The project team began the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation introducing the project and presenting the proposed design. The presentation was followed by a questions, comments and responses. Project team members include:

**Project Sponsor**  Jersey City  Jennifer Cato - Acting Director of Traffic Engineering  
**Funding Agency**  NJTPA  Christine Mittman - Manager Local Safety Programs  
**Consulting Engineer**  WSP  Edgardo Perez - Project Manager and Lead Engineer  
WSP  Athanasios (Thanasi) Georgiadis, Engineer

The following are comments and questions from the meeting Chat in the order they were posed as well as responses to the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Question</th>
<th>C: Comment</th>
<th>R: Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q  In round numbers, how many of these projects on this list have included protected bike lanes, the standard for enabling alternative transportation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>R  This question is referring to slide 2 in the presentation which lists 14 projects in Jersey City federally funded through the Local Safety program since 2011. Montgomery Street and Marin Boulevard projects include buffered bike lanes. Garfield Avenue has an existing bike lane in one direction which will be evaluated during preliminary engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  When you say that the Lincoln Park intersection (Belmont and West Side Avenue (WSA)) isn't part of the project, does that mean that there will not be any safety improvements at that intersection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>R  This is a County-controlled signalized intersection. Jersey City is the project sponsor and can only make improvements on their roadways and facilities. Improvements to this intersection would have to be initiated by Hudson County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  Can you please email this presentation out to all after?</td>
<td></td>
<td>R  The presentation has been added to the project’s information on this page: <a href="https://www.jerseycitynj.gov/residentresources/transportation/trafficsafety">https://www.jerseycitynj.gov/residentresources/transportation/trafficsafety</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Way too many crashes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Thank you for flagging Lexington Ave - this intersection is a nightmare, and especially with the library branch and COVID testing site there. I cannot more strongly stress the need for changes here, we don't even have a crosswalk!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian collisions are the most concerning here, as a major route for pedestrians and bicyclists to Lincoln Park.

Where are the improvements with regards to protected bicycle lanes? I don't see protected bike lanes listed here.

A bike lane option was included in the presentation. The City will consider comments from the public as well as impacts and make a decision as to whether to incorporate bike lanes in this project.

Regarding “pedestrian crossing times”, has this ever been adjusted in the past?

If a pedestrian crossing time is deemed to be too short, it can be adjusted. If there are specific crossings of concern, contact Jennifer Cato via e-mail to discuss further.

How will we slow cars down/remove the dangerous driving and speeds?

One of the benefits of curb extensions is visual narrowing of the roadway which tends to slow drivers. The proposed edgelines will encourage drivers to stay within defined lanes.

What about curb extensions for crossings that are corner-to-midblock?

Yes, curb extensions are proposed at these locations.

Are there going to be safe bike lanes? There is currently no safe way to travel north/south in this part of JC. West Side Avenue would be a good candidate because vehicle speeds are low.

See the prior response regarding the bike lane option.

There are a lot of mis-aligned intersections on this corridor.

Are there going to be any signal timing changes to favor pedestrians such as lower cycle lengths or LPIs?

Signal timing adjustments will be determined in final design.

I strongly agree with the need for better bicycle infrastructure here with it being both a major north/south route, as well as providing access to recreation in Lincoln Park.

Could you incorporate raised crosswalks with those Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs)?

There is a traffic volume limitation of 3,000 vehicles per day (vpd) where speed humps, raised crosswalks and/or raised intersection tables can be installed without approval from the NJDOT.
Traffic counts analyzed along the WSA corridor show Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) between 8,870 and 10,675, well in excess of the 3,000 vpd limit. 

Link: Speed Hump Law, Engineering (state.nj.us) 

There is legislation currently proposed to increase the limit to 4,000 vpd.

C We have an RRFB on this corridor at Harrison and it is currently very badly respected by drivers.

C Yes, RRFBs by themselves do not appear to work in Jersey City (see Newark Ave)

C There are RRFBs in other locations around Jersey City and they rarely work. Cars still do not stop for pedestrians. I would re-think that.

Q For the RRFBs, are there any options that don’t require pedestrian to activate? When someone has limited mobility, or has a stroller (again this is by a library), it is onerous to try to position yourself to activate it.

R There is infrared type detection technology that can activate the RRFB when a pedestrian enters and remains in the area. This will be considered during final design.

C Really needs the raised crosswalk which helps slow traffic and increase pedestrian visibility

Q Will the RRFBs include a flashing “ahead” module or only at the crosswalk itself?

R The RRFB is to be placed at the crosswalk and does not include an advanced RRFB. RRFB locations will be further reviewed in the Final Design phase of the project and will follow the Federal MUTCD guidelines.

C Another vote for a protected bike lane--I ride West Side Ave to Lincoln Park. We need bike lanes on this road.

Q What will you do to remove and mitigate e-bikes from riding on the new sidewalks and green infrastructure?

