

TA-2016 – Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phase II Transportation Alternatives Design Assistance Program (TAP)

Borough of Pennington, Mercer County

NJDOT Local Aid District # 3

Design Consultant: NV5

In-Person Public Information Center • Tuesday, March 28, 2023

COMMENT RESOLUTION SUMMARY

Prepared By: NV5 and Pennington Borough
Comment Period: Tuesday, March 28, 2023, through Tuesday, April 11, 2023
June 13, 2023 (Comment received through June 6, 2023)
Final: May 9, 2023

Document Format:

Question or comment received during the Public Information Center or during the comment question period.

Response | Responses to question or comment provided by NV5 and Pennington Borough ('Borough')

General Note:

Will the Public Information Center material be available for review and to post comments during the comment period?

Response | The Public Information Center plan sets will be provided on the Pennington Borough website: <https://www.penningtonboro.org/home/news/streetscape-public-information-session>
Questions and Comments between March 29, 2023 to April 11, 2023 can be sent to:
James Davy
Mayor – Pennington Borough
30 North Main Street
Pennington, NJ 08534-0095
P: 609-737-0276
E: jdavy@penningtonboro.org

A. Questions and Comments prior to Public Information Center

1. Email received 03/20/2023 6:28PM:

Hello Mayor Davy,

I was reading about Pennington's upcoming streetscape improvements in "Mercer Me." I would like to request that you include additional outdoor bicycle parking in the new plans. If you are including any bollards you could include bollard style bike racks. They are unobtrusive, and easy to use. (See the image of one below)

With our planet's climate emergency we need to do everything we can to make it easier for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Thank You,

[Redacted]

Response | Existing bollard style bike racks are located in the vicinity of the Village Salon on South Main Street, similar to the style shown above. At this time, no additional bike racks are proposed due to the limited space and need to avoid obstructing pedestrian sidewalk routes. The Borough may consider additional racks at other locations in the future.



2. Email received 03/21/2023 8:31PM:

Good day,

Dodge Construction Network wants to ensure we have the most complete and accurate information regarding Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phase II that is bidding on March 28 at 06:00 PM.

DCN is requesting the following information:

- Confirm the bid date and time listed above are unchanged.
- Construction cost estimate or a construction cost range for the project.
- Planholders list/bidders list
- Complimentary set of Bid Documents.
- Any addenda that have been released, please attach them to this response.

Thank you for your time and assistance,
[Redacted]

Dodge Construction Network [redacted]

Response | NV5 Email 03/22/2023 11:42AM

We are conducting a Preliminary Engineering Public Information Center on March 28th based upon progress plans. We are not bidding out the project. The Bid Phase would not occur until after the Final Design Phase is completed and funds are authorized for construction.

B. Frequently Asked Questions / Comments during Public Information Center

1. Proposed Pedestrian Scale Lighting:

- Concern about how bright lights will be and shining beyond sidewalk.

Response | Discussion with Mayor Davy who mentioned a new Borough ordinance. NV5 and Pennington will request that PSE&G lighting have options for light shields if lighting impacting adjacent property.

- Comment about limit of proposed street lights along South Main Street – could the proposed lighting continue further south?

Response | The project is Federally funded grant administered through NJDOT Local Aid Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program and Design Assistance. The original grant included fourteen (14) pedestrian scale lighting assemblies within the project limits. Extending the project improvements outside the limits would other funding.

2. Proposed Street Trees / Tree Removals within Project Limits:

- Tree Hazard for tree shown proposed for removal should happen now as large limbs have fallen (location in front of Block 301 Lot 51)

Response | Following coordination with Pennington Borough, the Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee and Mercer County, the existing tree in front of Block 301, Lot 51 will be removed due to damage and replaced by a new tree.

- Do not plant pear or messy trees with leaves that stain or clutter sidewalk
- Street trees are going to make area look nice. Who would trim?

Response | Pennington Borough will be responsible for tree maintenance and within Mercer County right-of-way.

- Tree species being used for the project. Questions about existing tree diameter and whether the new trees will be as large as some of the existing trees.

Response | Following coordination with Pennington Borough and the Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee, the following tree species has been selected for the project to match the Phase 1 project.

Botanical Name	Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk'
Common Name	Ivory Silk Lilac Tree
Mature Height	15 - 25 feet
Mature Spread	10 - 15 feet
Sun Exposure	Full Sun
Soil	Widely Adaptable
Growth Rate	Medium
Flower Color	Creamy, White
Foliage	Green
Pollinator Friendly	Yes



- Comment regarding different species being proposed beneath power lines versus unobstructed areas.

