  
15 mistakes so that Route 92 has been designed smart  
16 in order to avoid the pitfalls of the past.

17                   Finally, the report correctly  
18 points out that Route 92 is to accommodate growth  
19 which has already occurred, or is already in the  
20 process of occurring.

21                   When Princeton Forrestal Center  
22 was being planned and approved in 1975, we pointed  
23 out that Route 92 was needed to handle then  
24 existing traffic, as well as the projected growth.  
25 Everyone expected Route 92 to be built in the near

1 future back in 1975. The need has intensified in  
2 the almost three decades that have passed. It's  
3 been almost eight years since the New Jersey  
4 Turnpike Authority applied for a wetlands permit  
5 for Route 92. It's been almost six years since  
6 the jurisdiction was transferred to the Army Corps  
7 of Engineers. In that time the projected impacts  
8 on wetlands has been substantially reduced. The  
9 NEPA process deserves the credit for this. But,  
10 it has taken an incredibly long time. Traffic  
11 continues to worsen on roads that were never  
12 intended to handle these levels. The planning was  
13 predicated on the construction of Route 92 and it  
14 is needed more than ever.

15 The draft thoroughly documents  
16 the environmental and traffic impacts.

17 We hope you will make a rapid  
18 decision to permit the road. The region deserves  
19 the decision and it needs Route 92.

20 Thank you.

21 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
22 you, Mr. Wolfe.

23 Our next speaker will be Karen  
24 Linder, Princeton Greenways Association.

25 MS. LINDER: My name is Karen

1 Linder, L-I-N-D-E-R. I'm a trustee for the  
2 Kingston Greenways Association. Our primary  
3 mission is to preserve and protect the green belt  
4 around the Village of Kingston.

5 Kingston is rich in preserved  
6 lands, including the Cook natural area and the  
7 most heavily traversed segment of the D&R Canal, a  
8 new two hundred acre tract parkland in what used  
9 to be the Princeton nurseries is about to be  
10 projected as a result of a complicated negotiation  
11 between its owners, Princeton University, and the  
12 Flumer family, and South Brunswick Township and  
13 Green Acres.

14 This new preserve, which will  
15 link the Cook preserve and the canal, will be  
16 bordered by Ridge Road and bisected by Mapleton  
17 Road. The two closest east/west roads, the  
18 proposed Route 92 terminus in Kingston.

19 Further to the west lies the  
20 Trap Rock Quarry, which is bordered by Route 603  
21 in Kingston, said road being the continuation of  
22 Laurel Avenue into Rocky Hill.

23 When Trap Rock Quarry is  
24 eventually depleted its mine recovery plant calls  
25 for conversion of the quarry into a reservoir.

1 Its remaining land is in Somerset County's Master  
2 Plan as a proposed new state park.

3 I only want to mention these  
4 properties because westbound traffic that is fed  
5 onto Ridge Road by Route 92 will ultimately be  
6 followed right through the middle of our green  
7 belt. Traffic noise from the vehicular traffic  
8 will detract from the serenity of these  
9 properties, polluting runoff will have a negative  
10 impact on Heathcote Brook water quality, and,  
11 hence, our treating water and light pollution from  
12 the plant.

13 Yet, I see no mention or  
14 recognition of the negative impact that Route 92  
15 will have on Kingston's parklands and preserves.  
16 Why wasn't this considered? I think this is an  
17 important oversight in the draft EIS, especially  
18 since you, yourself, chose to eliminate from  
19 further consideration many alternatives to Route  
20 92 that you felt had significant impacts to  
21 parklands and preserves.

22 Number two, the U.S. Fish &  
23 Wildlife Service maintains lists of so-called  
24 species of concern, and I see mention of Cooper's  
25 hawk and Savannah sparrow, both state listed

1 threatened in the DIS.

2 The Kingston Greenways  
3 Association has a lot of birds in our ranks and we  
4 just wanted you to know that we have reported  
5 sightings of four species of concern, namely,  
6 Savannah sparrow, Osprey, and Cooper's hawk. In  
7 addition, you probably heard about the bald eagle.  
8 There's confirmed to be nesting within a few miles  
9 of terminus of this road.

10 Could you comment on the  
11 proposed negative effect proposed Route 92 is  
12 going to have on these endangered species in  
13 Kingston, outside of your study area?

14 Lastly, Section 4.9, Page 258  
15 of the first volume, I did read it, states that  
16 New Jersey Transportation Authority plans to  
17 enhance the stormwater management designs for  
18 Route 92 to ensure compliance with New Jersey  
19 DEP's reasonably adapted stormwater management  
20 regulations, however, it doesn't appear that any  
21 of these revised approaches are described in the  
22 draft EIS. When will these be available for  
23 review and comment? And, how can we properly  
24 assess the environmental impact of the project if  
25 we don't know which you're really going to do?

1                   Our final comment, Kingston  
2                   Greenway Association is in favor of and supports  
3                   the State's new stormwater regulations, but could  
4                   you please comment on the affect of compliance  
5                   with the stormwater regulations and what affect  
6                   it's going to have on the overall cost of the  
7                   project? I'm assuming that such compliance might  
8                   have the potential to add several million dollars  
9                   to the cost of proposed Route 92.

10                   Thank you.

11                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
12                   you, Ms. Linder.

13                   We will now hear from Richard  
14                   Poller, South Brunswick Environmental Commission.

15                   All right, we'll next hear  
16                   from --

17                   MS. ZEMAN: I'm not Richard,  
18                   but I'm speaking in his place.

19                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: I also  
20                   see you're on the list to speak later. Will this  
21                   list satisfy both requirements?

22                   MS. ZEMAN: Yes.

23                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Okay.  
24                   Please continue.

25                   MS. ZEMAN: My name is Ann

1 Zeman, Z-E-M-A-N. I'm speaking on behalf of the  
2 environmental commission of the South Brunswick  
3 Township.

4 We urge the Army Corps of  
5 Engineers to refuse to issue a permit to discharge  
6 fill material into the wetlands for the  
7 construction of Route 92. The environmental  
8 commission, whose mission it is to monitor all  
9 matters related to the environmental quality of  
10 the Township, feels that the draft Environmental  
11 Impact Study minimizes the disastrous effects that  
12 the proposed Route 92 would have on the region's  
13 environment.

14 Route 92 would bisect through  
15 one of Middlesex County's largest and most fragile  
16 pieces of remaining open land. Almost fourteen  
17 acres of wetlands, and nearly three hundred acres  
18 of farmland would be destroyed.

19 Route 92 would also cut through  
20 a nature preserve, endangered species habitat and  
21 preserved open space.

22 It would also pollute an  
23 aquifer recharge area with roadway contaminants,  
24 especially salt and others.

25 Route 92 bisects an area around

1 Devil's Brook, designated in the New Jersey State  
2 Development and Redevelopment Plan as PA-5, the  
3 status New Jersey applies to its most  
4 environmentally sensitive areas. A PA-5 category  
5 is meant to have the greatest degree of protection  
6 from development.

7 The sixteen hundred acre site  
8 is the second largest PA-5 area in Middlesex  
9 County and comprises one-third of all the PA-5  
10 land in the County. Why would the New Jersey  
11 Transit Authority and the State of New Jersey want  
12 to compromise this land when the State plan  
13 clearly directs, and I quote, "infrastructure  
14 investment decisions should encourage growth in  
15 areas that are already developed or are currently  
16 developing and should discourage development,  
17 sprawl into undeveloped areas."

18 On the destruction of nearly  
19 fifteen acres of wetlands discussed in the DEIS,  
20 this contains very little information on the  
21 proposed mitigation to create wetlands, with no  
22 evaluation that this mitigation would succeed.

23 There are numerous studies  
24 showing how difficult wetlands creation is, that  
25 created wetlands lack ecological diversity,

1 habitat value of natural wetlands.

2 Bradley Campbell, the  
3 Commissioner for the State Department of  
4 Environmental Protection, said himself that  
5 wetlands mitigation is "always a last resort" and  
6 has been a dismal failure in the past.

7 Why was this mitigation not  
8 evaluated and is this included in the estimated  
9 cost of four hundred million?

10 Section 3.10 of the DEIS,  
11 "Known Contaminated Sites," contains a listing at  
12 24 Friendship Road, classified as a level C-1,  
13 which means that it has the potential for  
14 groundwater contamination. The EIS states that no  
15 information was available from the SRP southern  
16 field office regarding this, which we feel is  
17 really unacceptable. How will this plume be  
18 addressed, and how will this contamination impact  
19 the groundwater?

20 The DEIS also states that the  
21 proposed Route 92 is expected to meet EPA  
22 regulations of air quality emissions, however, the  
23 environmental commission questions why the EIS  
24 designated the area suburban, which meets the EPA  
25 regulations, since 3.9 miles of the 6.7 total

1 mileage, or fifty-eight percent, is zoned rural  
2 residential and it is all farmland. Why wasn't  
3 this evaluated as rural for these emissions? Use  
4 of the more accurate rural would show that  
5 emissions for air quality would not meet the EPA  
6 emissions.

7 A major concern in South  
8 Brunswick is the recent increase in impervious  
9 coverage over the whole entire township. The  
10 proposed Route 92 would add at least a hundred and  
11 three acres of impervious surface, a large enough  
12 area to be of significant concern.

13 It should be noted that the  
14 alternative examined by the EIS, widening of Route  
15 1, would result in a much lower increase of  
16 impervious surface. Construction of the road  
17 would represent a real setback in the efforts to  
18 limit impervious surface in the South Brunswick  
19 area, and the effect it would have would negate  
20 the effect of previous acquisition of about a  
21 hundred forty acres of open space in this area.

22 The more recent state  
23 stormwater regulations now mandate special  
24 stormwater recharge requirements under new  
25 construction, which help eliminate some of the

1 more serious effects of runoff. Yet, EIS is  
2 completely inadequate and does not explain how new  
3 stormwater regulations will be met. And, we'd  
4 like, also, a full explanation of how the  
5 regulations will be compiled with.

6                   Given the increases in  
7 population, water demand will also increase, and  
8 the likelihood of additional water supply will  
9 come from the aquifer in this area. Was the New  
10 Jersey DEP watershed management and water  
11 allocation consulted for this? I see no  
12 indication of that.

13                   A further negative impact on  
14 the proposed Route 92 would be the chemical  
15 pollution caused by salt runoff. Again, this  
16 would be much greater than the consequence of  
17 Route 1 widening.

18                   We are greatly concerned about  
19 salt intrusion into the aquifer and potable wells  
20 into the Route 92 corridor. In 1999 the New  
21 Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
22 notified the Monroe Township Municipal Utility  
23 Authority that salt water intrusion was indicated  
24 in the region for monitoring wells. Monroe  
25 Township MUA responded that this chloride was, and

1 I quote, "due to the road salting practices of the  
2 New Jersey Turnpike Authority and the County Road  
3 Department."

4 This is in a letter dated June  
5 1, 1999 from the executive director to the DEP,  
6 and I encourage you to get a copy.

7 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Ma'am,  
8 I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it up.

9 MS. ZEMAN: We'd ask you to  
10 address this. We are very concerned. This was  
11 not addressed in the DEIS.

12 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: You can  
13 always provide a written comment. Please wrap it  
14 up.

15 MS. ZEMAN: We urge you to  
16 address the salt issue. We also urge you to not  
17 give a permit for the wetlands of the fill. And,  
18 I'll write the other stuff.

19 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
20 you.

21 We will next here from Dr.  
22 Robert K. Tucker, Dayton Village Citizens'  
23 Coalition.

24 MR. TUCKER: I'm Robert Tucker,  
25 T-U-C-K-E-R. I'm here representing the Dayton

1 Village Citizens' Coalition, a nonprofit citizens  
2 organization formed for promoting quality of life,  
3 historical preservation and environmental  
4 protection.

5 The coalition is opposed to  
6 construction of Route 92 because of its  
7 destruction of wetlands and crucial wildlife and  
8 endangered plant habitat it would cause, its  
9 potential for contamination of our water resources  
10 and the disruption of the quality of life in our  
11 community.

12 My qualifications include a  
13 Ph.D. in zoology from Duke University with a  
14 specialty in aquatic ecology. I served eighteen  
15 years in the New Jersey Department of  
16 Environmental Protection, ten years of which as  
17 their chief scientist. While at NJ DEP in the  
18 late '70s, early '80s, I supervised the first  
19 statewide study of toxic substances and  
20 groundwater and drinking water in the State. For  
21 the last four years I've been principal  
22 investigator in a US EPA national science  
23 foundation grant to study wetlands function. I'm  
24 currently serving as a governor's appointee to the  
25 New Jersey Wetlands Mitigation Council.

1                   The coalition objects to the  
2                   destruction of wetlands and the further  
3                   degradation of the surrounding wetlands, the  
4                   surface waters and groundwater, by contaminated  
5                   runoff and by the destruction of valuable habitat.  
6                   We actually see that the destruction of wetlands  
7                   is greater than what is listed in the EIS.

8                   First of all, because when  
9                   jurisdiction for the permit was handed back from  
10                  EPA to the Corps, the delineation reverted to the  
11                  1987 manual.

12                  In '88, '89 representatives  
13                  from the Corps, US EPA, the Natural Resources  
14                  Conservation Service, and the Fish & Wildlife  
15                  Service got together and came up with a much more  
16                  scientifically dependable way to delineate  
17                  wetlands. And, they thought this had been agreed  
18                  to, but in '91, because of developers impacting  
19                  congress, going back and lobbying congress and  
20                  threatening the Corps' appropriations, the Corps  
21                  evidently gave in and went back to their 1987  
22                  delineation manual.

23                  So, we certainly object to  
24                  using this non-scientific and unacceptable  
25                  delineation. It means that at least two acres

1 that should be listed and impacted are not so  
2 listed.

3 But, even more important is the  
4 fact that this road will impact, by the runoff  
5 from the road, and the aerial transport of  
6 contaminants, a greater area of wetlands, and by  
7 cutting up the area, fractionating the area, the  
8 habitat, it will cause destruction over a wider  
9 area.

10 New Jersey has already lost  
11 probably greater than forty percent of its  
12 wetlands up to 1985, and is still losing wetlands  
13 that aren't being replaced or mitigated, as Ann  
14 Zeman pointed out. A lot of the mitigation  
15 doesn't work. From my experience, and from  
16 studies that have been done in New Jersey, more  
17 than fifty percent of the mitigation projects  
18 fail. And, even when they are, apparently,  
19 successful, most zoologists see that they don't  
20 really come up to the ecological conditions of  
21 natural wetlands. They don't have the vitality,  
22 the diversity of natural wetlands.

23 In the EIS we notice that there  
24 are acknowledgements of endangered species in the  
25 area, although the Department of Transportation

1 has received an LOI from NJ DEP saying that there  
2 are no endangered animals right in the area, but  
3 we know that they are around there. And, it's  
4 very, very difficult to find rare endangered  
5 animals. In fact, because they're rare it makes  
6 it particularly harder to find them.

7 I have written comments, so  
8 I'll try to summarize quickly.

9 The other point is that the  
10 water quality, even though the stormwater  
11 regulations might be followed, there are bridges  
12 over the area, and we just have to look at the  
13 situation that I've observed over Rocky Brook,  
14 just south of Route 33 and east of Hightstown,  
15 where a bridge over the Turnpike -- I mean a  
16 bridge on the Turnpike over Rocky Brook, clearly,  
17 puts all kind of contaminants in the brook. And,  
18 you can see the effects on the biota and on the  
19 water quality.

20 So, for these reasons we very  
21 much object to Route 92 and ask that the permit  
22 not be allowed.

23 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
24 you, Dr. Tucker.

25 Folks, we're going to take a

1 five-minute break, but before you stand up I'm  
2 just going to review the bidding here. We have  
3 forty-nine more good people who have spent a lot  
4 of time and have patiently sat and listened to  
5 those who have spoken so far. It's all the more  
6 important that you absolutely keep your verbal  
7 comments to five minutes out of respect for  
8 everyone else. We can take written record. You  
9 can also make a tape recording separate from this.  
10 But, please summarize your points so that you can  
11 all get a shot. Forty-nine people, do the math,  
12 that's over four hours straight at five minutes a  
13 piece if we don't allocate time just to walk up to  
14 the microphone and then be recognized as you sit  
15 down.

16 This is going to be a long  
17 evening.

18 We're going to take a  
19 five-minute break. I want Laura Lynch ready to  
20 go. I will start this in five minutes. The rest  
21 of you just can quietly come in through the back  
22 door.

23 (Whereupon, a short recess is  
24 taken.)

25 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: I ask you

1 to please take your seats. We'll hear from Laura  
2 Lynch.