R This is an enforcement issue and the City will continue to work with the police department regarding enforcement of bikes riding on sidewalks.

C Strongly in favor of green infrastructure wherever we can place these pits and plantings.

C Curb extensions + rain gardens however are effective and appreciated

C I agree that RRFBs are not enough to provide pedestrian safety in these areas. There are a lot of children and high risk pedestrians walking here and drivers do not consistently stop for them.
Really surprised at no mention of protected bike lanes given the climate and congestion goals

RRFBs at Lexington should definitely be paired with curb extensions or other hard protections.

Also no loading zones to reduce double parking?

Existing loads zones will remain and one new loading zone is proposed.

Has bike parking been incorporated into this plan, especially along the retail corridor?

Bike racks will be incorporated into the project.

Is any space being designed - and infrastructure being installed to support local businesses who currently or may have curbside dining?

No, that is not a consideration in Local Safety Program projects. The intent of this federally funded program is safety improvements to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes.

Have you considered making Bergen a one way street?

It is not within the scope of this project. The City has not yet evaluated the feasibility of bike lanes along Bergen Ave.

I think the curb extensions are a great way to make crossing safer and improve sightlines for all road users.

That drawing doesn’t look to scale

These bike lanes, of course, happen to also fill the same function as the previously shown bumpouts, channeling and calming traffic

This would make the corridor so much safer and more pleasant for all users!

How wide are the travel lanes in the bike lane plan?

The minimum travel lane width will be 11 feet.

Given the current climate crisis, reducing parking is a small price to pay to increase safety for ever increasing numbers of cyclists. A cycle track of 8’ is incredibly narrow and doesn't allow for easy passing with significant bike traffic.

Buses and the bike lanes coexist fine on Bergen!
All for the bike lanes

Buses conflict with everything as it is right now

West Side Ave would become so much more vibrant with protected bike lanes! I know I am not alone in saying I would frequent the businesses much more if I had a safe way of cycling there.

It says the cycle track would conflict with curb extensions, but could the cycle track not involve pedestrian islands at intersections to achieve the same purpose as a curb extension?

Cycle track would provide safe alternatives

Who is the lead engineer on this project?

WSP is the design consultant and Edgardo Perez is project manager and lead engineer from WSP.

NYCDOT has installed cycle tracks like that

Is any Transit Signal Priority being considered to improve the bus route travel times?

Typically bus priority signals are utilized when there is a lane where the bus could bypass the traffic. West Side Avenue is one lane in each direction, so it is not being considered.

If the street had one of the bike lane options, that doesn't mean people can't choose to drive in the area. It just means they might have to walk another block to their destination. If we prioritize parking, however, it would discourage cycling, especially within underrepresented communities.

Another voice calling for bike lanes. this road is far too dangerous to cyclists without them.

Status quo is buses conflict with everything along that corridor right now

Grand and Grove Street, while done with paint and plastic bollards, is an *excellent* design that shows how bike lanes and curb extensions coexist very well

I agree that loading zones should be planned for (it sounded like the plan will involve just inventorifying current loading zones)

How will the removal of parking spots affect the businesses on these blocks?

The proposed layout does not eliminate legal parking spaces. The proposed curb extensions and bus bulbs will, however, prevent illegal parking along the corridor.
C It would improve business. People are more likely to make quick stops on bikes or by foot than in cars.

Q Is there any data that has been compiled in terms of the number of cyclists using the current bike lane infrastructure that exists?

R Data collected by the City has been added to the project’s information on this page: https://www.jerseycitynj.gov/residentresources/transportation/trafficsafety

Q I understand all new roads being created or redeveloped in Jersey City have to have protected bike lanes in Jersey City. Is this still the case?

R The City’s Complete Streets Policy includes the following language:

Establishes that all public street projects, both new construction and reconstruction (excluding maintenance) undertaken by the City of Jersey City shall be designed and constructed as "Complete Streets" whenever feasible to do so in order to safely accommodate travel by pedestrians, bicyclists; public transit, and motorized vehicles and their passengers, with special priority given to pedestrian safety.

Here is a link to the resolution: Complete Streets JC Res. 11-317.pdf (civiclive.com)

The City also adopted the Bike Master Plan which developed the overall bikeway network, inclusive of protected bike lanes throughout the city. Depending on a number of factors, such as roadway width and community context, protected bike lanes may not be the appropriate facility for every street; however, the City is committed to prioritizing the safety of its most vulnerable users in a holistic manner.

C We had a horrible crash there months ago. That's terrible.

C The municipal lots on WSA are underutilized as it is.

C Turnover on cheap or free parking spaces is very low. Studies show that separated bike lanes improve commercial activity, and given the state of the streets, very importantly, safety for all road users.

Q So 3 out of 14 have protected bike lanes (PBLs), 2 of them not yet built. Hypothetically, if this WSA project does NOT include PBLs, what other nearby, parallel route up and down the southern/central part of JC on the West Side would get them? If this is NOT the place for them, where will you put them?

