



Minutes: Design and Infrastructure Meeting at Fall Quarterly BPAC Meeting - September 24, 2014, Rm. 261, Bloustein School, 11:00 am

The group focused on four major discussion points:

1. Complete Streets implementation
2. Best practice case studies
3. Linking policies with development design
4. ADA and vulnerable users

Discussion began by asking if group felt that other stakeholders should be invited to the group. One attendee suggested local land use planners, but concerns were that that might not be the best use of time for group. Perhaps land use planners should be invited to work with the legislative group. Decided that later, as needed, group can reach out to others.

Discussion then moved on to first area of focus:

Complete Streets and the disconnect between policy adoption and implementation at the local, and also the state level.

Brief discussion on how there has been plenty of reason to be jaded due to lack of movement in implementation, but that there is no need to lose hope as there is plenty of opportunity for future change.

Discussion on the need for model design standards for towns to adopt so that they **can be used and referenced in development applications**.

State DOT has been putting in a lot of effort in promoting policy implementation, but need next steps. Should this group work to provide or make available standard details? Is there a need to create more tools?

There is a need to create more incentives for implementation. One idea is modifying the scoring system for funding so that proof of previous implementation is weighted favorably.

Discussion briefly returned to stakeholders, especially with need for more county reps in discussion. Idea that more county reps in group may result in more implementation. There are too many municipalities to do the same with them, but home rule must be kept in mind.

Concerns came up about disconnect at the state level between policy and implementation. Member from Bergen County spoke of issue when town wanted complete street but State DOT came in and did not do that on their roadway. Question was asked about how to get local municipal engineers and planners on board with implementation of state does not lead? Question if DOT project managers really get it. Also spoke of example



how many times local stakeholders don't see project until it has been fully designed, at which point too late to go back and change.

Should this advisory group work to point out the failures? Is that advocacy? Or should group work to point out best practices and showcases? Idea to use blog and website as platform, possibility to create "top 10 implementation" list. Can also use website to showcase model ordinance examples, and model standard detail examples.

Question about what has been the barrier to implementation, aside from lack of incentive? Why aren't the project designers already looking at best practices? The information already exists.

Again question came up about where the line is between advising and advocating.

Topic moved to next area of focus: **vulnerable road users and ADA problems.**

State has ADA compliance issues which would become DOJ issue. ADA is not a luxury, it is required. How does group use this information to advise DOT?

Like with Complete Streets, group can work to show best practices and example for implementing ADA in difficult areas. Can show how requirements like cross-slope were met in difficult situations. Also need to find ways to connect people with these best practices to smooth over the process.

Committee is also a good way to exchange knowledge. By discussing ADA issues and solutions within the group, that knowledge can be taken back and shared with "day job" organizations.

Group members spoke of experience on how applications to programs like TAP and SRTS are still being submitted with serious ADA issues. Guidance needed early on so projects can be submitted properly.

Discussion then moved to concerns about how these applications can be onerous with all their requirements. Members spoke of how they knew of projects that didn't apply to grants because of concerns over red-tape and costs to just get through process. Noted that this red-tape is a result of legal requirements.