3 I ask you to please take your  
4 seats and save the comments for the break.

5 Laura, before you start, I just  
6 want to let you all know, what I'm going to do is  
7 call two names for now on, the speaker who will  
8 come up next and then I'll put first on deck.  
9 That might save us a minute or two, times  
10 forty-nine is almost an hour.

11 I don't mean to confuse  
12 anybody, but I'll call the next speaker and then  
13 first on deck so you can mentally prepare  
14 ourselves.

15 MS. LYNCH: Laura Lynch,  
16 L-A-U-R-A, L-Y-N-C-H. I'm speaking here tonight  
17 representing the New Jersey Chapter of the Sierra  
18 Club, with over twenty thousand members. I was  
19 also a participant in the Penns Neck area EIS  
20 partners round table, which ended just a few  
21 months ago.

22 The Sierra Club will be  
23 delivering to the Army Corps a page-by-page  
24 filleting of the DEIS, but tonight I'm just going  
25 to read a few minutes of comments.

1                   There was a lot of wishful  
2                   thinking in this DEIS. There was a lot of proof  
3                   by blatant discertification that wetland  
4                   mitigation works, that car and truck drivers will  
5                   pay tolls when a free alternative exists, that  
6                   enactment and enforcement of truck restrictions on  
7                   Heathcote and Ridge Roads will have it, that a  
8                   sixteen to twenty-five percent reduction in  
9                   through traffic will be noticeable, that there has  
10                  been a consensus among communities that Route 92  
11                  was the best alternative.

12                                 Where is the proof for any of  
13                   these assumptions?

14                                 The best available evidence,  
15                   some provided by the New Jersey Department of  
16                   Environmental Protection around the New Jersey  
17                   Turnpike Authority, leaves little doubt that much  
18                   of what is written in the DEIS is wrong.

19                                 Wetlands mitigation does not  
20                   work. The DEP says as much. Trucks crowd Route 1  
21                   and its vicinity because they are avoiding New  
22                   Jersey Turnpike tolls. Adding another toll road  
23                   will not solve this problem. There is no proof in  
24                   the DEIS that drivers will choose a toll road over  
25                   several free alternatives.

1                   The Heathcote and Ridgewood  
2 communities will have to show the burden of a  
3 potential truck ban enforcement without any  
4 financial aid from the New Jersey Turnpike.

5                   What is lacking from the DEIS  
6 is any proof of community involvement, any sense  
7 of discussions, suggestions or compromises. The  
8 goals in this DEIS seem to have been tailored to  
9 fit Route 92 as if the road had been planned long  
10 before the goals were written.

11                   The real problem is ramped over  
12 development of Route 1, coupled with the lack of  
13 mass transit. Because there are a few east/west  
14 roads in the area traffic congestion is  
15 exacerbated, because Route 522 is under used, and  
16 the recently designed Penns Neck area improvements  
17 to Route 1 will aid in smoother throw to traffic.

18                   Route 92, on the other handle,  
19 by the Army Corps' own admission, hastens  
20 development along Route 1.

21                   The Sierra Club favors the DEIS  
22 option of Route 1 widening with signal removal.  
23 It leaves the Plainsboro Reserve intact. It is  
24 almost as successful at congestion relief as Route  
25 92 is, although no options truly solve the

1 problem.

2 Funds for Route 92 could be  
3 diverted toward road repairs and public transit,  
4 both of which are sorely needed. Route 1 signal  
5 removal continues the project that the DOT started  
6 along Route 1 from I-95 to West Windsor, but what  
7 is the most important issue at hand, and what has  
8 been left out of the DEIS, is community  
9 involvement. The public participation section of  
10 the DEIS, a document of one thousand three hundred  
11 thirteen pages, is just half a page. Public  
12 outcry that has lasted over fifty years certainly  
13 needs more.

14 The only workable solution to  
15 this problem is to listen to what those affected  
16 by Route 92 have to say and to work towards a  
17 compromise. Conflict mediation succeeded in West  
18 Windsor, and it can succeed here too.

19 Thank you.

20 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: All  
21 right. Thank you, Ms. Lynch.

22 Next up will be Jan Ten Broek,  
23 followed by Diane Brake on deck, please.

24 MS. TEN BROEK: Jan TenBroek of  
25 Millstone Valley Preservation Coalition. I'll

1 keep it very short.

2 I thank the Army Corps of  
3 Engineers for keeping the overall public interest  
4 in mind, and you're sworn to do so. The problem  
5 here is that the financial community, the  
6 financial interest in the particular project, seem  
7 to override the public interest of the fragile  
8 surrounding communities, such as Kingston,  
9 Griggstown. And, there are many other areas which  
10 are going to be very negatively impacted by this  
11 development, and we hope that the Army Corps of  
12 Engineers will consider the overall public  
13 interest and deny this application.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. BRAKE: Diane Brake,  
16 B-R-A-K-E. I'm the president of the Regional  
17 Planning Partnership, which is a nonprofit  
18 organization formed in 1968 to advocate smart  
19 growth and regional cooperation.

20 I will submit written comments  
21 that are more extensive, but I wanted to speak  
22 tonight because I wanted to put on the record that  
23 an organization like my own, that looks at the  
24 region more broadly, and has looked at this for a  
25 long time, has come to the conclusion that Route

1 92 should be built. And, I come here not being  
2 from an organization that normally supports the  
3 construction of highways. In fact, we opposed the  
4 construction of 95 through the Sourland Mountains,  
5 particularly because it was an environmentally  
6 sensitive area, with no other infrastructure, very  
7 little development, and would open up a new area  
8 for suburban development.

9 At the time, and this was in  
10 the late '70s, we proposed that the 95 corridor  
11 would more appropriately be the Turnpike and that  
12 the money that was going to be spent on the 95  
13 through Sourland Mountains should be spent instead  
14 on improving the connection between the Turnpike  
15 and Route 1, another important regional connector,  
16 where growth should be developed, where there was  
17 already infrastructure, there was already  
18 development, there were many county roads.

19 So, we are a multi-goal  
20 organization, looking at economic growth,  
21 environmental protection, and social justice.  
22 And, in that context we have to look at the big  
23 picture. How do we support all of these things,  
24 environmental protection and development? We do  
25 it by choosing a location. And, it always has to

1 be located somewhere because the growth that we  
2 have heard about from the projections in the study  
3 are from land use development, from the towns,  
4 many of which public officials were here tonight.  
5 We know, for example, we have been following the  
6 development in the Route 1 corridor for the last  
7 thirty-five years, we have looked at the current  
8 development on the books in South Brunswick  
9 Township, where they have tens of millions of  
10 square feet already approved, and tens of millions  
11 more square feet on the books to be developed in  
12 the area of 8A. And, that's not even to mention  
13 tens of thousands of housing units that could be  
14 developed in that area as well.

15 We have recommended that  
16 infrastructure be limited in access so that it  
17 does not create sprawl, that the interchanges on  
18 92 are restricted to growth areas.

19 We've been very disappointed  
20 that the center development that we've advocated  
21 for thirty-five years has not been embraced by  
22 local governments in order to make sure that we  
23 can have a viable transit alternative. We support  
24 those who oppose roads because they often increase  
25 auto dependency, but we ask you to look at roads

1 that also can serve to make a better network to  
2 connect road based transit.

3 We have supported the Central  
4 Jersey Transportation Forum, where twenty towns  
5 have been getting together looking at land use and  
6 transportation, and we were particularly struck by  
7 the first page of the EIS, where you wrote that it  
8 is important to have the land use integrated with  
9 the infrastructure development. And, we certainly  
10 hope that the agencies responsible for the  
11 construction of this road will do everything in  
12 their power to ensure that the development that  
13 happens is centered, less auto dependent, and with  
14 a regional view about where development should be  
15 and where conservation should be. We recognize  
16 that wherever development happens, there are  
17 environmental impacts. What is a question here is  
18 a matter of choice of where this should be, and we  
19 feel that having looked at this for the last  
20 thirty-five years, that this is the right  
21 location, that this is careful planning, that the  
22 NEPA process has worked, even with a different  
23 definition of wetlands the design of this road has  
24 changed significantly to reduce the impacts on  
25 wetlands. We are glad for the delay because the

1 new stormwater rules will even improve the water  
2 quality even more, but we do hope now that those  
3 stormwater rules are in place. The Turnpike has  
4 committed to meeting those stormwater obligations.  
5 The Corps issued the permit.

6 Thank you, very much. We'll be  
7 submitting more comments written.

8 Thank you.

9 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
10 you, Ms. Brake.

11 Mr. Joe Peters, will be  
12 followed by Doug O'Malley, N.J. PIRG.

13 MR. PETERS: Thank you.

14 P-E-T-E-R-S.

15 What I want to do is just go  
16 through this real quick.

17 We're here, really, to discuss  
18 the merits of a roadway that has a long and  
19 checkered past, one that was considered at one  
20 point the gateway to the shore, as a free ride  
21 from Central Jersey to the shore, but is now a  
22 lonely 6.7 toll road that will never pay for  
23 itself, while destroying over thirteen acres of  
24 natural wetlands, and can never be replaced, and  
25 ravishing the pristine farmlands of Southern

1 Middlesex County in the process. The loss of the  
2 natural wetlands is probably the most devastating,  
3 since I happen to live next door.

4 To prove that wetlands can  
5 never be artificially created, three years ago New  
6 Jersey DOT tried to create them, and now we have  
7 fifty mosquito infested acres of mud that used to  
8 be fertile farmland, with very little active life  
9 in it. They would have been better off digging a  
10 pit, filling it with water and stocking fish in it  
11 so outdoor enthusiasts can enjoy it. Unlike the  
12 Plainsboro Preserve across the street.

13 There are questions that need  
14 to be asked about this road. As my old college  
15 professor once said, engineers can build anything,  
16 but balancing the needs of the project with the  
17 needs of the community is the challenge.

18 This is what we have here, a  
19 road that could be built, but does it really fit  
20 the surroundings of and help the community? Even  
21 if it does, was it really worth it?

22 Looking at the EIS, there's  
23 also one other piece that needs to be looked at  
24 even more. Why was the scope, need and the  
25 purpose of the project written the way it was? It

1 was written so narrowly that the only possible  
2 solution to it was Route 92.

3 I think what we need to do is  
4 look at the reasoning behind the scope and  
5 purpose, and we must investigate more deeply the  
6 people who wrote it and what were their  
7 intentions.

8 In reviewing the traffic  
9 section of the EIS I noticed some information.

10 Looking at Appendix C, which  
11 was the truck traffic and car traffic, I want to  
12 know what the definition of regional traffic is.  
13 Is it really traffic that's leaving the Turnpike  
14 heading to South Jersey and Pennsylvania and  
15 points west, or is it just commuter traffic?

16 And, in reply to Plainsboro Township, I  
17 have a couple of questions. How can you state  
18 that the Plainsboro Township Master Plan is good  
19 planning if your commercial buildings were  
20 approved without the needed infrastructure to  
21 support it? Was your master plan developed with  
22 92, a road that you have no control over, being  
23 constructed included in it? And, if not, how  
24 could you not think that Dey and Plainsboro Roads  
25 would not have increased traffic as they have

1 today?

2 Now, I notice that we had  
3 people from labor here. I just wanted to mention  
4 to them that we, who are against Route 92, are not  
5 against labor. What we want to do is support  
6 labor in the building of the alternatives to Route  
7 92. We believe that the amount of moneys  
8 available for the alternatives would be equal to  
9 or greater than any cost of construction of Route  
10 92. And, if they would think about it, they would  
11 come and support us.

12 I believe also that the  
13 proponents of Route 92 have sold labor a  
14 damaged bill of goods. They're afraid that we  
15 will prevail in defeating this project, and they  
16 have made us out to be against labor.

17 Also, nowhere in the EIS have I  
18 discovered is there any cost benefit analysis of  
19 the building of Route 92 versus the building of  
20 the alternatives. Not just the single  
21 alternative, but all of the alternatives. I  
22 believe that is missing and should be received.

23 Now, the building of the  
24 alternatives to Route 92 are in themselves not an  
25 answer to the traffic problems that face the area.

1 Combining them is something that needs to be  
2 addressed and taken into the mix before any  
3 decision can be made to see if this road should be  
4 built. This should include the widening of Route  
5 1 with and without traffic signals, the extension  
6 of 522 to Route 535, the improvement of Route 535  
7 at the intersection of the Turnpike underpass,  
8 redesign of both Exit 8A and the Route 32 and  
9 Route 130 intersections, the widening of both Dey  
10 and Plainsboro Roads in areas with a possible  
11 Cranbury bypass for Plainsboro Road, and the  
12 modifications of Scutter Mills and Dey Roads  
13 intersection and the increase of Dey Road.

14 Finally, what is not apparent  
15 but a very plausible solution is the extension of  
16 the truck/car lanes further south on the Turnpike  
17 from Exit 8A to 7A intersecting with I-195 in  
18 Hamilton. This needed improvement would not only  
19 decrease the amount of regional traffic on local  
20 roads, but also decrease the capacity of the  
21 Turnpike itself. For anyone who lives near Route  
22 130, it is commonly known as the Cranbury squeeze,  
23 and is the bigger hindrance of traffic staying on  
24 the Turnpike besides its toll. The extension of  
25 this traffic would allow smoother traffic. Also,

1 it would also achieve one direction of Route 92 --

2 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: All  
3 right, Mr. Peters.

4 MR. PETERS: -- to reduce the  
5 presence of non-local truck traffic on the local  
6 roadway network and shift the traffic to a  
7 commuter highway, besides increasing the traffic  
8 of the Turnpike to its logical exit of 7A, which  
9 is the gateway to the shore.

10 If the Turnpike doesn't look at  
11 these viable options, they're doing the citizens  
12 of New Jersey, as well as the citizens of  
13 Middlesex County and Mercer County, an injustice.

14 I appeal to you that Route 92  
15 not be built and the alternatives be examined in  
16 more detail.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. O'MALLEY: Douglas  
19 O'Malley, O-M-A-L-L-E-Y. I'm representing New  
20 Jersey PIRG, Public Interest Research Group. We  
21 have over twenty thousand members across the  
22 State.

23 I'll be referring to comments  
24 we'll be submitting jointly with the New Jersey  
25 Sierra Club. These comments were prepared by Ed

1 Lloyd, an environmental law professor at Columbia  
2 Law School, as well as Jim Tripp, a general  
3 counsel for environmental defense.

4 First off, I want to start by  
5 saying that, really, the two ghosts looking over  
6 tonight's hearings are of Jane Jacobs and Mr.  
7 Robert Moses. And, there's two competing values  
8 that are represented by those ghosts, one is roads  
9 over people, and the second is an honest and  
10 thorough questioning of planners who don't  
11 necessarily always take into account the concerns  
12 of the people.

13 Quite simply, there are many  
14 concerns with this road. Number one, the idea of  
15 this will help to ameliorate traffic concerns on  
16 Route 1, and after the construction of 92 failing  
17 grades will still be present at Route 1 and  
18 Cozzens Lane, Route 1 and Major Road, Route 1 and  
19 the New Road, Scutters Mill Road, Scutters Mill  
20 Road, Dey Road, Scutters Mill Road and Crossing  
21 Road, Route 130, Dey Road at Route 535, Route 130  
22 at Friendship Road, Route 532 at Kingston Road,  
23 Route 1 at Route 532, as well as a ranking of E at  
24 Route 27 and Raymond Road, which is significant  
25 because that is currently ranked as a B.

1                   That, obviously, leads us to  
2                   the conclusion that this will not help those  
3                   failing grades at those intersections.

4                   We also need to consider the  
5                   cost of this road.

6                   We currently in the State of  
7                   New Jersey are bonding our way out of our  
8                   transportation woes. We are borrowing money, as  
9                   it stands, to fix the roads that we have. That is  
10                  unsustainable.

11                  Obviously, the State needs to  
12                  address this issue, but one way not to help it  
13                  certainly would be to spend upwards of five  
14                  hundred million dollars on this road.

15                  The third general point I want  
16                  to make is kind of, really, an important one, and  
17                  that's the concept of induced growth. It is not  
18                  adequately represented in the EIS.

19                  Now I'd like to refer to some  
20                  technical points in the EIS that should be  
21                  addressed. Seven points.