R A bike lane option was included in the presentation. The City will consider comments from the public as well as impacts and make a decision as to whether to incorporate bike lanes in this
The City will also consider the installation of bike lane facilities on parallel north-south routes.

Project link: https://usa.streetsblog.org/2019/05/29/protect-yourself-separated-bike-lanes-means-safer-streets-study-says/

I wouldn’t want bike lanes instead of buses, but how can we decide whether parking is more important than bike safety? There is no alternate route for bikes, if JFK or Bergen had bike lanes it might be more manageable.

“pedestrian crossing times” are absolutely too short.

Study link: here’s another on both safety and economic activity: https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/why-us-cities-are-investing-safer-more-connected-cycling-infrastructure

Cycletrack is essential on this corridor. There are zero safe ways to get to Lincoln Park, or any of the businesses on WSA, by bike/e-bike/scooter. The 3 N/S streets (WSA, JFK, Bergen) have a combined 14 lanes for cars, half of them parking, and there are 0 bike lanes anywhere. There has to be 1 safe way for other modes to go!

Can we do other things like speed bumps / or other physical disruptions so that drivers can slow down? in addition to curb extensions?

See the response to a previous question regarding raised crosswalks.

How frequent is parking turnover? i.e. How necessary is the on street parking?

The corridor has high parking utilization and generally the demand for parking exceeds supply. Vehicles regularly park in no parking zones, such as corners, loading zones, near fire hydrants and bus stops. A parking count was performed in March 2021 during a typical afternoon. For both directions of travel there are approximately 167 +/- legal parking spaces that were counted and 238 vehicles were counted as parked vehicles which represents 143% parking utilization. The highest number of parked vehicles is south of Communipaw Avenue.

We need a strong North-South bike connection to transit and the park. Cycle track on one-side at least preserves some parking.

Study link: https://usa.streetsblog.org/2015/10/06/salt-lake-city-cuts-car-parking-adds-bike-lanes-sees-retail-boost/

Agree that especially without Bergen or JFK as north-south connections, making West Side Ave a comfortable bike route is very important.
I totally agree. Bikes and micromobility don't even have a sliver of the pie when it comes to north south routes. Personally, that's the biggest thing reducing my travel to different neighborhoods in JC.

Sales up at businesses in Salt Lake City when switched from cars to bikes.

"Along San Francisco's Valencia Street, two-thirds of merchants surveyed four-and-a-half years after bike lanes were painted said that the lanes had a positive overall impact on their business." Study link: http://www.bikewalk.org/2004conference/sessions/28_Business_calm/TrafficCalming_summary.pdf

That's giving in to induced demand when we say we can't make streets safer for pedestrians because of too many cars. It's backward thinking.

Shouldn't lose sight of the large number of crashes involving bikers, too. The presentation showed maybe a third of all crashes involving bikes? if the ped crashes call for curb extensions (they do!), the bike crashes call for bike lanes.

Was the Jersey City Bike Master Plan consulted in conjunction with this plan? West Side Avenue is identified as a street that should have a protected bicycle lane facility.

As part of Preliminary Engineering, a bike lane option was evaluated and included in the presentation. The City will consider comments from the public as well as impacts and make a decision as to whether to incorporate bike lanes in this project.

That design standard (re: raised crosswalks/intersections) does not seem to align with Vision Zero policy.

Can bollards or other measures be used to protect loading zones? As they can often be used as unsafe passing lanes elsewhere in JC. Loading zones overall are much appreciated especially for helping local businesses and eliminating dangerous and illegal parking at intersections.

The installation of bollards at loading zones is not recommended.

It's great that the curb extensions allow drivers to see pedestrians better, but how do curb extensions reduce vehicular speed?

See the previous response to a question regarding curb extensions and reduced vehicle speeds.

Study link: https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/eng/documents/speedhumps/
"Congestion" is not causing crashes, excessive speeds and incompetent drivers are, full stop. The constant honking is a symptom of the problem, not a problem itself to be fixed. For example, drivers honking to alert parked cars that they are passing instead of driving with due care to avoid a collision. The only solution is to slow traffic and reduce expectations of speed and also reduce cars total.

"Demand for on-street parking" - this will be true in any dense area. Take away parking. Drivers are already routinely obstructing sidewalks and crosswalks here, which is why curb bump-outs are good Bus bulbs, or in the case of bike lanes, bus pedestrian islands are a must. Existing bus stops are useless as you outlined well.

RRFB is a waste of money - drivers should be driving slowly enough to stop in a dense urban area, and do it without being begged to. The ones who don't do this won't stop for them because there are no consequences for not doing it now.