22                  The first is, nowhere to be  
23                  found is peak periods and peak hours analyzed.  
24                  The second point is that the statement contains no  
25                  information about the trips or traffic volume that

1 will be added to Route 1 by Route 92 construction  
2 south of Ridge Road in either the a.m. or p.m.  
3 peak hour or period. Point number three, similar  
4 to the request in item two, we are requesting that  
5 the Army Corps clarify the traffic volume on Route  
6 1 south, Ridge Road, beyond the red or other  
7 colored lines presented in Figures 4.1 through  
8 Figures 4.6. Point four, the statement does not  
9 contain trunk line volume numbers or level of  
10 service on the Turnpike at present or in 2028,  
11 northbound and southbound, for a.m. peak hours or  
12 periods segregated by trucks and autos, nor the  
13 existing number of autos and trucks exiting and  
14 entering at Interchange 8, or 7 or 7A or 8A or 9  
15 during both a.m. or peak hour periods. Point  
16 five, most of the information presented in the  
17 current statement is presented in terms of peak  
18 period and peak volume, not annual or daily  
19 average traffic. Point six, ACS 2000, signalized  
20 intersection tables for volume, of Part C of the  
21 appendix do not seem to match the graphic maps  
22 later in Part C. Which volume or numbers is the  
23 reader supposed to comment and rely on? These are  
24 relatively technical matters. The last one,  
25 perhaps in my mind the most important, that is the

1 vehicle miles traveled compared with the no action  
2 course or a course of building Route 92.

3 The vehicle miles of travel  
4 projections do not appear in the induced  
5 development or the transportation section in  
6 Chapter 4, but only in the air quality sections,  
7 and then without explanation. Moreover, these  
8 figures when they do appear present a scenario  
9 that really is unsustainable, a concept that under  
10 a no action scenario in 2028 there would be more  
11 traffic than with Route 92.

12 The additional comments to this  
13 will be found in the written statements. Thank  
14 you.

15 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Next up  
16 will be Mr. Damien Newton, Tri-State  
17 Transportation Campaign, followed by Robert von  
18 Zumbusch, Delaware and Raritan Canal Coalition.

19 Mr. Newton, please.

20 All right, then, Mr. von  
21 Zumbusch.

22 Thank you.

23 Mr. von Zumbusch will be  
24 followed by Corrington Wong, Kingston Historical  
25 Society.

1                                   MR. von ZUMBUSCH: Robert von  
2                                   Zumbusch. I'm a trustee of the Delaware & Raritan  
3                                   Canal Coalition. We have over twenty associated  
4                                   organizations. Some of those organizations have  
5                                   taken a stand on Route 92. We are still in the  
6                                   process of reviewing and still continuing to  
7                                   review the DEIS, however, we have come to some  
8                                   conclusions already, and I think it's fair to say  
9                                   that we will certainly not support the present  
10                                  alignment of Route 92.

11                                  One of the things that has been  
12                                  said is that Route 92 would connect two centers of  
13                                  activity, Exit 8A and Route 1. Route 1 is not a  
14                                  center, it's a corridor. And, that makes all the  
15                                  difference in the world. Because, the definition  
16                                  of the purpose of this is looking for a higher  
17                                  aerial route connecting the two. What is really  
18                                  not necessary is not such a system, but a network.

19                                  I think there's no question  
20                                  Plainsboro has gone through great efforts to  
21                                  provide smart growth in Plainsboro for Plainsboro,  
22                                  but not for the region. And, I think this is  
23                                  really very important.

24                                  To think that designing all the  
25                                  developments at Darn Road and other roads were not

1       designed so as to handle this traffic, and after  
2       all, only sixteen percent was considered regional  
3       traffic, the rest of it is local traffic, and it's  
4       already over burdened. I think there's a fault  
5       there. And, to expect that another town -- and no  
6       town here is perfect in its planning. I think  
7       that other towns also have this.

8                               I think what we do have,  
9       though, is a certain disagreement, and there has  
10      not been equal and fair input and the opportunity  
11      to look at all alternatives.

12                              Many of the alternatives that  
13      were summarily dismissed in the Corps' report  
14      really were stacked in such a way, why does 522  
15      have to be six lanes? That immediately puts all  
16      sorts of environmental impacts on it, on that  
17      alternative, which really doesn't have to be. It  
18      can be two lanes and just extend it instead of  
19      widened an extended.

20                              That's just an example. But,  
21      it seems to me that what we have is Route 130,  
22      Route 1, which can act as distribution roads,  
23      essentially, to a certain extent, and then we  
24      should have multiple roads connecting them. And,  
25      they will handle both local and regional traffic.

1 I don't think we need a single.

2 The other thing about the  
3 single road is it enters Route 1 at its narrowest  
4 point, where traffic is already a problem.

5 I think there is universal --  
6 not universal, but there is, generally, very broad  
7 consensus that Route 1 needs to be widened,  
8 whether or not Route 92 is built. And, I think it  
9 needs to be addressed before Route 92 is built.

10 What we observe is that the  
11 widening of Route 1 be put on a fast track  
12 immediately. We're not suggesting at this point  
13 that -- I'm not going to say 92 absolutely could  
14 not be built or what-have-you, but what we do need  
15 to do is that we do need to go through a process  
16 of what is known as conflict mitigation or round  
17 table. Many of the same people who have suggested  
18 supporting Route 92 also were strong supporters of  
19 this round table approach. I think this is a very  
20 good approach. Also, some of the people who were  
21 opposed to 92 supported this. And, several of our  
22 associated organizations were involved in this  
23 process, and we talked to them extensively, and  
24 all of them were in favor of this. And, I think  
25 that this is really what we should do.

1                   I think another important thing  
2           is the impact on areas west of Route 1, which  
3           really has not been addressed, particularly in  
4           Kingston, and after the Corps of Engineers stated  
5           that one of the reasons for the EIS was its impact  
6           on Kingston.

7                   So, we will certainly submit  
8           more detailed, and I will not read my footnotes  
9           now. I gather I'm running out of time. So, I  
10          will go on. But, one other thing I would like to  
11          mention, most towns in this area have been  
12          involved also in trying to push for a natural  
13          heritage area, the crossroads of the revolution in  
14          New Jersey. The American Revolution.

15                   That has not been mentioned at  
16          all in here.

17                   Ridge Road is the route that  
18          Washington took to the Battle of Monmouth.

19                   Thank you very much.

20                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Thank  
21          you, Mr. von Zumbusch. And, now, Corrington Wong.

22                   MR. von ZUMBUSCH: I believe  
23          Mr. Wong has not arrived.

24                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Did  
25          Damien Newton make it back.

1 MR. NEWTON: Yes. Right here.

2 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Damien  
3 Newton is up, followed by Lincoln Hollister from  
4 the Sensible Transportation Options Partnership.

5 Did I get that right?

6 Lincoln Hollister will be  
7 following Mr. Newton Damien.

8 MR. NEWTON: Damien Newton,  
9 N-E-W-T-O-N.

10 I brought with us  
11 representation of the governor. I'm sorry, its  
12 not to scale, for everyone that's been asking.  
13 He's a little taller.

14 Although today's hearing has  
15 been convened by the Army Corps of Engineers and  
16 it's Army Corps staff sitting in front of you,  
17 everyone should be aware that this hearing is a  
18 part of the environmental process, and Route 92 is  
19 a proposal of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.  
20 The chair and top staff of the Turnpike Authority  
21 are appointed and answer to the governor. The  
22 project and policy decisions the New Jersey  
23 Turnpike Authority makes are decisions of the  
24 McGreevey administration.

25 So, people who are opposed to

1 this road should not only let the Army Corps know  
2 their positions, but also let Governor McGreevey's  
3 office.

4 Thank you for the opportunity  
5 to testify again today. I'm the New Jersey  
6 coordinator for the Tri-State Transportation  
7 Campaign. The campaign is the region's leading  
8 nonprofit consortium of experts, planning  
9 organizations, activists, and environmental groups  
10 concerned with transportation. Our mission is to  
11 achieve an environmental sound, economically  
12 efficient, and socially just transportation  
13 network and system in the thirty-two counties in  
14 and surrounding New York City, including Central  
15 New Jersey and the surrounding communities.

16 From where I left off this  
17 afternoon, unlike the 1999 application that the  
18 Turnpike Authority submitted, this Environmental  
19 Impact Statement contains no information about the  
20 trips that would be added to Route 1 by Route 92  
21 construction south of Ridge Road in either the  
22 a.m. or p.m. peak hour period, nor is any  
23 intersection on Route 1 south of Ridge Road  
24 analyzed in terms of level of service or any other  
25 criteria in the DEIS.

1                   In 1999 the Turnpike itself  
2                   admitted, while Route 92 will reduce traffic on  
3                   Route 1 north of Ridge Road significantly with  
4                   traffic shifting to the Turnpike, south of Ridge  
5                   Road traffic on Route U.S. 1 increases. See  
6                   January 6, 1999.

7                   Indeed, as Figure 5 from that  
8                   application makes clear, volume would increase  
9                   south of Ridge Road from about 48,300 trips to  
10                  67,000 trips. The additional 19,400 trips, 10,600  
11                  of them added trips south of Ridge Road alone  
12                  according to Figure 6 in that document, can be  
13                  expected to be added by Route 92's construction.

14                  Now, between the two hearings  
15                  today I drove my colleague to Princeton Junction  
16                  so she could catch a train home tonight, and I got  
17                  to be telling you, on the way back, going south on  
18                  Route 1, I was not thinking, if only there was  
19                  10,600 more cars.

20                  This DEIS does not reveal what  
21                  the projected added trips are south of Ridge Road,  
22                  like the 1999 application, nor does it project the  
23                  levels of service at these intersections at both  
24                  a.m. and p.m. peak hour and period compared to the  
25                  existing 2001 conditions and the trend 2028 no

1 build scenario.

2 Obviously, this is known  
3 information. We request this information be made  
4 public so that motorists who use Route 1,  
5 residents of West Windsor, the Princetons,  
6 investors in properties and developers, as well as  
7 local elected officials, understand that Route 92  
8 will significantly increase traffic conditions on  
9 the fast growing Route 1 during peak hours.

10 Despite this added traffic to  
11 Route 1, one of the other objectives of the  
12 Turnpike as to its stated purpose is to "reduce  
13 the presence of non-local traffic on the local  
14 roadway network and shifting such traffic to Route  
15 92." DEIS Part 1, Page 8. Yet, Route 92 would do  
16 a poor job of reducing non-local truck traffic and  
17 shifting such traffic to Route 92 by 2028.

18 Twenty-four years from now, in  
19 the a.m. peak hour, Route 92 is projected to  
20 attract just one hundred seventy-six trucks  
21 eastbound and fifty-nine trucks westbound. In the  
22 p.m. peak hour period in 2028 Route 92 would  
23 attract just seventy-two trucks eastbound and one  
24 hundred twenty-nine trucks westbound, at the price  
25 of three hundred fifty million dollars at least.

1                   Another traffic thing, fourteen  
2 intersections were studied. I'm sure you probably  
3 heard this already. Eleven will still fail during  
4 the morning rush in 2028 if Route 92 was built,  
5 ten would fail in the evening rush.

6                   Three hundred fifty million  
7 dollars and three of fourteen will pass. I don't  
8 think you can get a baseball contract for three  
9 hundred fifty million if you're going to go three  
10 for fourteen.

11                   One of my last points is we  
12 heard a lot about local input, local people being  
13 involved in the process. Could all the local  
14 people that are opposed to Route 92 raise their  
15 hands, please?

16                   I don't think the local people  
17 have been involved in the drafting of this  
18 project. I encourage that there be more local  
19 input before this project goes forward.

20                   LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Mr.  
21 Hollister.

22                   Before you begin, Mr. Newton, I  
23 do, unfortunately, have to remind you and everyone  
24 here that these are formal proceedings and that  
25 the procedures set forth here are in Title 33, the

1 code of the federal regulation, Part 327, and I am  
2 going to have to allow my counsel to speak now for  
3 the record.

4 MR. PALMER: I'm sorry, Mr.  
5 Newton, do you intend to enter that poster in  
6 evidence?

7 MR. NEWTON: I was not planning  
8 on entering it.

9 MR. PALMER: Okay, fine. Thank  
10 you very much.

11 The problem was, Mr. Newton, if  
12 you had intended to enter it, we could not accept  
13 it. I would have to ask you to describe it  
14 verbally for the record.

15 LT. COLONEL HOFFMANN: Mr.  
16 Hollister, the floor is yours.

17 MR. HOLLISTER: I am Lincoln  
18 Hollister, H-O-L-L-I-S-T-E-R. I represent the  
19 organization "Sensible Transportation Options  
20 Partnership," otherwise known as STOP. STOP was  
21 created to develop an alternate sensible option to  
22 the former Millstone Bypass. The Millstone Bypass  
23 Wolfe destroyed the Washington Road Elm AlleeL,  
24 and other environmentally sensitive resources. We  
25 participated in the Penns Neck area EIS partner's

1 round table process. This process lead to a road  
2 design that not only protected the environment,  
3 but also significantly reduced present and  
4 projected congestion in the Penns Neck area. It  
5 was a win-win solution.

6 The environment we protected is  
7 spectacular. It was even found suitable for a  
8 pair of American bald eagles to build a nest in  
9 Plainsboro, where one or more eaglets are now  
10 being raised.

11 I have read that American bald  
12 eagles have a foraging radius of about five miles  
13 from their nest. The Plainsboro Preserve, with  
14 its bass-laden lake, is well within this range.  
15 The Plainsboro Preserve is a place worthy of its  
16 name, a preserve in the midst of New Jersey  
17 sprawl.

18 Route 92 will pass through this  
19 preserve. Will anyone, including the nesting pair  
20 of American bald eagles, want to continue to seek  
21 tranquility in a place where there is the constant  
22 roar of traffic?

23 My first question for the Army  
24 Corps of Engineers is whether the impact on the  
25 habitat of the nesting pair of American bald

1 eagles was considered in drafting the DEIS, and if  
2 so, what were the findings?

3 On reading through the DEIS I  
4 could not find an answer to this question.

5 My second question regarding  
6 the environment concerns noise. In the DEIS I  
7 could not find the values for noise measurements  
8 at the Audubon nature center at Plainsboro  
9 Preserve. Are they in the DEIS?

10 Given the short distance from  
11 Route 92, and given the traffic levels expected on  
12 Route 92, how much added noise will there be at  
13 the Audubon nature center?

14 I was very confused by the  
15 traffic analysis. I did not see in the maps and  
16 discussion that the new Route 522 was taken  
17 account of. Some widening of Route 1, improvement  
18 of a couple of interchanges, and completion of the  
19 planned extension of Route 522 seem to me would  
20 accomplish the stated goals of Route 522.

21 What am I missing here?

22 My question is, has the traffic  
23 analysis considered the traffic flow on the new  
24 Route 522?

25 I am also puzzled by statements

1 to the effect that traffic numbers in the models  
2 incorporate the Penns Neck roadway. In the  
3 appendix of the Route 92 DEIS, where this roadway  
4 is described, I see that what is described is a  
5 four year old preferred alternative of the  
6 environmental assessment. This alternative was  
7 rejected in the Penns Neck area EIS. Is it really  
8 true that the rejected roadway system was the one  
9 used, this is the question, was that the one used  
10 in the regional traffic analyses of the Route 92  
11 DEIS?

12 Finally, the N.J. Department of  
13 Transportation came up with a bold and successful  
14 structure for bringing all concerned citizens and  
15 stakeholders into one room to come up with a  
16 reasonable plan. This was done at our round table  
17 meetings that were superbly managed by a  
18 professional conflict resolution team. Surely,  
19 such a successful process can be done again. The  
20 result is jobs, preserved environment, improved  
21 traffic mobility and satisfied residents who would  
22 of had to have lived with the consequences of  
23 badly designed and irreversible road construction.

24 What am I missing here?

25 My question is, please, why not



1 was never discussed.

2 Two. How can in good conscience  
3 anybody consider, with a tight budget in the State,  
4 spending such an enormous sum of money on such a  
5 limited roadway?

6 Three, four, how can wetlands, in  
7 fact, be created if they are a natural thing and  
8 it's taken Mother Nature hundreds of years; how can  
9 engineers say, okay, we will go out and make  
10 wetlands. The answer is they can't, but that  
11 question was never answered.

12 Is 92 a north-south facilitator or  
13 east-west facilitator? That's not clear either.  
14 If it's a north-south facilitator, wouldn't the  
15 area be better served by either widening Route 1 or  
16 widening the Turnpike? If it's an east-west  
17 facilitator, why does it stop magically at Route 1?  
18 Where does the traffic go?

19 You know, in New York people used to  
20 make these incredible jokes about the Long Island  
21 Expressway. In New Jersey we've got Route 1. Rush  
22 hour we're pretty much in the same place. So the  
23 idea of bringing more traffic to Route 1, which is  
24 already not going anyplace, doesn't seem to make  
25 any sense. And I would really like to know how is

1 this thing developed not taking that fact into  
2 consideration?

3           The area that would be very much  
4 impacted by the completion of 92. It's a very  
5 historic area in the Millstone Valley. We have a  
6 scenic byway which was approved by the State of New  
7 Jersey and we got funding from the Federal Highway  
8 Administration to create a quarter management plan  
9 quiet recently and that work is in process and the  
10 historical value of the 12 districts on the State  
11 National Register that make up the Millstone Valley  
12 were really never discussed and yet any road that  
13 ends at Ridge Road and Route 1 obviously is going  
14 to dump an enormous amount of traffic in the  
15 historic districts and on the scenic byway and I  
16 think that needs to be addressed as well.

17           And lastly, if there is a problem, and  
18 you need to find a solution, why come up with  
19 something and try to ram it down people's throats?  
20 Not have smart, not very popular and not very  
21 successful.

22           I think, since transportation and  
23 roadway is very definitely a regional area, what  
24 you need to do, rather than issue the permits and  
25 move ahead with 92 as proposed, is gather all of

1 the people who have vested interests in  
2 transportation together and negotiate a settlement.

3 We too will be handing in some written  
4 comments. I thank you.

5 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Chrinko.

6 MR. CHRINKO: Frank Chrinko. I've  
7 been a resident of South Brunswick 45 years. Prior  
8 to building my home in South Brunswick I had  
9 property in East Brunswick and with plans to settle  
10 there. The New Jersey Turnpike thwarted those  
11 plans by announcing its proposal to build the  
12 Turnpike just a few hundred feet from my property.

13 I'm a life-long resident of Middlesex  
14 County and I'm here to show my opposition to another  
15 intrusion by the New Jersey Turnpike to build in my  
16 hometown.

17 Historically route 92 is a planner's  
18 nightmare. Almost 60 years ago it was proposed as  
19 the Princeton bypass intended to connect Route 206  
20 in the west with Route 33 in the east. The road  
21 was praised by the Princetons, the University,  
22 Plainsboro, West Windsor, plus many other towns  
23 that were trying to keep traffic out of their  
24 communities.

25 The bypass was never built. Then

1 about 20 to 25 years ago the same Princeton  
2 coalition of communities succeeded in having an  
3 interstate link designated by the then Governor  
4 Kean. Once again to keep the traffic out of their  
5 communities. That decision had the affect of  
6 making Route 1 what it is today. That DEIS  
7 designation of the interstate link was one of only  
8 two such DEIS designations, in the history of the  
9 interstate highway system.

10 I have served as Mayor, Township  
11 committeeman, industrial commission, chairman and  
12 member of the Route 1 study commission during my  
13 years in South Brunswick Township.

14 My 20 years of Public Service tell me  
15 what is going on here is wrong. The U.S. Army  
16 Corps of Engineers Environmental Study, with all  
17 due respect, is grievously flawed. It deals far  
18 less with the roads impact on the environment than  
19 with the affect on traffic and other  
20 non-environmental matters. It could not have been  
21 better written by the New Jersey Turnpike  
22 publicist.

23 For the record, I will state that we  
24 do not need Route 92. It's a 20th century  
25 antiquity. We already have an east-west roadway,

1 it's called Route 522. Try it, you'll like it.  
2 It's a completed four-lane limited access non-toll  
3 road and it is now able to take you from Route 27  
4 in the west to Route 130 in the east with a  
5 commitment to extend it to the Turnpike itself.  
6 Why do we need another east west highway?

7 Six questions are appropriate and  
8 should be answered.

9 Why was Route 522, an existing road  
10 largely ignored by the study, even the maps in the  
11 study make Route 522 almost imperceptible, why was  
12 it hidden?

13 What will happen to the existing Route  
14 32, formerly known as Foresgate Drive, will it be  
15 co-opted by the proposed 92?

16 I got an answer to this question in  
17 the lobby earlier and it may not be appropriate.

18 How will properties along Route 32  
19 between 130 and Jamesburg obtain access without  
20 being required to pay a toll?

21 That was answered and the answer is no  
22 toll for those people on Foresgate Drive.

23 Why wasn't the use of Route 522  
24 explored in order to have it connect to the toll  
25 gates at the New Jersey Turnpike that already exist

1 within a stones throw of where 522 will be built?

2                   Should a non-bias commission be  
3 appointed to determine if there really is a need  
4 for 92? I don't believe that, some suggestions  
5 were made here tonight along those lines, and I  
6 don't believe there is any other way it should be  
7 done by a completely non-biased commission.

8                   Finally, how will the proposed 92  
9 effect the quality of life on Route 1, Kingston,  
10 Rocky Hill, Kendall Park, Monmouth Junction and all  
11 the existing local roads in the area?

12                   I plead with you, do not approve this  
13 road. Thank you.

14                   LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: And thank you Mr.  
15 Chrinko.

16                   Our next speaker will be Edmund A.  
17 Luciano, Jr., Councilman of South Brunswick  
18 Township followed, by Geri Luongo.

19                   MR. LUCIANO, JR.: Thank you very  
20 much.

21                   Today I don't have many statements to  
22 make, just a lot of questions.

23                   Has anyone studied the South Brunswick  
24 Master Plan for circulation and for growth that  
25 we've put in existence since 1991 and 1992? I did

1 not see that reported or referred to in any of your  
2 study. Number 1.

3                   Number 2. I'm also, and I also did  
4 not see environmentally any of the residual  
5 environmental damage that's going to be caused by  
6 the building of the roadway. You're going to have  
7 vehicles moving in and out of the local areas in  
8 South Brunswick Township. They are going to rumble  
9 through the town, they are going to take some of  
10 the older homes and their foundations and crack  
11 them especially if you start to go through Kingston  
12 Road. We have historic homes. The streets are  
13 very narrow. When you come down into where the  
14 area is you would like to build Route 92, you will  
15 be going through farming area. It's active farming  
16 area. That means people are giving us food to eat  
17 and you will be in that very area having large  
18 diesel vehicles putting out diesel particulates in  
19 the very air, in the area of the food we eat.

20                   Thirdly, you're going to have areas  
21 that are wetlands, marshland whatever you want to  
22 call them. No one has put a study to say how it's  
23 going to affect the wildlife that's there during  
24 the construction, nor how it's going to affect it  
25 after the construction.

1                   Also you have not taken into account,  
2                   nor have I seen it written anywhere, what is going  
3                   to happen to the area as it is being built, versus  
4                   after it's being built. The footprint afterward is  
5                   much smaller than the area disturbed.

6                   No where in the DEIS does it talk  
7                   about that damage and does it talk about how you're  
8                   going to remediate the damage.

9                   That brings me to another point  
10                  of remediation. South Brunswick Township is going  
11                  to take the brunt of this construction. I would  
12                  like to know as a Councilman for my town how much  
13                  money the New Jersey Turnpike Authority is going to  
14                  give South Brunswick Township to fix our roads and  
15                  intersections that are going to be ruined by the  
16                  weight of the trucks carrying the rock and all the  
17                  other building debris that you need to build the  
18                  elevated road. It should not fall on the back of  
19                  our taxpayers.

20                  Hopefully somewhere in your bonding  
21                  you can find money to pay South Brunswick for the  
22                  damage you are going to be causing. I think that's  
23                  only fair.

24                  I'd also like to know the first bond  
25                  that was issued. It was for how much money, 350

1 million? Anybody up there? No? Nobody knows.

2 Okay.

3                   Has that bond money been spent and how  
4 much has been spent? If you don't know, I would  
5 like to have the answers to those questions because  
6 by my own estimates you have expended all of the  
7 money that your bonding issues covered. You're  
8 going to have go into a second bonding issue.

9                   I would like to know how much money  
10 that is going to be and where is it going to be  
11 bonded from, general obligation bond from the State  
12 of New Jersey through the DOT, or coming through  
13 the Turnpike and through increased tolls?

14                   The reason for that is I would like to  
15 know and it was not put into the DEIS. If you  
16 raise the tolls on the Turnpike, exactly how much  
17 more traffic do you think is going to be put onto  
18 Route 1 to be diverted off of the Turnpike so as to  
19 avoid the tolls because that's now going to  
20 increase the traffic on Route 1 North and South.

21                   And I guess my final point is, has  
22 anyone looked at the Route 522 and Hightstown  
23 bypass? 522 was built by South Brunswick Township.  
24 If you were to look at those, they almost mirror  
25 what 92 is doing. I would submit that area north

1 and south of what is known as the Forrestal area  
2 you can easily build a very accessible interchange  
3 into 522 from the Turnpike for a lot less money  
4 than what we are talking about here to build a  
5 roadway that's going nowhere.

6 I guess I'll finish on this final  
7 question, that is, a road that might have had a  
8 purpose 60 years ago and it might have been a road  
9 that was built with the best of intentions needs to  
10 be re-examined, re-evaluated based upon what's in  
11 existence today and what's here today. We are  
12 having sprawl only because 92 is being talked  
13 about. Imagine the sprawl that 92 is going to  
14 bring into the north and southbound lanes in the  
15 area where it is going to drop off the traffic.

16 That's against Governor McGreevy, both  
17 in the smart map, also against environmentalists I  
18 talked to and against the plans that we have for  
19 our area. I just think you need to sit down and  
20 re-evaluate because there is enough problems in New  
21 Jersey that if you were to take almost a billion  
22 dollars -- and I'll guarantee you the State  
23 next-door -- if this road comes in at less than a  
24 billion dollars I'll buy the three of you all the  
25 dinners you want.

1                   Your roadway is going to cost you \$1  
2 billion when it's all said and done. Thank you. I  
3 would like a re-estimate of what the road is now  
4 going to cost. 300 million is already gone.

5                   LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Will be followed  
6 by Geri Luongo. I'll ask for Nancy Carringer,  
7 South Brunswick resident. And Nancy will be  
8 followed by Joe Schwartz. Thank you.

9                   MS. CARRINGER: I appreciate this  
10 opportunity to share my reactions to the Draft  
11 Environmental Impact Statement and to share my  
12 thoughts about Route 92 and I would ask if you had  
13 a good dinner and did you enjoy your view of Route  
14 1 at dinner, at the dinner hour?

15                   I'm a life-long resident of South  
16 Brunswick Township. I went to elementary school  
17 here. I followed my career in education here in  
18 South Brunswick. I've watched the area change from  
19 a farming community, which surrounds four historic  
20 villages, to a suburban district of over 33,000  
21 resident and a high school of over 2000 students.

22                   Discussion of Route 92 has been around  
23 for longer than I can remember. When South  
24 Brunswick was a farming community, Route 92 was  
25 really kind of laughed at, who needed it. Now with

1 the suburban sprawl and the accompanying  
2 development of the Route 1 corridor traffic,  
3 congestion is tremendous. There is no denying  
4 that.

5 In the early '90s it was rush hours  
6 that were bad when people were going to and from  
7 work. Now it's constant from seven in the morning  
8 to ten o'clock at night. The rush hours are still  
9 the heaviest. There is no good time to drive Route  
10 1 except perhaps midnight to 6:00 A.M. and, yes,  
11 there is demand for east-west access road. Ridge  
12 Road, Deans Lane, Friendship Road weren't built to  
13 handle the volume of current conditions.

14 So why do I oppose Route 92? There is  
15 several reasons.

16 There is a relatively new four-lane  
17 road traveling east-west. We heard a lot about it.  
18 Route 522 provides rapid access from Route 27 to  
19 Route 1, Route 130 and when completed will provide  
20 four-lane access to Cranbury, South River Road and  
21 the Turnpike and the construction of that,  
22 according to Mayor Gamteise, will start in  
23 September. The construction of the last phase,  
24 September of this year, it will be finished before  
25 we ever move on with further discussions of Route

1 92. It will provide east-west relief without the  
2 environmental damage the current plans for 92 would  
3 incur.

4 Any east-west roadway would do to  
5 volume, would add to the volume which travels Route  
6 1. Route 1 is not able to handle the numbers,  
7 especially in South Brunswick where it's only two  
8 lanes north and two lanes south. Route 1 needs to  
9 be widened and signals need to be removed.

10 I would reiterate what Police Chief  
11 Michael Baket said this afternoon. We are in the  
12 funnel part of the hour glass and we do have 400  
13 accidents every year between Independence Way and  
14 Route 522.

15 The projected cost of Route 92 in  
16 1993, as I understand it, was \$400 million to build  
17 6.7 miles. The 2004 cost would be much greater  
18 than that amount and money would be far better  
19 spent on improvements to Route 1.

20 A question for the DEIS, which I would  
21 like considered, is why is Route 522 defined as a  
22 six-lane highway alternative when Route 92 is only  
23 proposed as a four-lane roadway?

24 Why does 522 have to be six lanes when  
25 Route 92 is only proposed for four lanes? Route

1 522 is now currently four lanes.

2 I would also like to know the source  
3 of information on the traffic studies showing the  
4 need to relieve east-west congestion.

5 What studies have been done on the  
6 north-south traffic flow on Route 1?

7 What is meant by local traffic? Is  
8 local traffic what I do when I drive from my home  
9 to come here? Is it from New Brunswick to  
10 Princeton? What is local traffic?

11 Something needs to be done, gets no  
12 argument from this community member. I support the  
13 Sierra Club views of the DEIS and support their  
14 conclusion, conflict mediation, which includes  
15 public participation. Would not only be helpful to  
16 all the state holders, but result in a far superior  
17 exclusion to traffic congestion in Central Jersey.  
18 The proposed Route 92 is not the right answer.

19 Thank you.

20 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Schwartz and  
21 Mr. Schwartz will be the final speaker followed by  
22 a five-minute break.

23 MR. SCHWARTZ: Joe Scwartz. I live in  
24 South Brunswick in Kingston and I thank you for  
25 this opportunity to speak.

1                   I'm here to stand with my fellow  
2 citizens in opposition to Route 92. Nothing I read  
3 or heard convinces me that Route 92 will have any  
4 benefit for my community. I'm not a traffic expert  
5 or an environmental expert and others have stated  
6 the opposition viewpoint much more eloquently than  
7 I can, but I have lived in New Jersey all my life.  
8 I've spent 25 years driving on the New Jersey  
9 Turnpike and it seems to me they've got all they  
10 can handle trying to manage the road they already  
11 have.

12                   The Turnpike Authority has very little  
13 credibility with me in terms of how to build, run  
14 or maintain a road. Telling us that building  
15 another highway is a solution to our traffic  
16 problems is like telling to an obese person the  
17 solution to their weight problem is to buy a bigger  
18 pair of pants.

19                   Isn't it time for us here in central  
20 New Jersey to get a bit more creative than to pave  
21 over a little space we have left. The cost alone  
22 makes this problem obscene, especially in the  
23 financial straits our state is in. The State can't  
24 adequately fund its schools and now they want over  
25 500 million, maybe a billion dollars to build a

1 road into Forrestal. That does not make sense to  
2 me, it's offensive.

3 Why do we have zoning laws and laws  
4 protecting our wetland and environment if people  
5 can go out to destroy them?

6 I urge you to deny this permit and  
7 protect the community from this unnecessary  
8 project. Thank you.

9 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Schwartz.

11 Following the break I would ask Mr.  
12 Mark Halmo to be ready to speak and following him  
13 Mark Rogers.

14 (RECESS TAKEN)(AFTER RECESS)

15 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Mark Halmo.

16 MR. HALMO: Good evening. My name is  
17 Mark Halmo and I've been a resident of South  
18 Brunswick for nearly nine years. I'm here to  
19 express my opposition to the construction of Route  
20 92.

21 I have lived all my life in  
22 neighboring towns, born and raised in East  
23 Brunswick, 16 years in North Brunswick and now with  
24 my family I reside in Dayton. I've seen this area  
25 grow in leaps and bound, witnessed the expansion of

1 highways, the onslaught of single-family and  
2 condominium projects and sadly the encroachment of  
3 ever-dwindling areas of natural reserves.

4           But I've also seen things that  
5 encourage me to believe it's not too late to  
6 re-affirm our responsibility for the land and  
7 skies.

8           As I enjoy the great outdoors, I've  
9 been graced with the sights of several endangered  
10 species struggling to make a comeback right here in  
11 area of the proposed highway, the red shoulder  
12 hawk, the piping plover, just to name two. I have  
13 also seen wood ducks nesting as nature had  
14 intended, in a hollow tree., and most recently a  
15 bird I thought I would never see in this area.

16           On Tuesday, April 27, 2004 at  
17 approximately 5:45 p.m. My son and I were walking  
18 our doing in Sondek Park, which lies very near the  
19 intersection of New and Friendship Roads and in  
20 very close proximity of the suggested path of Route  
21 92.

22           While we walked along the tree line at  
23 the Park's southern border. I took note of a  
24 rather large bird flying toward us. As the bird  
25 approached, I was taken aback at what I was seeing.

1                   And what I was seeing was a Bald  
2 Eagle. With a white head, white tail and leggings,  
3 and a wing span five to six feet across. This was  
4 adult to be sure.