I'm all for bike lanes too, but they're useless if they're going to be blocked by cars. The priority must be blocking car intrusion into pedestrian spaces. "Congestion" is not causing crashes, excessive speeds and incompetent drivers are, full stop. The constant honking is a symptom of the problem, not a problem itself to be fixed. For example, drivers honking to alert parked cars that they are passing instead of driving with due care to avoid a collision. The only solution is to slow traffic and reduce expectations of speed and also reduce cars total.

Q If 3 of your 14 listed projects include protected bike lanes, and 2 of those are not yet built, and the other one only got built basically because Mayor Fulop said let's just do it, and this project has no assurance of having protected bike lanes ... Why should advocates for safer, more accessible, equitable biking for transportation in Jersey City regard this entire set of projects, and indeed the organizations behind it, as anything but a smokescreen, a delaying tactic to preserve and perpetuate the current toxic, car-centric transportation system?

R This is in reference to slide 2 in the presentation which lists 14 projects sponsored by Jersey City that are federally funded through the Local Safety program since 2011. It includes $25 million in funding for the construction of safety improvements at 234 intersections within the City. These improvements includes traffic signal upgrades, pedestrian countdown signals, high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant curb ramps and more. The majority of these projects are intended to reduce right angle/left turn, rear-end, and pedestrian crashes. Reducing pedestrian crashes is a high priority since they account for 41% of all fatal and incapacitating injury crashes in the last ten years within the City. Where Jersey City has proposed new bike lanes in an application to the Local Safety Program, they have been incorporated into the design (Montgomery Street and Marin Boulevard). Where the City proposes bike lanes in future Local Safety Program projects, they will be included in the design. The City is committed to prioritizing the safety of its most vulnerable users, including cyclists, in a holistic manner and incorporating protect bicycle lanes when feasible.
Q I'm definitely for bike lanes, but how do we deter cars parking on the bike lanes - given that you will be taking away all the parking spots?

R If the City advances the project with bike lanes, it will be an enforcement issue to deter vehicles from parking in the bike lanes.

C The bike lanes must be "protected bike lanes", i.e. next to the curb. Like in downtown JC.

Q I would appreciate clarification about the exact standard that’s preventing installation of additional safety measures like raised crosswalks, including whether it is a requirement or a guideline, and whether requesting waivers of such requirements from FHWA and/or NJDOT would be possible?

R See the response to the previous question regarding raised crosswalks (page 2)

C These are exactly the standards that prevent safety improvements where they’re most needed.

C I agree. High traffic routes are where raised crossings and other speed limiting devices are most needed for pedestrian safety.

Q If you are designing to MUTCD standards, will it be possible to suggest designs in line with suggested amendments to the MUTCD?

R The project can only be designed to the current standards. If the proposed changes are approved before or during final design, then the project team will evaluate the validity of the changes.

Q How does this project comply with Complete Streets resolutions adopted by the city and the county with regard to bicyclist protections?

R The City’s Complete Streets Policy includes the following language:

“Establishes that all public street projects, both new construction and reconstruction (excluding maintenance) undertaken by the City of Jersey City shall be designed and constructed as "Complete Streets" whenever feasible to do so in order to safely accommodate travel by pedestrians, bicyclists; public transit, and motorized vehicles and their passengers, with special priority given to pedestrian safety.”

Here is a link to the resolution: Complete Streets JC Res. 11-317.pdf (civiclive.com)

This project complies with the policy by giving priority to pedestrian safety through the proposed curb extensions to increase pedestrian visibility and reduce exposure by reducing crossing times.
By the time this project is implemented, the new MUTCD may be in effect and allow different measures. Raising this issue with FHWA or NJDOT would be the least thing to consider, I think.

I live on Lexington and often ride my bike down WSA. It is currently dangerous and more protections for cyclists are needed.

Due respect, the bikes on sidewalks issue is 100% an infrastructure issue. It happens because we don't have safe bike lanes!

How can we get bikes off sidewalks, the streets are so dangerous for riding?

This project includes federally approved traffic calming countermeasures to reduce speeding along the corridor resulting in improved conditions for all roadway users.

Design to incorporate bike infrastructure can resolve some enforcement issues. Bikes on sidewalks will never be enforced properly.

Is there consideration of protected bike lanes as a traffic calming measure themselves? They reduce width, which contributes to lowering vehicle speeds (in combination with other measures.)

The bike lane option included in the presentation and under consideration by the City would replace the existing parking spaces on one or both sides. The existing lane width is insufficient to accommodate bike lanes without the loss of travel lanes or parking lanes.

To follow up, providing a protected bike lane would reduce expensive enforcement hours to remove e-bikes off the sidewalk. Have you considered that design can solve for this vs enforcement?

See the previous response regarding enforcement of bikes on sidewalks.

Can/will the signals be designed to reduce the speed for any green bands to prevent folks from speeding down the entire corridor?

The project will address safety concerns at the signalized intersections including operational changes, such as signal timings and signal phasing as needed. It is not the intent of this project to implement corridor-wide timing changes or coordination of the traffic signal system.