5                   The Eagle flew about 15 feet above  
6 tree-top level and passed within 60 feet of my now  
7 stationary position.

8                   To further add to this remarkable  
9 sight, in its talons it clutched a rabbit. I am  
10 doubtless as to the identity of this magnificent  
11 creature, as I have had several other experiences  
12 with eagles in flight, namely, at Merrill Creek  
13 Reservoir and preserve in Sussex County.

14                  I have also had the good fortune to  
15 photograph eagles in the wild during a recent trip  
16 to Florida. As this bird continued its flight due  
17 southwest, I marveled at how lucky we are as a  
18 community to have such a creature, an icon of this  
19 great nation, a symbol recognized as America  
20 throughout the world, right here in South  
21 Brunswick.

22                  My euphoria, however, was short lived  
23 as I remembered Route 92, and the noise, the  
24 pollution, and the everlasting destruction of  
25 environmentally sensitive habitat it would bring.

1                   Eagles are non-migratory, territorial  
2                   and in need of solitude. Any chance of expanding  
3                   their numbers would surely be lost.

4                   The call for serving the needs of the  
5                   many has been bandied about, how it's imperative  
6                   this roadway be built for economic growth, and the  
7                   convenience of the motoring public.

8                   As for convenience, I say there lies a  
9                   viable alternative route just north of this not  
10                  really needed toll road, as Route 522 currently  
11                  supports the east-west flow of traffic, and which,  
12                  at considerably less cot, both in dollars and  
13                  environmental impact, could be extended through a  
14                  section of town that is home to many warehouses, a  
15                  short distance from Exit 8A via Routes 130 and 32  
16                  or Cranbury Road, or if the Turnpike Authority is  
17                  so set on building something,

18                  perhaps a new interchange where 522 passes  
19                  over the Turnpike should be their agenda.

20                  As for serving the needs of the many,  
21                  consider this. Consider the generation of  
22                  Americans of today and tomorrow. We are in a most  
23                  admirable position. We have at our fingertips an  
24                  opportunity to provide a truly unique, a truly  
25                  American experience to all citizens of all ages of

1 all walks of life.

2 By declining the permits for 92, we  
3 are electing to support stewardship of the land,  
4 the quality life of this towns's residents and the  
5 wildlife that depends on us to do the right thing.

6 I urge you that this assault by  
7 asphalt be put to rest once and for all.

8 Thank you.

9 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Halmo.

11 During the break some people opted not  
12 to speak. I notice I stated the speaker to follow  
13 Mr. Holmo and cannot confirm that we are still on  
14 this schedule. I show Mr. Mark Rogers scheduled to  
15 speak next. Does that follow what everybody  
16 remembers? There was a shift during the break.  
17 Mr. Mark Rogers.

18 Michael Braverman. Mr. Braverman is  
19 followed by Bob Luszcz.

20 MR. BRAVERMAN: Michael Braverman and  
21 I'm a resident of Plainsboro. I have some comments  
22 specific to the study itself.

23 Specifically first of all in section  
24 5.3.6, Endangered Species-Southern Arrowhead.

25 This report is vague and doesn't take

1 into account the runoff or water levels of species  
2 survival. I presume it's referring to *Sagittaria*  
3 *calcyina*; *S. calycina spongiosa*; *S. cuneata*; *S.*  
4 *filiformis*, *S. latifolia var pubescens*; *S.*  
5 *subulata*; and *S. teres*.

6 This report is also misleading in that  
7 it does not give any description of the status of  
8 this plant which has a State element rank of S1.

9 S-1 defined as critically imperiled in  
10 New Jersey because of extreme rarity.

11 The report also states that 25 percent  
12 of the population would be endangered, but it does  
13 not give any description of how that number was  
14 obtained.

15 In regard to mitigation, the report  
16 suggests the transplanting or starting seed from  
17 existing plants in the area or seeds from other  
18 areas be used.

19 The division of Parks and forestry has  
20 also noted their lack of experience with  
21 transplantation. That is directly in the report  
22 itself.

23 To remove seeds from local plants  
24 would be decreasing the chances of those  
25 individuals surviving in their natural habitat.

1 Seeds falling in the vicinity of the mother plant  
2 are logically in their best habitat. Removing  
3 seeds would not replace destroyed plants, but  
4 simply removing existing or potential populations  
5 around. The other option mentioned is to bring in  
6 seed from the Southeastern United States and this  
7 is a very important point. Because the collection  
8 or importation is contrary to a 1993 recommendation  
9 by the Army Corps of Engineers themselves out of  
10 their research station in Vicksburg Mississippi --  
11 and I have a citation attached -- that's because  
12 only the biotypes present may be locally adapted  
13 and there is a risk of importing diseases, which  
14 are not present in this area.

15 Section 3.3.5.1 notes records in 2002,  
16 the New Jersey Department of Environmental  
17 Protection National Heritage Program lists  
18 endangered species or species of concern in the  
19 proposed highway 92 area, these plants were not  
20 surveyed because they used a map to determine which  
21 habitats had potential for supporting these plants.  
22 They did not do surveys of many of these plants  
23 listed as being present in the DEP report. This is  
24 an inadequate survey of the area.

25 For example of how this oversight

1 method is flawed, pale dogwood, cornus amomum var  
2 schuetzeana is listed on the state list of  
3 endangered plants. Yet on page 3-36 cornus amomum,  
4 which is misspelled as comus is mentioned is being  
5 present. Other misspellings of even common plants  
6 such as bluegrass which is misspelled as Pao  
7 palensis, should be Poa pratensis, bring into  
8 question the quality of the study.

9                   The highway 92 plan is also in  
10 violation of the Governor's Save Corridors Act. I  
11 have a copy of the press release attached. It  
12 specifically mentions the intersection of Ridge  
13 Road and U.S. 1 is unsafe due to congestion. This  
14 is exactly where highway 92 is bringing traffic.

15                   I am in favor of widening and removing  
16 traffic signals from Route 1 because this would  
17 benefit the people of Middlesex and Mercer County,  
18 which is really what they want.

19                   There are also several problems with  
20 table ES-1 which is at the very beginning of the  
21 report. It's misleading in that it only lists  
22 preserved farm land which conveniently avoids the  
23 fact Highway 92 impacts about 10 times more  
24 farmland than any other alternative.

25                   As stated on page ES 18, it states

1 Highway 92 would impact about 288 acres of  
2 farmland.

3 ES 14 mentions Plainsboro supports  
4 Highway 92, but as a resident of Plainsboro I'm  
5 against Highway 92.

6 More specifically on page ES 14, it's  
7 misleading in that it mentions South Brunswick  
8 zoning laws as somehow in agreement with highway  
9 construction while the Township of South Brunswick  
10 is on record as being against highway 82. Thank  
11 you.

12 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Mr.  
13 Braverman.

14 Zoya Pugh. Ms. Pugh will be followed  
15 by Gene Lennon.

16 MS. PUGH: Zoya Pugh. My family and I  
17 have lived on Friendship Road for 27 years now.  
18 Thank you for letting me speak tonight.

19 The Route 92 project is a flagrant  
20 example of corporate welfare as can be imagined.  
21 Millions of taxpayers and motorists will be paying  
22 perhaps as much as a billion dollars to do little  
23 more than bolster the real estate holdings of  
24 Princeton University. It will create more traffic  
25 problems than it will solve and ultimately may not

1 even be used by those motorists who stand to save a  
2 few minutes off their trips.

3 My first question is, has anyone done  
4 a survey to ascertain how many motorists and  
5 truckers will use the roadway, considering the  
6 hefty tolls, and will they continue to use it until  
7 tolls are increased substantially?

8 After all, the projected tolls are  
9 based on decade-old figures and even back then they  
10 were not expected to have much impact on what this  
11 project will incur. Not only are we paying a hefty  
12 monetary price to benefit Princeton University and  
13 a few other beneficiaries of this pork barrel  
14 project, but we and our grandchildren pay an  
15 incalculable price of environmental losses as a  
16 result of this behemoth roadway.

17 I have been hearing supporters'  
18 arguments, one being the Princeton board which used  
19 to oppose the road, but now a spokesman for the  
20 proponents. It branded the environmentalist's  
21 arguments and concerns relating to the  
22 environmental impacts and bring kneejerk,  
23 nonsensical bogus answers. It claimed the area  
24 along the highway can be screened as agricultural  
25 or dedicated as open space according to smart

1 growth model.

2                   The editorial statement was referring  
3 to Route 55 and state there is no reason Route 92  
4 can't offer the same attraction to motorists in our  
5 region of the State.

6                   I'm not that knowledgeable about Route  
7 55. I do know the area along the 92 path, there  
8 are hundreds of acres of wetland, a number of  
9 creeks. This highway will not drop neatly from the  
10 sky, but a messy process. Many more than 14 acres  
11 of wetland will be impacted. The delicate balance  
12 of nature that exists will be rudely upset.  
13 Sophisticated engineering techniques might be able  
14 to deal with some runoff, but there is no way they  
15 can effectively shield delicate wetlands.

16                   The plan only relates to the 14 acres  
17 that will be filled. What about the additional  
18 hundreds of acres that will be severely degraded by  
19 paved-over and compacted and otherwise disturbed?  
20 Who is going to supervise these efforts, what will  
21 they cost and who will be accountable to regulate?  
22 Any good field ecologist can tell you that even a  
23 dirt service road can have a very negative impact  
24 on animal and plant populations. No one can even  
25 imagine the catastrophic affects.

1                   Sure the landscape can remain  
2 reasonably attractive to motorists. As the  
3 editorial states, it may look green and natural to  
4 the untrained eye of the motorist speeding along at  
5 65 miles an hour, but, in fact, it will be a  
6 landscape that will be permanently and dramatically  
7 altered and depleted of the many live species.

8                   Please deny permits to the New Jersey  
9 Turnpike. Thank you.

10                   MR. LENNON: Gene Lennon. Thank you  
11 for the opportunity.

12                   I haven't heard anybody mention yet so  
13 far in these discussions, and I like to preface  
14 this by saying I have a tremendous amount of  
15 respect for the technical expertise for the Army  
16 Corps of Engineers. However, it's important  
17 somebody Brunswick talk about S2188 in these  
18 discussions. Does anybody know about that?

19                   There is a reason I see the hair on  
20 some of the back of your necks standing up there.

21                   I have here a press release that's  
22 about two weeks old from the office of to Tom  
23 Daschle, U.S. Senator from South Dakota. I'll read  
24 a little bit from this.

25                   Washington, D.C. Senator Tom Daschle

1 recently offered new legislation to reform the Army  
2 Corps of Engineers. Co-sponsored by Senators John  
3 McCain and Russ Feingold, the Corps of Engineers  
4 Modernization and Improvement Act of 2003 would  
5 revise the processes used by the Corps to design  
6 and construct civil works and other projects  
7 throughout the United States to provide better  
8 oversight and review of proposed projects.

9                   This legislation will provide an  
10 important new independent review panel to ensure  
11 that Corps decisions are not unduly influenced by  
12 political concerns.

13                   I repeat this is current legislation,  
14 brand-new stuff, although bouncing around in  
15 Washington for a couple of years. And problems  
16 with the Corps go way back, going back to the  
17 1800s.

18                   There is a lot of recent stuff that  
19 brings this to attention now. This is important  
20 for everybody to know about because Congress,  
21 various members of Congress, a lot of environmental  
22 and other organizations are gathering together to  
23 point out the fact the Corps can't be universally  
24 trusted in their decision-making.

25                   It's important for us opposed to 92 to

1 see as a possible tool for us the fact this is not  
2 an appropriate time for the Corps to make these  
3 decisions while Congress is discussing the  
4 viability of them as a decision-making organization  
5 for this type of issue.

6 So I have with me a great deal of  
7 information. Five minutes is certainly not long  
8 enough to go into the long history with the Corps,  
9 but I have information I'll be happy to give you.

10 This is not intended as a personal  
11 slight against those of you, but this is an  
12 important tool for those of us fighting Route 92.  
13 We should all understand the Corps has for whatever  
14 reason their own agenda. Some of this will prove  
15 that. Congress looking into these issues will  
16 prove that.

17 We must accept this is a political  
18 process. We need to go over this by going after  
19 the Governor. One of the ways to go after the  
20 Governor is by telling him it's outrageous for him  
21 to use the Corps of Engineering as the governing  
22 body to make this determination when Congress is  
23 investigating them for their inability to make  
24 these kind of determinations without being unduly  
25 influenced by political issues, financial issues

1 and a whole bunch of other things. This is simply  
2 not appropriate at this time for the Corps to be  
3 doing this.

4                   Again I apologize if it seems I'm  
5 attacking you directly. It's not my intention.  
6 It's very important we all send letters to the  
7 Governor, even if you already sent him a letter.

8                   Send a new letter saying you just  
9 heard about this and it's outrageous for the  
10 Governor to make his decision based on the Corps  
11 decision-making process being the fact they are  
12 being investigated by the Congress for their  
13 decision-making.

14                   Thank you.

15                   LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Mr.  
16 Lennon.

17                   We are going to now hear from Mr.  
18 David Southgate and following Mr. Southgate will be  
19 Tari Pantaleo.

20                   MR. SOUTHGATE: Thank you. I live on  
21 Ridge Road between Kingston and Route 1. So you  
22 can imagine my interest in Route 92.

23                   I've read substantial parts of DEIS.  
24 It is an impressive document which presents  
25 accurate research on many of the issues involved in

1 the proposed construction of Route 92. However,  
2 there are a number of features of the document with  
3 which I'm not impressed, in which it is incomplete,  
4 incorrect, misleading and wrong-headed. I'll deal  
5 with these in turn, as they affect our particular  
6 situation on Ridge Road.

7                   One. Incomplete.

8                   Nowhere can I find comments on light  
9 pollution. Our current situation on Ridge Road is  
10 presently dark and quiet at night, despite our  
11 nearness to Route 1. I suspect that if the  
12 interchange is built with tall light poles on an  
13 elevated road structure, as is often the case, a  
14 nighttime peacefulness will be severely disrupted.  
15 Why was this issue not addressed in the EIS.

16                   Two. Incorrect.

17                   This is one of the more egregious  
18 directions of the DEIS. It states Route 92 will  
19 reduce traffic on local roads and quotes an average  
20 value. But the local roads have been selected to  
21 include only those on which the traffic study shows  
22 a reduction. Roads west of Route 1, such as our  
23 part of Ridge Road, are not on the so-called  
24 screenline crossing, even though they are in the  
25 traffic study area. These excluded roads have an

1 increase of traffic due to Route 92 and they are as  
2 much local roads as are those on the screenline  
3 crossing. To exclude these roads from  
4 consideration is just plain cooking the books.  
5 It's a well-known way of doing it.

6 Three. Misleading.

7 A number of alternative road  
8 development scenarios have been determined not to  
9 have the capability of dealing with the anticipated  
10 traffic situation. However, one which is quoted as  
11 being a partial solution has not been considered  
12 seriously enough, that is, the widening of Route 1,  
13 removal of lights and the extension and combined  
14 with the improvement of Route 522. Those go  
15 hand-in-hand. Why was this combination option not  
16 considered?

17 The discussion of Route 522 considers  
18 only widening to three lanes. That's not shown to  
19 be needed. That does not consider the combination  
20 with Route 1 improvements.

21 In addition, the environmental impact  
22 of widening Route 522 I believe is exaggerated.  
23 Similarly, the environmental impact of improving  
24 Route 1 is misrepresented. Not that there is no  
25 environmental impact, but such construction will be

1 proven to Route 1, will be needed in any case, it  
2 should be done. It is significant to bring Route 1  
3 up to the correct current standards for such items  
4 as stormwater handling and for safety.

5                   These should not be considered as  
6 detrimental factors. I do oppose Route 1 and 522  
7 combined improvement alternative, would result in  
8 substantial drop in traffic through Kingston and on  
9 Ridge Road and parallel roads.

10                   I believe I speak for many in the  
11 Kingston areas in deploring what appears to be a  
12 bias in the DEIS in preferring the construction of  
13 92 to this alternative, which many well be  
14 lower-cost, less destructive and more effective.

15                   Finally, wrong-headed. This is a  
16 bigger issue.

17                   The DEIS deals with many issues, large  
18 and small. One issue which may be bigger than all  
19 the areas is that 92 is a vital part of regional  
20 overdevelopment. There is bowing in the DEIS to  
21 the need to "collaborate closely with local  
22 communities to ensure development occurs in  
23 sustainable patterns."

24                   Nowhere do we see the decrying of  
25 overdevelopment of wall-to-wall blacktopped

1       suburbia in New Jersey with just little patches of  
2       open space. Surely this is the major environmental  
3       impact, that 92 is part of a general  
4       overdevelopment system.

5                        I would like to point out simply  
6       allocating money for 92 does not automatically  
7       guarantee that it is spent on 92. I maintain this  
8       money, hundreds of million dollars, shouldn't be  
9       spent on 92, it should be spent on environmental  
10      preservation so that 92 is not needed and this  
11      alternative should be forcibly posited in the EIS  
12      so the public can see the true choice that exists.

13                      Thank you.

14                      LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Ms. Pantaleo.

15                      MS. PANTALEO: Tari Pantaleo. Good  
16      evening. Thank you for your time.

17                      I've been a Plainsboro resident for 17  
18      years. One of the finest achievements of that span  
19      of time has been the creation of the Plainsboro  
20      preserve. The DEIS notes the Route 92 project  
21      would pass through the preserve separating 12 and a  
22      half acres of the property from the rest of the  
23      preserve by virtue of an elevated roadway over the  
24      preserve.

25                      It is stated on page ES 13 that the

1 project would not significantly affect the wildlife  
2 and aesthetic value of the entire property. I  
3 can't fathom how any discretion of this open space  
4 can be contemplated.

5                   To raise just one question. If I'm  
6 birding in the vicinity of the roadway, assuming  
7 bird population in the area will not be affected by  
8 this road, exactly what decibel level will that  
9 section of Plainsboro preserve experience? Will I  
10 be able to detect bird song in the presence of  
11 traffic noise on a road estimated to carry more  
12 than 40,000 vehicles per day?

13                   My second question I put to you as one  
14 who has worked in the Village of Kingston for the  
15 last 25 years. I have deep concerns about the  
16 negative consequences Route 92 will have in this  
17 area.

18                   To address just one of these. One of  
19 the primary goals of proposed Route 92 is to reduce  
20 the presence of non-local truck traffic on the  
21 local road and shift it to the highway; however,  
22 the DEIS goes on to estimate at peak an additional  
23 20 trucks per hour will pass through Kingston on  
24 Ridge Road as a result of the construction on Route  
25 92. Exactly how is this in keeping with your

1 stated goals?

2 Thank you for answering these  
3 questions and the many others raised today.

4 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Jeanne Wacker,  
5 Ms. Jeanne Wacker?

6 Mr. Duke Wiser, who will be followed  
7 by Francis Cap.

8 MR. WISER: I live on Ridge Road in  
9 Kingston.

10 I would like to ask the following  
11 questions be answered before the final DEIS is  
12 released.

13 What was the statement of work that  
14 the Army Corps gave Camp Dresser McKee?

15 Why did the Army Corps fail to specify  
16 the geographical boundaries of the EIS in the  
17 statement of work to Camp Dresser McKee?

18 Why did the Army Corps fail to specify  
19 the scope and purpose of the DEIS in the statement  
20 of work to CDM?

21 Who and what agency were the  
22 originators for the statement of work and the  
23 geographical boundaries that actually appears in  
24 the draft EIS?

25 How much did the Turnpike Authority

1 pay the Army Corps, CDM and any other  
2 subcontractors for the draft EIS?

3                   What are the dates, dollar amounts and  
4 titles of all business done by CDM and any of its  
5 subcontractors for the EIS, for the New Jersey  
6 Turnpike Authority since 1990?

7                   In the EIS scoping meeting of June  
8 2000, it's specifically requested an independent  
9 consultant be retained for this EIS to ensure  
10 unbiased accuracy.

11                   We are aware CDM has done a  
12 substantial amount of business with the Turnpike  
13 Authority and in all likelihood is still doing  
14 business with them. What specific measures did  
15 the Army Corps take to detect or prevent such  
16 egregious conflicts of interest?

17                   Why did these measures fail to the  
18 extent the Army Corps hired a long-term partner of  
19 the Turnpike Authority to guard against  
20 environmental damage by the Turnpike Authority?

21                   The estimated traffic flows and other  
22 projections in the EIS are utterly worthless as  
23 decision-making tools unless some statistical error  
24 measure is known, such as their limits of error or  
25 standard deviations.

1                   Furthermore, measured values are  
2 worthless for decision making unless similar error  
3 analysis is done. For each measured or estimated  
4 numerical value in the draft EIS, what are its  
5 error bounds or standard deviation?

6                   Inbound Section II, the EIS rejected  
7 several alternatives to Route 92, such as the EPA  
8 alternatives and Route 522. No objective numerical  
9 criteria for rejecting these alternatives are  
10 given.

11                   What are the objective, numerical  
12 criteria under which each of the alternatives was  
13 rejected?

14                   Certain combinations of the rejected  
15 alternatives were considered, but many more  
16 potentially effective combinations were not. For  
17 each possible combination of alternatives, what  
18 were the objective, numerical criteria for  
19 considering or not considering that combination?

20                   The draft EIS states that public input  
21 was collected for the EIS in several ways.  
22 However, the draft EIS does not state that any such  
23 input was actually factored into the process and in  
24 the Army Corps statement of work for EIS reflected  
25 no consideration of public input.

1                   Why did the Army Corps seemingly  
2 dispense with all public input on the EIS scope of  
3 work? If it did not, then what public input was  
4 used in which specific parts of the statement of  
5 work, the DEIS and the final EIS?

6                   Why did the traffic studies not study  
7 the local roads and intersections which would be  
8 worst hit by the east-west traffic induced by Route  
9 92?

10                  Ridge, Heathcote and Laurel Avenues in  
11 Kingston, Canal Road in Franklin Township, Route  
12 603, 518 and 206 in Rocky Hill and Hopewell and  
13 Nassau Street, Route 27 in Princeton?

14                  A designated New Jersey scenic byway  
15 connects directly to the Route 92 study area.  
16 NJDOT is also seeking Federal designation of this  
17 scenic byway.

18                  What is the name and location of the  
19 scenic byway? What impacts would Route 92 have on  
20 the scenic byway? And where would these impacts to  
21 this scenic byway be included in the EIS?

22                  Have you made arrangements with the  
23 Microsoft Corporation to publish their copyrighted  
24 material in the EIS?

25                  The entire purpose of the proposed

1 roadway is to save people time; however, this would  
2 seem to boil down to a few minutes a day per  
3 driver. Were non-driving time saving alternatives  
4 considered?

5 For example, for a lot less money a  
6 high speed Internet connection could save people  
7 lot more time than Route 92 seems to. There would  
8 seem to be a myriad of other such alternatives.

9 If these were not considered, why not?

10 Finally, Donald Sweeney, a former  
11 employee of the Army Corps, blew the whistle on a  
12 similar study to this one. As an indirect result,  
13 the Pentagon rebuked the Army Corps of Engineers  
14 for manipulating studies and a systematic bias  
15 favoring large construction projects.

16 At what address may I send Mr. Sweeney  
17 a thank you letter?

18 Thank you for your time. You have  
19 many, many, many, many more questions like this in  
20 writing and look forward to your detailed answers.  
21 Thanks.

22 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Cap.

23 MR. CAP: Francis Cap.

24 I've resided in the Township for over  
25 16 years now and have been involved as an observer

1 and participated in this debate since 1968. Since  
2 that time we've experienced a transfer of the  
3 roadways, development rights from a purely public  
4 interest, the Department of Transportation to, what  
5 may be loosely defined as an autonomous body, the  
6 Turnpike. Of private good, I've met with the  
7 Governor past, state, county and local officials  
8 with a group called NO 92. The button should have  
9 more information than NO 92, but we couldn't  
10 include a lot of the questions that were brought to  
11 you guys here this evening.

12 We have experienced personally warm  
13 welcomes. The NO 92 group provided points to the  
14 Turnpike Authority. Usually stacked with  
15 proponents and far less decorum than you've  
16 provided us today. None of this has embittered me  
17 or clarity in which I wish to convey this evening.

18 This roadway, once touted as a  
19 regional planning tool, has vastly changed in  
20 concept from its inception. As a regional planning  
21 tool it no longer continues to merit the resources  
22 required to build it. Regional traffic studies may  
23 conclude enabling the Turnpike Authority to build,  
24 but not without first exploring many, many more  
25 improvements in the process. After review I would

1 highly doubt that we would come to the conclusion  
2 of that enablement.

3           If the improvements on Route 1  
4 systems, seemingly held hostage by this author  
5 against us, and the debate of 92 need to be  
6 included in the build-out study and analysis.

7           The completion and extension of Route  
8 92, the currently built east-west roadway is  
9 proposed to continue to Route 535. The realignment  
10 of the Turnpike through Exit 7, to remove the  
11 bottleneck which presently diverts Authority  
12 traffic onto the local roads, requires further  
13 analysis.

14           I find it humorous it does count as  
15 far as traffic mitigation in terms of development  
16 and empowerment of this roadway in their scenario.  
17 The residential section of the study of the New  
18 York Turnpike Authority Exit 8B, either at 522, 530  
19 terminus or Hightstown or further down should also  
20 be included in the portion of this analysis.

21           The widening of the road to mirror the  
22 effectiveness of South Brunswick Township's 522 for  
23 east-west traffic flow need to be included.

24           The syndrome of other Townships  
25 steering this missing link of the transportation

1 puzzle through my backyard and our community have  
2 an equal responsibility actions through both local,  
3 county improvements on existing north-south and  
4 east-west roadways.

5                   The hearing minutes and subsequent  
6 analysis need to be incorporated before a decision  
7 is rendered for the results to be fair, impartial  
8 and sound. If the hearings are only designed to  
9 interpret material from the builder, the  
10 benefactor, without looking microscopically at the  
11 region, then justice cannot be served this day.  
12 One can argue the improvements outlined create and  
13 stimulate jobs and smart growth as existing zoning  
14 is to increased development. It will stimulate  
15 commercial development along Routes 1 and 130, both  
16 inside and outside this Township. It will maintain  
17 the home rule of local governance.

18                   Someone once said if you build it,  
19 they will come.

20                   I'm proposing, if you improve them, we  
21 will stay, they will come and all will prosper.

22                   In summary, regional traffic issues  
23 cannot be remedied with a single look at a single  
24 road primarily situated in a single Township. The  
25 enabling label, the granting of the permit, if

1 supported without a holistic look by the Corps,  
2 would be a disservice to you, this flag and all.

3 Thank you.

4 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Ed Lugin.  
5 Following Mr. Lugin would be Mr. Mark Peel.

6 MR. LUGIN: Ed Lugin. I live in  
7 Monmouth Junction, South Brunswick Township.

8 The reason I came here tonight -- I  
9 don't have a preplanned speech because I didn't  
10 intend to come here because I knew nothing about  
11 this meeting until I received some information from  
12 a friend of mine that there was a discussion and  
13 the prime alternate for Route 92 was Route 522.

14 So I came here and listened to a lot  
15 of information. I can see why everybody is upset  
16 about 92.

17 I live between New Road and 522. I  
18 don't live in a warehouse, but anyway there is  
19 quite a few people that live on 522. I'm learning  
20 a little bit. I probably like to get a transcript  
21 of this after and look at it a little more to  
22 understand a little more.

23 Just from the meeting tonight, I see  
24 two things and heard some things that confuse me  
25 very much.

1                   One is that this 92 seems to be a  
2                   personal corridor of some kind for advocates of  
3                   real estate, Princeton University area and so forth  
4                   by talking to some people here, their opinion. I  
5                   guess that's true to some extent.

6                   Another thing is it seems to be a road  
7                   that goes nowhere. The Councilman from South  
8                   Brunswick I think said that.

9                   Another thing that confuses me is  
10                  Route 522 is an alternate. Route 92 would go to  
11                  where Ridge Road and Route 1 meet. 522 goes to  
12                  Route 1 approximately, I would think from driving  
13                  it, a mile, mile and a half north of there. I  
14                  think the impact is the same, two roads going  
15                  nowhere.

16                  Why did South Brunswick Township, if  
17                  they said they spent the money to build 522, spend  
18                  the money to a road that goes nowhere? That's  
19                  another thing that confused me. If you hook that  
20                  up with the Turnpike with the extension, you go  
21                  down 522 in the morning towards Route 1 and make a  
22                  left turn going south on 1, unless you want to go  
23                  into somebody's housing development, that's the way  
24                  you will go. It might take you two or three lights  
25                  to make the turn which might be one and a half, two

1 and a half, three minutes. That's without it being  
2 extended to the Turnpike.

3 What's going to be the impact of  
4 traffic once extended to the Turnpike? It will  
5 take 15 minutes to make a left turn on Route 1.  
6 Route 1 is bogged down anyway.

7 I'm a little confused why either road  
8 is going to Route 1 when nothing happens to Route 1  
9 and Route 1 can't handle the traffic it has now.

10 That's all I wanted to say, my  
11 personal opinion of the meeting. I need to read  
12 more about it and maybe I'll see some other things.

13 Thank you.

14 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Peel.

15 MR. PEEL: Mark Peel. Kingston  
16 Village.

17 On page 4-52 of the Draft EIS is a  
18 chart that summarizes the benefits of 92. The road  
19 will shave an average of 2.5 minutes off an area  
20 commute by the year 2028.

21 With this document we've taken "smart  
22 growth" to new levels of Orwellian absurdity: A  
23 proposal to fill critical wetlands and dump  
24 thousands of vehicles in the Village of Kingston,  
25 at a cost of 400 million, in order to save

1 commuters two and a half minutes.

2                   This EIS is extremely timid in its  
3 projections, but my guess is even the two and a  
4 half minutes savings are vastly overstated. We  
5 need only look a few miles to the north to see what  
6 effect Route 92 will have on Central New Jersey.

7                   Earlier this evening some evoked the  
8 spirit of Robert Moses. I'll tell you a story  
9 about him.

10                   In his biography of Robert Moses, The  
11 Power Broker, historian Robert Caro traces the  
12 sprawl and congestion repeatedly induced by  
13 Moses's gargantuan highway projects.

14                   At the ribbon cutting for the Grand  
15 Central Parkway, politicians and press praised the  
16 new highway saying, "It would solve the problem of  
17 access to Long Island 'for generations'".

18                   But the Grand Central Parkway solved  
19 the problem for about three weeks. Then it was the  
20 site of what the Herald Tribune called the greatest  
21 traffic tie-up in the history of the New York  
22 Metropolitan area.

23                   This was in 1936 and I think you could  
24 argue this traffic jam has persisted as the daily  
25 routine without interruption for 68 years.

1                   Moses's answer to this fiasco is that  
2 more highways and bridges were needed. So a  
3 succession of parkways and freeways encircled New  
4 York and Long Island like choking vines, all of  
5 them jammed to capacity within months of opening.

6                   One of them is like this road,  
7 Bronx-Whitestone bridge six million three hundred  
8 vehicles in the first year. It carried at the end  
9 of that year traffic experts calculated it only  
10 reduced traffic on the neighboring Triborough  
11 Bridge by 122,000 trips. Somehow that bridge  
12 generated six million additional new motor trips.  
13 It had not improved traffic at all, it made it  
14 worse.

15                   Where in this EIS are the projected  
16 increases that are sure to come if Route 92 is  
17 built? The EIS was clearly prepared with the  
18 assumption our traffic problems are caused by  
19 inadequate roads. This is insanity.

20                   New Jersey needs transportation  
21 solutions, not more roads. Get out on any New  
22 Jersey highway at virtually anytime of day and you  
23 will see an endless parade of single occupant  
24 vehicles. The one car family is a distant memory.  
25 The average New Jersey household now owns 2.4 motor

1 vehicles. The highest in the nation. Even high  
2 school seniors drive to school. The costs are  
3 enormous. Kids aren't safe on the streets, not  
4 because of pedophiles, but because from cars  
5 whizzing through neighborhoods at ridiculous  
6 speeds.

7                   Route 92 is emblematic of the worse of  
8 this car culture. Traffic in Central New Jersey is  
9 impossible because there are too many cars making  
10 too many trips that cover too many miles.

11                   When Route 92 was resuscitated back in  
12 1998, the number 1 selling car in American was the  
13 Toyota Camry. It average 22 miles to the gallon  
14 and emitted eight point six tons of greenhouse gas  
15 in an average year. That's when all this study  
16 started.

17                   Today the best selling vehicle is the  
18 Ford Explorer. It consumes 33 percent more fuel  
19 than the Camry and produces 28 percent more  
20 greenhouse emissions, 11 tons per vehicle per year.

21                   An EIS study of alternatives that  
22 fails to come to terms with the impact of bigger,  
23 greedier, dirtier, more dangerous personal  
24 vehicles, making longer and longer daily commutes  
25 is not an EIS at all: it is a suicide packet.

1                   Under what concept of sound regional  
2     planning do we pave over wetlands and sacrifice  
3     historic villages so that commuters in gas guzzling  
4     SUVs can save two and a half minutes in their 15  
5     mile commute?