Seems like we need to do more to actually have fewer cars on this street which is so narrow and needs to be shared between cars, pedestrians and bikes.
Q  Can you come back to us when you have a design with protected bike lanes on West Side Ave?

R  The presentation included a bike lane option depicted on a segment of the corridor as well as two cross-section options. If the City decides to include bike lanes in the project, the consultant will revise the preliminary design and a revised corridor layout will be provided on the project’s web page.

Q  These improvements sound great. Yes to cycle tracks. Would there be a way to limit motorized bikes/scooter (not Ebikes) out of the bike lanes?

R  As defined by NJ Statute, Class 3 e-bikes and all mopeds are required to be registered and insured; however, the Statute is unclear as to where these vehicles are permitted to travel.

C  Reducing e-bike traffic on sidewalks *IS* an engineering issue. If bike lanes are safe and included, people won't have to bike on sidewalks out of self-preservation!

C  Agree that bikes (whether pedal or electric) on the sidewalk is a leading indicator that the community does not feel safe riding in the street.

C  We have Citibike stations between the Lightrail and Lincoln Park. Having a protected bike lane would allow people to travel safely down WSA and support the local businesses

C  This is a generational opportunity to improvement this corridor. Build for the future. Build the cycle track!

C  Link: [http://streetmix.net](http://streetmix.net) if you want to make your own sections

C  The bikes being ridden on sidewalks is becoming a constant problem. It seems that construction workers and food delivery workers are the main source of this persisting pattern. And with motorized bike it only adds to the problem, I would like to see some sort of enforcement especially in commerce districts where people are exiting stores and businesses. The moment you cross the threshold of the establishment onto the sidewalk if you do not pause and also look both ways an impact will occur. I take my kids to school on bike and we have to use the sidewalk because of how unsafe the streets are. It is not a good idea to criminalize activities people do because they don’t feel safe in the street. How would you enforce it? Cops on every corner? It's just not possible. Have you ever seen a bike pulled over after riding on the sidewalk? It's never going to change without infrastructure design

C  NACTO recommends 11ft for car lanes
Q  Can you come back to us with a plan in which the car/bus lanes are 11ft, per NACTO recommendations?

R  The proposed layout has a travel lane width that varies from 11 – 11.5’ within the corridor. The City and design consultant will work together in final design to determine the most appropriate lane width taking into consideration safety, turning movements and the vehicle types utilizing this West Side Avenue.

C  This drawing looks like it gives cars 80% of the space, bike 0% and pedestrians 20% - there are so many people walking around in this neighborhood and trying to ride bikes. Why would we choose drivers over everyone else (including kids)

C  Cycle track looks great! Better than current and future situations

C  Bike lanes alone would calm traffic

Q  Can raised crosswalks co-exist with bike lanes?

R  There is a way to have both elements, but the see the prior question (page 2) regarding the raised crosswalks.

C  I’ve heard from business owners who are supportive of bike lanes along that corridor

Q  Are there any plans to replace at least some of the parking that will be lost due to bike lanes? Are any creative solutions being considered such as requiring new buildings being built on the southern part of WSA to have retail, visitor and/or monthly parking for local residents included?

R  The current proposed layout for the project does not include bike lanes and will only result in the elimination of illegal parking along the corridor. The presentation included a bike lane option for discussion and to solicit feedback from the community. The City will make a decision on whether to include bike lanes and if so, the City will consider the replacement of parking, but it would not be part of the scope of work of this project.

Q  Follow up to the question about concrete for protecting the bike lane and preventing illegal parking or dangerous encroachment. Could we consider raising the bike lane to the height of the curb in those cases?

R  A raised bike lane adjacent to the curb is not part of the scope of work for this project. The project scope is based on an application from the City for safety improvements along the corridor that did not include bike lanes. For that type of improvement to be considered using federal funds, a concept development study would be needed to evaluate alternatives, impacts and costs prior to preliminary engineering.
Utility companies that are digging up trenches from corner to corner in the bike lanes as well as installing gas lines into each property perpendicular to the trench are not properly being filled and tamped down thus acting like pseudo speed bumps for cyclists while riding in the bike lane, or if not in the lane then forcing cars into the bike lane to avoid the ill faded fill. PSE&G use subcontractors who are not finishing the job in a safe manner.

There are two municipal lots along WSA that I rarely ever see full. Everyone just double-parks.

TSP is typically a bypass space but could also be a signal priority (similar to a preemption or to call a phase)

Please make sure that bike lanes along this route are PROTECTED.

It would be great if we didn’t take for granted that West Side Avenue should host more than 10k cars! Can we set a target for bringing that number down?

West Side Avenue is designated as a Minor Arterial roadway which according FHWA guidance is “intended to provide service for trips of moderate length, serve geographic areas that are smaller than their higher Arterial counterparts and offer connectivity to the higher Arterial system. In an urban context, they interconnect and augment the higher Arterial system, provide intra-community continuity, and may carry local bus routes”.