6                   A sane transportation policy would  
7     help localities recover the true cost of single  
8     occupant automobiles in the form of commuter taxes  
9     and fuel consumption, emissions, distance traveled  
10    and vehicle size and type. Measures that might  
11    encourage people to live nearer where they work.

12                  Spending 350 or 400 or 500 million to  
13    make it easier to pursue our present  
14    self-destructive course is like handling an  
15    alcoholic a bottle of booze or perhaps more  
16    accurately like a parent who can't control an  
17    unruly child.

18                  We, the driving public, who whine  
19    about gas prices and now sending soldiers to war to  
20    keep the flow of oil coming, we are that spoiled  
21    child. Instead of pandering to our gas guzzling  
22    appetite like a craven parent who tries to by the  
23    kids love, this should be what we are doing to our  
24    environment and communities. We need a good  
25    spanking.

1 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: We are going to  
2 take a five-minute break.

3 (RECESS TAKEN.)(AFTER RECESS.  
4

5 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Please cease your  
6 individual discussions and I'm asking you to please  
7 approach the podium.

8 Dorothy Renk. Then David W. Luck.

9 MS. RENK: My name is Dorothy Renk.  
10 I'm a resident of Kingston.

11 Dear Corps members: We've noticed  
12 some items overlooked by the study and would like  
13 to know if you would take these into account.

14 Number one alternates to 92 have  
15 already been built such as Route 522 which can  
16 handle high-speed traffic.

17 Two. 92 would increase pollution of  
18 your air because it drops off traffic right at  
19 Ridge Road which leads to our town and several  
20 others. Alkaline is one of the toxins from  
21 gasoline emissions that causes cancer and the town  
22 already has a higher than average incident of  
23 cancer.

24 92 will cause toxic runoff into our  
25 underground aquifers that supply our drinking

1 water. Thus it will pollute our water wells. 92  
2 destroys our wetlands, our Township wetlands, and  
3 we were promised by politicians all the way up to  
4 the governor's office that wetlands would be  
5 preserved.

6 We basically will now and in the  
7 future flip the bill for 92, a road which we do not  
8 want built. How can you let this happen?

9 We have to ask now a study that  
10 addresses none of our, our towns or our Township's  
11 concerns be fair in determining whether or not 92  
12 should be built. Please say no to 92. Work on  
13 bearing the quality of life in our town and  
14 Townships.

15 Thank you.

16 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: I need to be clear  
17 about this. David W. luck, president, and George  
18 G. Luck, trustee and past chief, Kingston  
19 volunteer, fire company 1.

20 MR. LUCK: My name is David Luck. I  
21 am the president of the Kingston volunteer fire  
22 company and I represent to you this evening the  
23 volunteer firefighters of the Kingston community  
24 that will be responding to call and do respond to  
25 calls now in this area.

1                   Our main concern is one we expressed  
2                   previously at the last public meeting and is one of  
3                   response-types. In fact, since our last public  
4                   meeting here in this facility, we had an incident,  
5                   we could not pull out of our fire department to  
6                   respond to a call to this hotel because of the  
7                   traffic.

8                   Second, when we are responding to an  
9                   emergency. With the advent of Route 92  
10                  construction, we see only things getting worse. We  
11                  have been in the fire service now for over 80 years  
12                  and in that time we've seen no matter what type of  
13                  road construction takes place, things only get  
14                  worse. We've never seen any type of construction  
15                  in the way of traffic and highways that has  
16                  improved situations.

17                  We are in a growing community,  
18                  understandable. But again the response time is  
19                  very critical for us.

20                  We also wanted to bring to light a  
21                  concern in reviewing the report, and that is, the  
22                  inaccuracy of our response area. It was indicated  
23                  in the report that Kingston covered the southwest  
24                  portion to the Route 92. I'll stand before you  
25                  tonight and explain to you that the response area

1 of the volunteer fire department along Route 1  
2 corridor extends from Independence Way, which is  
3 the borderline of South Brunswick and Plainsboro up  
4 to and through Route 522, both on the east and west  
5 sides of Route 1.

6 In fact, in that Ridge Road area we  
7 cover up to and the area of Greenlands Boulevard  
8 and Perrine Road, both of which are on the  
9 eastbound side of Route 1.

10 We ask the record be properly  
11 reflected of the coverage area of the fire  
12 department.

13 As a primary response unit, our  
14 concern is the response time. We noted in the  
15 report you had indications one way of alleviating  
16 some of the concerns for high-speed traffic were  
17 traffic humps. Traffic humps are something on a  
18 thoroughfare the Kingston Fire Department is  
19 opposed to. They do have a direct impact on our  
20 response time and for a thoroughfare of any sort  
21 that is connecting one area to another, we would be  
22 opposed to any type of humps that would take that  
23 type of action. We ask you give that consideration  
24 and address that in your follow-up.

25 I guess parts that have struck me as

1 we reviewed the whole report is that the emphasis  
2 on reserving local streets for the local traffic  
3 and we would love to do that, but we in the Village  
4 of Kingston realize we are on a thoroughfare that  
5 dates back to the times of the Indians and that was  
6 Route 27, was an Indian trail that has evolved over  
7 the period of time and we understand as time moves  
8 forward things change, but we also know that with  
9 good planning and review of the other options and  
10 considerations have been presented already this  
11 evening, there are alternatives to the Route 92.  
12 We ask that be given consideration.

13 I think the chief of police earlier  
14 today reported on the number of traffic injuries on  
15 Route 1. Specifically addressing the area we  
16 covered from 522 down through Independence Way,  
17 that's a concern for us as well.

18 The other area that we have found a  
19 number of our calls, in fact, the increase in our  
20 response has been in the area of the hotels.  
21 Kingston for a very small community covers seven,  
22 soon to be eight hotels/motels in this area. 75  
23 percent of those require access through this  
24 intersection here, Route 1/Ridge Road. That is for  
25 us very critical and covers a very large part of a

1 transient population and we are very concerned for  
2 that. We ask that be given consideration as well.

3 I thank you for your time.

4 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Chief  
5 Luck.

6 Sol Tuller. On deck Carl Postman.

7 MR. TULLER: Sol Tuller. I live in  
8 Kingston. I'm not a member of any group,  
9 association, board. I'm not an elected official,  
10 not an un-elected official. I just live here.

11 If my remarks seem a little bit just  
12 off the cuff, they are. I just decided to speak as  
13 I came in here today.

14 I noticed the map outside. It's a  
15 good map, it shows the alternates. Doesn't show  
16 the Kingston or Rocky Hill historic site. A  
17 gentleman pointed to a slight and showed Kingston.  
18 It was obvious from the slide and word. The study  
19 was basically in the Plainsboro area. I feel the  
20 study has been done in point A to B plus 100 feet  
21 either way. It didn't consider the communities  
22 that might be destroyed by this road.

23 If we talk about the effect on the  
24 area, we have to use the word "area" in a much  
25 larger context literally. I don't like to cast

1       aspersions on elected officials. I will anyway  
2       right now.

3                       I think that the elected officials of  
4       Plainsboro are very shortsighted and I think I will  
5       digress. I don't consider it a digression. There  
6       is a complex built down the road from me. My  
7       personal feeling is I don't think they worried  
8       about the traffic that much because the traffic  
9       will be in Kingston and that small part of  
10      Plainsboro. Most of Plainsboro is the other side  
11      of Route 1.

12                      When I hear the support for Route 92,  
13      I feel deja vu. I don't answer to this stuff. I  
14      don't think Route 92 is it. Deja vu.

15                      I think it should be said, for my  
16      remarks, you should be congratulated for the way  
17      you've run this meeting. Thank you.

18                      LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: I'm struggling  
19      with this name. Carl Postman.

20                      William Flimmer? William J. Buchanan?  
21      Geri Luongo.

22                      MR. BUCHANAN: William J. Buchanan.

23                      I'm a resident of Monmouth Junction.  
24      South Brunswick Township Environmental Engineer  
25      with 20 years experience with Federal, state,

1 municipal, Government agencies. I wish to address  
2 concerns for the Draft EIS design, Route 92 and  
3 water quality issues, Section 4.

4           The EIS states the stormwater from  
5 proposed Route 92 could carry significant amounts  
6 of vehicle related contaminants from the roadway 92  
7 surface and groundwater resources.

8           The design and EIS proposes detention  
9 basins to mitigate this problem, except the area  
10 near AmTrak lines will have stormwater flow  
11 directly into the adjacent wetlands. Is it  
12 acceptable to destroy the wetlands or does this  
13 prohibit actually the construction of this  
14 particular section of roadway?

15           The EIS notes the design engineer may  
16 be required to add additional treatment or  
17 demonstrate the proposed stormwater basins remove  
18 80 percent of the total intended solids load. It  
19 is imperative the final EIS addresses this design  
20 criteria even if it demonstrates Route 92 is no  
21 longer feasible.

22           The concern of South Brunswick, water  
23 supply. The EIS indicates the Route 92 project  
24 will not impact the current water supply. What  
25 about future water supply? 50 percent growth in 20

1 years is indicated by EIS. The Bureau of Water  
2 Allocation and should manage this management  
3 program.

4 This agency was not consulted on this issue.  
5 Final EIS must address this issue. South  
6 Brunswick, where will it get its water in the  
7 future?

8 As a construction engineer, I've  
9 loaded about 200 truckloads of various fill  
10 material. I've spoke with many truckers in this  
11 period of time. New Jersey Turnpike officials seem  
12 to believe that truckers like to pay tolls. Why  
13 are so many interstate truckers on Route 130 and  
14 bypassing the New Jersey Turnpike? Truckers will  
15 use 522 instead.

16 I believe New Jersey Turnpike should  
17 perhaps consider adding benches and maybe a walkway  
18 and bike path as there probably will not be any  
19 traffic on Route 92, but 522 instead.

20 A final EIS must be issued with the  
21 public input prior to the issuance of a permit for  
22 this roadway. I would be pleased to read this EIS  
23 in its final form.

24 Thank you.

25 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Geri Luongo.

1 Alan Goldsmith.

2 MR. GOLDSMITH: Resident of Kingston.

3 I lived in New Jersey for nine years, all of that  
4 time in Kingston.

5 I did have prepared remarks, but  
6 everybody has spoken so eloquently and cogently and  
7 powerfully about why Route 92 should not get built,  
8 I can't hope to compete with that. I just want to  
9 go on record as being against it also.

10 I was struck when I drove to Exit 8A  
11 on the Turnpike from Route 1 in Kingston to see  
12 what the big deal was. I was shocked at the amount  
13 of time it took, 10 to 12 minutes. Along very good  
14 roads. This was during rush hour in both  
15 directions and included stopping for three lights I  
16 think.

17 To spend this kind of money, hundreds  
18 of millions of dollars, this state can ill-afford  
19 to destroy precious farmland and wetlands just to  
20 save three to five minutes, is absurd, it's  
21 scandalous. I think that all this energy and time  
22 has been spent to discuss this road when there are  
23 existing roads that are perfectly adequate. I  
24 don't understand it.

25 As I drive around this state, one of

1 the things that really strikes me is the way that  
2 areas, neighborhoods and communities are sliced up  
3 by ribbons of concrete. One road just a few  
4 hundred yards from another road just so people can  
5 get from one location that's already been destroyed  
6 to another location that's in the process of being  
7 destroyed. It just makes no sense to me and I  
8 think it's a sign, something Mark was referring to.

9                   The sickness of our society that we  
10 can send this ridiculous elevated roadway through a  
11 pristine area just to fill the private bank  
12 accounts of developers, add to Princeton  
13 University's already bloated endowment. It's not  
14 serving the public. At all.

15                   I wish that was taken into account,  
16 not just the money of powerful interest.

17                   Thank you.

18                   LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Goldsmith. Mr. Hwong.

20                   MR. HWONG: Corrington Hwong.

21                   Last time I spoke to a similar type  
22 panel was in 2000 and two things have changed.

23                   One, I have to wear glasses now to  
24 read; the other one, my son's is an officer in the  
25 Corps and in 2000 he was in Cutter Unit, he was in

1     Afganistan, today he's in Iraq.

2                     The Kingston Historic Society  
3     encourages the Corps to address impact of the  
4     proposed Route 92 on the immediately adjacent and  
5     extended regional historic communities and areas to  
6     Kingston. Numerous communities, most with  
7     districts and sites on the National Register of  
8     Historic Sites and Places, will be negatively  
9     impacted by the proposed Route 92.

10                    To the north and west of the  
11     intersection of Route 1 and proposed Route 92, this  
12     includes the villages and National Historic  
13     Districts of Kingston, Griggstown, and East  
14     Millstone and the River Road National Historic  
15     District in Montgomery Township. Nearby the  
16     Kingston Village National Historic District are the  
17     sister National Register Historic sites and  
18     districts of Rockingham, the house where George  
19     Washington resided while the Continental Congress  
20     met at Nassau Hall, Princeton University, the Red  
21     Maple Farm National Historic District and the  
22     Withington estate, Heathcote Farm, National  
23     Historic District. And several other National  
24     Register Historic Districts: The Kingston Mill,  
25     the Delaware and Raritan Canal and Lake Carnegie.

1                   Between the Kingston Village and the  
2 Red Maple Farm National Historic Districts are the  
3 Jediah Higgins house, the oldest residence in  
4 Franklin Township, and the Higgins family cemetery.  
5 The cemetery dates to the early 1700s. 200 yards  
6 from the Higgins family cemetery is a slave  
7 cemetery. Both sites are under archeological study  
8 by the Kingston Historical Society and the Higgins  
9 family, people who have inhabited Kingston since  
10 1675.

11                   Three other National Register Historic  
12 Districts and Sites that warrant special study for  
13 negative impact by additional traffic that may be  
14 generated by a Route 92 are the Princeton National  
15 Historic District, the Princeton battlefield, Stony  
16 Settlement Historic District Quaker Bridge, and the  
17 Lawrence Township Historic District, which includes  
18 the Lawrenceville school, a National Historic  
19 landmark. All three Districts' locations are  
20 located sited along what is known as the Kings  
21 Highway, a National Registered Historic Road. The  
22 road ties together and lies adjacent to no less  
23 than 15 National Registered Historic Districts,  
24 sites and landmarks.

25                   In all instances, Kingston Historic

1 Society is concerned that added noxious and acidic  
2 gasses plus traffic induced vibration will  
3 contribute to the accelerated destruction of these  
4 National Historic Districts or sites.

5                   Witness in Kingston Village at the  
6 intersection of Main Street, Route 27, and  
7 Heathcote Brood Road, the soot covered walls of  
8 buildings. The road only provides a 20 foot width  
9 within which trailer trucks and trucks carrying  
10 crushed stone travel daily through a purely  
11 residential area.

12                   It is this very road on June 25, 1778  
13 that the Continental Army marched their way through  
14 Kingston in 100 degree heat chasing English troops  
15 and engaging the British at the battle of  
16 Monmouth. The previous year, the Continentals had  
17 defeated the English at the battle of Princeton and  
18 camped in Kingston after the battle. At that time  
19 Washington held his famous conference on horseback  
20 in the Kingston Presbyterian Church cemetery. It  
21 was at the cemetery that Washington and his  
22 generals decided had to march north through the  
23 Millstone Valley along what is now Laurel Avenue,  
24 and Canal and River Roads, and winter at Jockey  
25 Hollow National Park, Morristown rather than attack

1 the English munitions depot and paymaster in New  
2 Brunwick.

3 Please note heading eastward from the  
4 center of Kingston, Heathcote Brook Road continues  
5 into Ridge Road, the very road that this Radisson  
6 Hotel is sited. 222 years ago, the Continental  
7 troops passed right by the building that this  
8 hearing is being held.

9 The National Parks Service conducted a  
10 National Heritage Corridor study for roadways which  
11 link the major American Revolutionary war  
12 battlefield sites in New Jersey.

13 Indeed, Kingston may be viewed as the  
14 center of the Crossroads of the Revolution.

15 Robert Caro's *The Power Broker*, a  
16 biography of road-builder Robert Moses, carries the  
17 theme that additional roads do not remove excessive  
18 traffic, but rather attract more traffic to the  
19 newly constructed road. New roads and bridges are  
20 traffic magnets.

21 The Kingston Historical Society  
22 encourages the Corps to thoroughly study potential  
23 additional traffic that would be attracted to and  
24 through communities north and west of the terminus  
25 of the proposed Route 92 and Route 1.

1                   Increased traffic does not improve  
2 congestion or traffic movement or the quality of  
3 life of the residents of Griggstown, East  
4 Millstone, Montgomery, Kingston, Rocky Hill,  
5 Hillsborough, millstone, Hopewell Borough, Hopewell  
6 Township, Pennington, Franklin, East Amwell or The  
7 West Amwells.