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) along the corridor ranges from 8,870 to 10,765 and is not likely to be reduced without a reduction in the AADTs of the local roadways that feed into it.

Have you studied the raised crosswalks and raised bike lanes use in other cities, such as Amsterdam, Utrecht, Rotterdam?

See the previous responses regarding raised crosswalks and raised bike lanes.

We are talking about bike lanes what about parking?

See the previous responses regarding parking impacts and bike lanes.

Is there data about where people using cars along here are coming from/going to? How much is through-traffic vs not? Can those trips be replaced by more efficient modes?

The scope of work for this safety improvement project does not include an origin/destination study or a planning study on alternate modes of transportation.

Was the parking master plan reviewed to see if it provides any guidance for WSA? if so, will those recommendations be included in this project?
The proposed curb extensions are consistent with the parking related strategies outlined in the Jersey City’s Parking Management Plan Final Report. Here is an excerpt from the report:

### Summary of Parking Related Strategies

The following table provides a summary of parking-related strategies that were proposed in the above plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parking-related Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Enforcement</td>
<td>- Restrict car parking around intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Procure equipment to support increased enforcement against parking violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Remove any barriers at the City level to ticketing vehicles parked in bike lanes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blocking driveways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase fines for certain parking and moving violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eliminate ambiguity over where on-street parking is, and is not, allowed, especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within 25 feet of crosswalks and near fire hydrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase enforcement of parking restrictions at corners and within 25 feet of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crosswalk at intersections on pedestrian and bicycle HINs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Enhancement</td>
<td>- Curb extensions are recommended to take up the space within 25 feet of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crosswalk to prevent illegal parking and at all intersections or mid-block locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as long as there is on-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explore best practice solutions to mark and protect no parking zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another excerpt from the report includes the findings of a survey regarding parking which shows that more than 50% of homes to not have driveways or access to parking lots/garages and rely on on-street parking. Removal of a substantial number of parking spaces along the corridor to accommodate bike lanes would exacerbate this issue.
I thought that one of the slides showed parking being removed off one side of the street.

Here's a Citibike dashboard I maintain that shows 5 years with average 20% growth each year. Link: [https://ctbk.dev/#/?r=jc](https://ctbk.dev/#/?r=jc)

How many legal spots would be lost with cycle track design? Those extended curbs/bulbs are already taking up a ton of space that is used for parking (though maybe not legally)

A protected cycle track would eliminate all parking on one side of the corridor which is estimated to eliminate up to 102 +/- parking spaces in the northbound travel direction or up to 72 +/- parking spaces in the southbound direction.
C  There would always be an increase in cyclists if there are safe ways to ride. current numbers would be immaterial

C  Bike lanes often appear "empty" because they move people so much more efficiently through the space.

C  Data about bike usage on a road with no safe way to ride a bike would be of limited value. If you don't build it, they can't come.

C  Slide 19, east side looks like no legal spots at all with bulbs, curbs

Q  Can we use data from other intersections where there are bike lanes we could also better project how much bike lane usage would be on this corridor?

R  Data collected by the City which shows bike lane volumes at several intersections where bike lanes currently exist will be included on this project link.

C  This dataset skews toward recreational cycling but there’s a stark difference between Hoboken/Downtown JC and the rest of JC
Link: https://www.strava.com/heatmap#12.59/-74.07441/40.71274/hot/all

C  Comparing the number of bicyclists currently to those that would here after safe infrastructure is provided is like comparing apples to oranges. you need to forecast a project number of new bicycle users that also considered future development / zoning and the regional roadway and bicycle routes. that is more of an effort that the city bicycle master plan undertook and this project should align with that plan’s recommendations.

C  You don’t count the people swimming across to decide whether to build a bridge"

C  Regarding counting bikes on dangerous roads: the number you get will only represent the small fraction of cyclists willing to risk their safety, there will be many other cyclists you won’t actually see.

Q  Why is the NJTPA not adhering to city and county Complete Streets resolutions with regard to bicyclist safety on most of their projects?

R  The NJTPA is providing the federal funds through the Local Safety Program. The City is the project sponsor that has proposed the safety improvements included in the project. They are responsible for design decision. While the NJTPA encourages and supports complete street policies. Incorporating bike lanes is not pre-requisite of the Local Safety Program.

C  Wherever they would go, why aren’t they on the table already? If there is no answer, then the answer is always Some other Street or Alternative Avenue.
Q  Is it possible to widen the sidewalk and make a bike lane on the sidewalk?

R  See the response to a previous question (page 13) regarding this suggestion.

C  I'm a cyclist and I'd rather take JFK Blvd N/S rather than take WSA, as it's not as dangerous. Keep that in mind giving the traffic on JFK vs WSA

Q  If you are going to consider Bergen being a one way would you also consider Monticello?

R  These are considerations to be made by the City and are not within the scope of work for this project. The City has not yet evaluated the feasibility of bike lanes along Bergen Ave or Monticello Ave.

Q  Forgive me if this was already mentioned but is there data on the future expected usage? given all the planned development coming over the next decade

R  A traffic analysis was conducted by the consultant which includes a Level of Service analysis for key intersections along the corridor. This analysis takes into consideration anticipated future conditions.

C  Regarding the speed tables, I again want to re-iterate that they are most important when there is high traffic. I work as an EMT in Jersey City and I assure you raised intersections do not delay our response times nearly as much as poor traffic design and double parked vehicles.

Q  Was the Jersey City Bike Master Plan consulted in conjunction with this plan? West Side Ave is identified as a street that should have a protected bicycle lane facility.

R  See previous response (page 8) regarding this question.

C  There are RRFBs on Garfield Avenue. They are useless, drivers never respect them or anyone trying to cross.

C  It sounds distinctly like curb extensions with no bike lanes is the preferred alternative.

Q  Less cars will also reduce crashes and make it safer too? Don't we have information on how bike lanes improve safety?

R  Bike lanes are recognized by FHWA as a proven safety countermeasure (see the link below regarding FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures). The City will consider feedback from the community on the proposed improvements, evaluate the impacts of including bikes lanes and make a decision.

Link:  https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/
C  As you say it is Jersey City’s decision in the end, and I urge the study team to make the safety benefits of bike lanes clear.

Q  When you say this is the preliminary phase for this project, what is the next step - is that with you or with the city?

R  This project is currently in the preliminary engineering phase. The next step is the review and approval of an environmental document by NJDOT – Bureau of Environmental and Programmatic Resources. Once the document is approved, the project will advance into Final Design phase.

C  I haven't heard anyone from the community on this call advocating for parking over bikes

C  Clearly there is broad support for a bike lane. Cycle track seems like the best compromise design

Q  Why are these projects always proposed with or without bike lanes? This should be not be an agenda item on a checklist, it should be integrated w/o question to integrate from the start.

R  The application to the Local Safety Program was submitted by the City to the NJTPA in 2017 and approved by the NJTPA Board for inclusion the FY 2018 program. Bike lanes were not proposed in the application and the inclusion of bike lanes is not a pre-requisite for the Local Safety Program. The City will consider feedback from the community on the proposed improvements, evaluate the impacts of including bikes lanes and make a decision.

C  Cars are not going anywhere unfortunately in this area you need a car to go shopping and even to the hospitals! Parking is important!

C  Many people live in our neighborhood without owning a car

C  On WSA, JFK, and Bergen, there's 6 lanes of parking and 0 bike lanes. The compromise is 1 bike lane and 5 lanes of parking (that's also not counting municipal and private lots)

C  There are many people in the neighborhood that don't have a car. I'm sure they would love a safe alternative to shop local vs. Instacart, etc.

C  There’s a lot of parking that’s barely used and lots of the metered spots are used by people not moving for hours. or days

C  Protected bike lanes need to be protected. Plastic bollards that a vehicle can knock over with no damage to the car is not protection.

C  People should not *have* to get a car to go shopping or to the hospital
C I walked to the hospital today. I rode a bike there in November. Just another perspective!

C Traditional planning in this area has strongly favored the cars. This is an opportunity to design at human-scale and make it safe for us to walk and bike. I sincerely hope Jersey City will take advantage of this once in a lifetime opportunity to design a street for people, not just for cars. protected bikes lanes are badly needed here.

C On WSA, JFK, and Bergen, there’s 6 lanes of parking and 0 bike lanes. The compromise is 1 bike lane and 5 lanes of parking. big picture here, bikes need a safe space

C It's important to maintain parking in certain areas for handicap access, that said it seems like in one of the N/S roads bike lanes could be added and creative solutions should be considered for parking

C But why would you propose anything that is insufficient to the complete streets requirement? If bicycle infrastructure is required by complete streets and there's an option your providing that doesn’t include them, you're not fulfilling the complete streets requirement.

C They are absolutely a traffic calming measure, and that is very well established. That's not what they are for, but that is one thing that they do. The mere presence of cyclists calms traffic

C This chat should not be the only way people add involved in process

Q It was my impression that the buffered bike lanes would be physically protected, whether in the cycle track option or the option with two one-way lanes. Is that so? bollards or flex posts should be included (this would address the concern others have expressed about possible parking in the lanes). the jersey barriers on grand are 2’ wide, right? the same size as the contemplated buffer…?

R See the previous responses regarding the inclusion of the bike lane option in the presentation.

C 10 feet is becoming much more standard. 11 is too wide

C Agree that protections should be in place. That being said, flex posts are insufficient as evidenced by dozens of them plowed down on Montgomery.