8                   Increased traffic does not make the  
9 communities noted viable. Increased traffic makes  
10 it difficult for people to live in the communities  
11 due to the annoyance of constant traffic, a change  
12 in the historically rural character of the  
13 villages, increased pollution from noxious and  
14 acidic gases, hydrocarbons, noise and light and  
15 vibration.

16                  The Society is concerned with the  
17 character of historic villages and roads which run  
18 through these fragile communities. We ask the  
19 Corps to have a degree of sensitivity about the  
20 negative impact increasing traffic would have on  
21 changing the rural character of these communities  
22 and roads. The reason these villages and roads  
23 have been identified as National Historic  
24 Districts, landmarks and sites is their unique  
25 character.

1 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Mr. Tim Sibley.  
2 Suzzane and Christopher Rolcke.  
3 Steven Reichenstein. On deck Lou  
4 Corsuro.

5 MR. REICHENSTEIN: Steve Reichenstein.  
6 Thank you for the way you are conducting our  
7 hearings and having them and being our guests. I  
8 thank all the people in the community that did all  
9 this research and presented all the details and  
10 facts.

11 I feel so honored to be in this  
12 community. We do come out after work and do this  
13 work and getting together and exercising our  
14 democratic rights and live in a country where we  
15 can do it.

16 I'm not happy with the facts of the  
17 program as I'm hearing it. Sounds like a limited  
18 information, some questionable information about  
19 the area. It's an old idea that seems to not be  
20 getting better with age and we're not listening,  
21 doesn't seem to be a lot of serious consideration,  
22 other alternatives.

23 Communities have been developing,  
24 dealing with the issue and are available and seems  
25 like there is a few people who want this to be done

1 and a lot of people who don't.

2 It's politics of division, labor  
3 against the community. Lot of negativism going on.  
4 That's disappointing.

5 I hope we listen to what people are  
6 saying tonight, look at more of the alternatives,  
7 look at more of the information plan, what happens  
8 at the end of this road, the next step, where does  
9 it go, what's happening there and where we go next.

10 Thank you. Thank you.

11 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Lou Corsuro.

12 Mr. Tom O'Toole.

13 Mr. Jeremy Pollack. Then Ashok Mishra  
14 would be on deck.

15 MR. POLLACK: Jeremy Pollack.

16 Resident of Kingston, South Brunswick Township for  
17 the last 30 plus years.

18 There have been a lot of hats worn  
19 tonight. One hat I haven't seen worn, this is not  
20 a prop. I came here tonight by bicycle. I'm going  
21 home by bicycle.

22 You're probably amused by the light at  
23 the top. It's a light until I turn it on and it  
24 blinks too. I'll spare you that.

25 It's a memorial light I added to this

1 helmet several months ago, after one of the sons of  
2 my co-workers was killed on Route 1 where the  
3 roadway narrows, where Plainsboro maintains a  
4 tunnel on Route 1 and the lack of length of that  
5 tunnel creates a pinch point to the roadway. If  
6 you travel there you will see the guardrails on  
7 either side are hit all the time by vehicles. I  
8 don't know the exact circumstances of this young  
9 man's death, but it raises the issue, yes, we need  
10 to widen Route 1, and also raises the issue of, I  
11 have to say carelessness or maybe something worse  
12 on the part of Princeton University not lengthening  
13 the tunnel they maintain on Route 1, allowing Route  
14 1 to be wide enough to have normal traffic lanes  
15 and shoulders.

16                   As I already stated, I came here on a  
17 bicycle. I'm a bicycle commuter everyday,  
18 year-round, in the rain and snow and everything. I  
19 commute round trip just about a bit longer than the  
20 proposed 92. My round trip is about seven and a  
21 half miles or thereabouts. Round trip takes me  
22 about 30 minutes.

23                   On many occasions at work, other  
24 people stop me in the hallway and ask me, gee, I  
25 passed you on the way here this morning, yet later

1 I see you got here before I did. How do you do it?

2 The answer is simple. Driving fast  
3 for short spurts is not necessarily the fastest way  
4 to get between two points. Slower and steadier  
5 progress often gets you there sooner. It's the old  
6 hare and turtle story all over again.

7 I don't know if anybody has time to  
8 read The New York Times today. I'm sure all of you  
9 have been very busy preparing for this hearing.  
10 The New York Times had a topically related article  
11 and I want to read a few extracts from that and get  
12 into the record. Titled Economic Scene, Does  
13 Highway Spending Really Payoff, by Virginia  
14 Postrel.

15 In theory infrastructure investments  
16 benefit taxpayers indirectly by increasing the  
17 nation's wealth.

18 How effective is this investment?

19 In an article in the March issue of  
20 The Journal of Urban Economics, two economists look  
21 at exactly how highway spending increases  
22 productivity by lowering business' inventory and  
23 logistics costs and calculate how the returns on  
24 highway spending have changed over time.

25 To make that calculation, Chad Shirley

1 of the Rand Corporation, that's research and  
2 development, original think tank, and Clifford  
3 Winston of the Brookings Institution, in  
4 Washington, a think tank, used census data on the  
5 inventory levels at 50,000 to 75,000 individual  
6 plants from 1973 to 1996. They looked at how  
7 infrastructure investment, both within each plant's  
8 state and across state lines, affected those costs  
9 holding constant other influences like interest  
10 rates and changing inventory practices.

11           The results are striking.  
12 Infrastructure spending does indeed lower inventory  
13 and logistics costs, increasing productivity. But  
14 at the rate of return plummeted over time from more  
15 than 15 percent in the 1970s to less than 5 percent  
16 in the '80s and '90s. These figures are corrected  
17 for inflation.

18           There is a logical reason for these  
19 diminishing returns.

20           This applies to highway construction.  
21 By the late '70s, the Interstate Highway System was  
22 substantially completed, the economists write.  
23 During the past two decades, the primary objective  
24 of highway spending has shifted from expanding the  
25 nation's capital stock to maintaining it.

1 Undoubtedly, the improvement in costs and service  
2 from such investments and the concomitant reduction  
3 in plants' inventories cannot compare with those  
4 produced by the construction of thousands of miles  
5 of new roads.

6                   Transportation economists meanwhile  
7 have looked at the specific details of the system:  
8 How roads are paid for, where they are built, what  
9 tradeoffs are made between up-front construction  
10 costs and maintenance, whether the road users pay  
11 the full costs they incur and so forth.

12                   Here is the punch line.

13                   The research has consistently found  
14 very poor performance, lots of inefficiencies, Dr.  
15 Winston said. The stuff is mispriced, the stuff is  
16 improperly built, there is a huge amount of waste.

17                   How could infrastructure spending be  
18 both productive and inefficient?

19                   Consider the choice between the  
20 immediate cost of building thicker roads in the  
21 first place and long-term costs of repairing  
22 thinner roads as they wear down. An economic  
23 calculation would have suggested thicker interstate  
24 highways, even ignore the cost of construction and  
25 traffic repairs.

1 Drivers might not care much about  
2 economic returns if highway --

3 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Sir, we will read  
4 the rest of the article later. You are out of  
5 time.

6 You can have a concluding remark.

7 MR. POLLACK: During the period Robert  
8 Moses was plowing roadways in and around New York,  
9 William Vickrey, the traffic commissioner for  
10 Figurola LaGuardia, was to have said, we thought we  
11 were making room for cars, but we ended up making  
12 more room for cars.

13 It seems some people are determined to  
14 do the same thing in this area too.

15 Thank you.

16 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Ashok Mishra.

17 Tony Beesley. Forwood Wise on deck.

18 MR. BEESLEY: Tony Beesley. I live at  
19 3 Euclid Avenue, one block southeast of Route 27,  
20 between Academy, which is a continuation of  
21 Mapletown Road and Heathcote, a continuation of  
22 Ridge Road. So it's right close to the center of  
23 the Village.

24 I haven't had a chance to study the  
25 report that other people are talking about or other

1 relevant documents. I've learned a lot from what  
2 other people have said. It's a testament to the  
3 quality and sense of community of the people that  
4 live around here.

5 My comments are much more kind of  
6 small scale and related to my own family situation  
7 and people that live on our street.

8 My wife and I, two children, age one  
9 and four, moved in here fairly recently. We were  
10 attracted to Kingston because we wanted to live in  
11 a place where we could do things on foot and  
12 bicycles instead of driving. From our house we can  
13 walk to the Delaware and Raritan Canal, walk to the  
14 deli and bakery and post office and fruit,  
15 vegetable market and other small businesses in  
16 Kingston.

17 In addition to the canal trail, by the  
18 Delaware and Raritan Canal trail, there is an  
19 extension trail that connects it to the Cook nature  
20 preserve just to the northeast of Ridge Road. That  
21 trail, actually you have to cross over Mapletown  
22 and Ridge Road to get to the Cook nature preserve.  
23 These are roads which would potentially be impacted  
24 by Route 92.

25 In addition, we spend a lot of time in

1 our yard and also we go to the playground across  
2 Route 27 and to get there, we go along Mapletown  
3 and cross over 27 and take Laurel up to the school  
4 where there is an open field and playground. That  
5 would also be impacted by Route 92. That's  
6 something we like to do and do it quite a bit.

7 We also spend a lot of time in our  
8 yard talking about and in the case of our children  
9 playing with our neighbors. Three of the dozen or  
10 so houses on our block have children, grandchildren  
11 are over every Saturday when the children's  
12 parents are out of the house.

13 Another aspect I like about living  
14 here, I bicycle commute to work. I work at Noah  
15 Laboratory which is on the Plainsboro Forrestal  
16 Campus and ride along Mapletown Road and take  
17 Sayrewood through a tunnel and it takes me to work.  
18 It's a really nice ride and a nice alternate to  
19 driving and something I look forward to.

20 Presently we are very happy with the  
21 situation in Kingston, for all the things I've  
22 said. It's a nice group of people, nice  
23 environment lots of parks and things that are  
24 offered.

25 However, there is one aspect that we

1 are concerned about and that is there is quite a  
2 bit of traffic on where Mapletown and Ridge Road  
3 meet up with 27. These roads are used a lot by  
4 cars, trucks, sometimes 18-wheelers. Used most of  
5 the time including evenings and weekends,  
6 especially during morning rush hours. The traffic  
7 on Mapletown Road waiting to cross Route 27  
8 routinely extends back across the Heathcote.

9                   This kind of traffic makes it  
10 difficult and potentially dangerous to cross  
11 Mapletown, the cars obscure the view of the traffic  
12 on the opposite lane. Is it up or getting close?  
13 This is something I have to do everyday.

14                   Another problem is some drivers cruise  
15 Euclid. The majority of the drivers are  
16 considerate, but at times, especially during rush  
17 hour when people are frustrated, we have cars  
18 driving through at unsafe speeds.

19                   I hope when my children are older they  
20 will be able to play on the road as I did when I  
21 was a child. With watching our children and  
22 ourselves and thoughtful planning locally, I think  
23 we can maintain and preserve and even improve the  
24 safety and quality of life we have right now.

25                   If Route 92 is built, I don't think we

1 will have a chance. The traffic is bound to  
2 increase in your Village. Not only will rush hour  
3 conditions get worse, but become the norm for the  
4 whole day and perhaps with an increased proportion  
5 of trucks.

6 My family and many others who also  
7 seem to walk around their Village will suffer a  
8 setback in terms of safety and quality of life.

9 I know these concerns seem selfish. I  
10 understand there are other alternatives of Route 92  
11 and proposed alignment. I'm not in favor of  
12 building any of these alternatives in place of 92.  
13 These will lead to degradation and safety and  
14 families impacted by those roads. It is time for  
15 transportation planners to make a genuine and  
16 serious effort to find alternatives that will  
17 enhance transportation and bike trails.

18 I would like to thank you for the  
19 opportunity of sharing my concerns and thank  
20 everyone else for coming out.

21 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Duke Wiser.

22 Debra Johnson.

23 Karen Linder spoke already.

24 MS. LINDER: Karen Linder.

25 To mitigate the affects on the

1 wetlands New Jersey Transportation Authority  
2 proposes to construct a 57-acre wetland north and  
3 south of the proposed highway alignment east of  
4 Pressed Road.

5                   However, at the end of the Draft EIS,  
6 in a letter dated May 4, '99, page 907 of Volume  
7 II, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife services expressed  
8 doubts about the mitigation proposed. They noted  
9 on page 918, wetlands at both sites would be  
10 constructed from upland fields by removing soils  
11 down to the water table.

12                   Approximately three feet of soil would  
13 be removed from the southern mitigation site,  
14 approximately 10 feet of soil from the northern  
15 mitigation site.

16                   They went on to say, successful  
17 construction of forested wetlands is difficult in  
18 this situation and made even more difficult by the  
19 removal of substantial quantities of soil in  
20 attempting to provide appropriate hydrologic  
21 conditions.

22                   I'm not a wetland engineer, but I am a  
23 gardener. Common sense tells me if I dug a 10 foot  
24 hole in my garden and then tried to grow something  
25 in the crappy subsoil in the bottom of that hole,

1 nothing would grow.

2                   But I could find no description in the  
3 Draft EIS of exactly what would be done after the  
4 so-called wetland was dug out. How can the public  
5 properly assess the environmental impact of this  
6 wetlands mission or its chance for success if there  
7 is no actual mitigation plan for identification?

8                   If the plan is to dig a hole down to  
9 the subsoil and see what goes, I would tell you to  
10 go back to mitigation school.

11                   Finally a comment, I won't speak to  
12 the traffic. A lot people have done it. I will  
13 speak to the traffic maps provided in the Draft  
14 EIS. Much of the numerical data provided on those  
15 maps had no road names. You had to spend a lot of  
16 time looking around saying, is that my road.

17                   The print that showed the traffic  
18 numbers was in a font about a half, maybe two,  
19 requirement to blow the document to about 400 times  
20 to be able to see it. When you blow it up that big  
21 you can't see any comprehensive sections of the  
22 map. That's a request for the next time. Perhaps  
23 this was intentional, you didn't really want people  
24 like us to look at those numbers. It was very user  
25 unfriendly.

1                   In the future, scale the font up just  
2 a little bit.

3                   Thanks.

4                   LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: Steven Georges.

5                   MR. GEORGES: Steven Georges and I  
6 live in the Plainsboro Walk development of South  
7 Brunswick.

8                   I would like to thank you for having  
9 this session tonight and everybody for coming down.  
10 I really admired all the thoughts of wisdom.

11                   I would like to go back to one of the  
12 prophets of an earlier generation who said, they  
13 paved paradise and put up a parking lot.

14                   I live in South Brunswick with my  
15 family, we moved from New York City about six years  
16 ago. All the people that are against this -- the  
17 pros for this are to reduce a commute time by three  
18 and a half minutes. I think we really have to be  
19 honest with what is the pro for this. The pro is  
20 there are a number of interests that would like to  
21 build this road. There are other alternatives that  
22 are not just building roads.

23                   For several years I commuted everyday  
24 to New York. I took the bus from the 8A parking  
25 lot. When I first moved to town I could go there

1 any time of the day or night and park easily. In  
2 the last three years, if you are not there by 7:30,  
3 you can't park.

4 So I wrote a Councilman in South  
5 Brunswick and asked, why doesn't this get expanded.

6 And he said, good question.

7 All the land around it is owned by the  
8 New Jersey Turnpike. So I said, so this is so they  
9 can get more people to be on their road and now  
10 they want to build another road?

11 I don't get it. Why aren't some of  
12 the alternatives expanding park and rides?

13 Today I rode my bicycle down through  
14 Kingston to Princeton Forrestal campus where I have  
15 a new start-up company. I'm very glad I'm working  
16 here in the Plainsboro area. As I rode through I  
17 just said, how would the character of all of this  
18 area that attracted my family here change.

19 I would like to just end with saying,  
20 first, do no harm and I think that building this  
21 road is something that once you do it you can't go  
22 back.

23 So I really think we need more public  
24 discourse and want to congratulate everybody for  
25 coming down tonight. Thank you.

1 LTC. KURT HOFFMANN: That concludes the  
2 list, unless someone who intended to speak but  
3 missed their calling has now arrived. I'll  
4 certainly give you an opportunity.

5 Let it be noted there are no  
6 additional speakers. That concludes the session  
7 then this is the end of the hearing.

8 Thank you.

9

10 (TIME NOTICED: 11:25 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, ALBERT M. CITTONE, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the statements, colloquy and testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to any of the parties in this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of June 2002.

-----

ALBERT M. CITTONE

Notary Public of the State of New Jersey

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, RUTHANNE UNGERLEIDER, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the deposition of said witness(es) who were first duly sworn by me, on the date and place hereinbefore set forth.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither attorney, nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this action, nor am I financially interested in this case.

---

RUTHANNE UNGERLEIDER, C.S.R.