C Absolutely. i am now very concerned that these bike lanes will be like the ones on Columbus, where I observe delivery bikers almost struck by cars in a daily basis.

C Very true. Painted bike lanes are not infrastructure. The ones on Columbus are like riding a terrifying line between getting doored and getting hit at 40 MPH.

C No, I was referring to areas of the Heights.
Irving St. between Central Ave and Kennedy Blvd. was dug up two years ago and till this day has not been remedied, well past the ninety day cure time.

Just FYI the "protection gap" between the 2 PBL segments on Columbus is supposedly up for a grant, awaiting something or other, but the city gov’t wants to PBL it sometime soon.

Will you please post a link to the project website in this chat, please?

This is a summary of the chat log from the PIC with the inclusion of responses to the questions.

There are many examples of cities with narrow bike lane buffers protected with curb height concrete. At a minimum flex posts or even flex posts mounted on low concrete to prevent abuse by drivers.

43% of parked cars are illegally parked! Wow.

A two way cycle path would allow for so many more than 70-80 people for traffic, we know most cars have one person in them.


The bike lanes ARE underutilized. I favor putting more resources in mass transit.

The only reason the bike lane network is underutilized right now is the lack of continuity, the amount of people parking in the lanes, the failure to clear and plow lanes, and the locations that they (don’t) lead to.

I posted a link showing 20% YoY growth in Jersey City’s Citibike network above. Here it is again. https://ctbk.dev/#/?r=jc

(20% year over year, for each of the last 5 years)

I don’t disagree with funding mass transit, but judging the use of bike lanes from an incomplete and mostly lacking network is inherently flawed

Agreed about transit. Bus lanes on JFK would be great; join the NJTPA call tmrw 5-7pm and mention that!
Q  Could you share how NJTPA’s regional model deals with predicted traffic growth? How will those predictions affect the recommendations?

R  Link to NJTPA Travel Demand Model: https://www.njtpa.org/Data-Maps/Modeling-Surveys/Travel-Demand-Model.aspx

   A traffic analysis was conducted by the consultant which includes a Level of Service analysis for key intersections along the corridor. This analysis takes into consideration anticipated future conditions.

C  PATH UNDER JFK

C  No, the Bike Master Plan has a PBL the whole length of WSA https://photos.app.goo.gl/yALRzFfwxFqJcqFA9

C  If there’s plans for bike lanes south of this, it only makes sense to include them here and create a complete network


C  I hope the study team considers whether the projected traffic volumes are accurate

Q  Was there any consideration of a pedestrian bridge over Communipaw at Westside?

R  No, it is not within the scope of this project.

C  Join tomorrow night too, re: JFK Blvd. between Pavonia & St. Paul's

C  I hope we're not making naive traffic projections based on population growth. Downtown, which grew 60% between 2010 and 2020 has much less traffic along Grove St for example. Walkability + bikeability + growth in retail and transit means Downtown is both *more* liveable and less car dependent

C  On roundabouts, what about Communipaw/440/1&9? Lots of public land at those corners

C  Are plenty of people in this neighborhood who are very concerned about parking. They're just not plugged into this process. Some of them will be shocked and angered if a significant number of spots suddenly disappear. (I have a parking spot, so I'm not trying to protect myself.)
I don't think that participation in this meeting is representative of the broader population in Westside. There is an intrinsic bias in who has the knowledge, flexibility and ability to participate in meetings like this.

It's more of a hazard to bicyclists to be struck by thousand pound vehicles than for drivers to have their paint scratched by actual protection.

I'm looking at the situation from all angles, and if the numbers prove me wrong, I will admit that. However, when you drive along Grand, Montgomery or Washington there's more tumbleweed than cyclists.

The lanes are used about as much as a skeleton, barely connected or unconnected sketch pad of roads would be used by drivers. There would be some cars. Not many.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, please consider that if this is a safety project first then the protected bike lane would have the biggest safety benefit. have a good night everyone.

The pattern is very common. It's one reason some cities just build a whole small network of PBLs in a month, say. Just so people can see it working. JC's network is a little like that. It's trying to be connected. But it's not yet really. And it's quite small still.

I use the Montgomery bike lanes every single day to get to and from work. At Montgomery and Merceles where the bike lane dumps out, I often endure a very sketchy 1-2 block section where I share a road with cars.

As a Jersey City resident, I hope we can include protected bike lanes in this project. It will make me more likely to frequent the retail along West Side Ave.

Thanks so much for taking the time on this! It's so important for the future growth of this neighborhood. There are thousands of units coming to this side of the city. They will need ways to get around, and the roads can't handle more cars.

Thanks so much for the work on this, NJTPA and JC folks! Incredible that you got through everything tonight. Much appreciated.

Link to Chat Log:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Z684dnkgLiMam2lJw1u6U54Vlek0ZB5eJg6jgn8U/edit?usp=sharing