Response | NV5 and Pennington Borough will continue coordination with the Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee to determine if additional species of trees are necessary beneath overhead utilities. The intent is a consistent street tree appearance.

- Questions regarding why trees, especially the larger ones, are being removed – what diseases and if trees that are damaged need to be removed.

Response | Trees removed or to be removed are considered hazard trees and/or are towards their end of life.

- Comment regarding ‘ornamental trees’ are not preferred since they are not large, do not provide shade
- Response** | While shade, overhead, and horizontal limitations are factors when considering trees, larger tree species may conflict with existing features. NV5 will continue to coordinate with Pennington Borough, the Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee, and Mercer County.

- Proposed tree guards being installed

Response | Proposed tree guards are included for tree wells with adjacent existing / proposed concrete sidewalk. In areas with an existing grass strip between the sidewalk and curb, no proposed tree guards are included.

3. Proposed Streetscape Amenities (Benches, Trash Receptacles):

- Bench next to bus stop good location. Bus stop is too close to intersection (check regs?)

Response | Acknowledged. NJ Transit bus stop # 32404 (for bus route # 624) present to the west of the signalized intersection of West Delaware Avenue and North/South Main Street. While relocation of an NJ Transit bus stop was not included in the scope of the grant, coordination with NJ Transit by the Borough will be considered.

- Put bench and trash can near new Bakery (site under renovation) [Block 205, Lot 28]

Response | Restaurants and businesses with food licenses are responsible for trash management. A bench may be provided by a business owner if the bench and its use does not obstruct the sidewalk,

- Trash can near crosswalk across South Main Street should be relocated – not in good spot. Stakeholder thought it was relocated from Vito’s pizza corner (opposite corner) due to attraction of bees.

Response | Comment acknowledged. Relocation of trash receptacles were considered, and the Borough prefers to remove the installation of additional trash cans since restaurants and businesses with food licenses are responsible for trash management.

4. Proposed Concrete Sidewalk, Paver Sidewalk, Concrete Driveway Aprons, and Curbing:

- Sidewalk and lighting will improve walking experience including at night

Response | Acknowledged.

- Why are segments of paver sidewalk being replaced?

Response | Several segments of existing paver sidewalk are non-compliant with ADA standards and, in some cases, have irregular surfaces. The proposed improvements in these areas include removal of the existing pavers, adjusting the subgrade to improve the slope, and resetting pavers in place.

- Can granite curb be extended throughout historic district? Currently the proposed improvements feature granite and concrete curbing.

Response | The intent of the proposed curb replacements was to replace segments in kind (concrete curb with concrete, granite curb with granite, and historically significant segment of curbing with an appropriate material [vicinity of Pennington Presbyterian Church]). Use of granite curb instead of concrete could be considered.

- [Block 601, Lot 24] Only one of two driveways with grant limits proposed for improvements. Property owner will request if want both improved or none – does not want driveways that do not match.

Response | The second driveway for Block 601, Lot 24 is outside the project limits. Replacement of this driveway could be considered – additional coordination with NJDOT Local Aid would be required. It is noted this property owner mentioned they would reach back out to the Team if needed. The Borough will follow up property owner.

- [Block 503, Lot 12] Property owner question regarding replacement of pavers for driveway with concrete driveway apron. Can pavers be used in lieu of concrete?

Response | The intent of using concrete driveway aprons in paver sidewalk areas was to provide uniformity throughout the area. Using pavers for a driveway apron could be considered and discussed with the County. This only applies to existing areas where pavers exist.

5. Proposed Roof Leaders

- Mercer County input at public meeting regarding roof leaders – Earlier project discussions requested proposed improvements tie roof leaders and sump pump into the County’s existing drainage system within Mercer County 640 South Main Street, East Delaware Avenue and West Delaware Avenue. However, tie in to the existing drainage system along South Main Street or into the existing curb line is not permitted within Mercer County right of way on any County roadways so no such improvements will be allowed or proposed.

Response | Since this is direction from Mercer County, property owners must address onsite runoff on their properties. This project will not propose solutions to existing roof leaders / sump pumps leading to sidewalk/elsewhere as property owners are responsible to address.

6. Miscellaneous Questions and Comments

- Project status and timeframe from design to construction

Response | The project is currently in Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase. Following the conclusion of the public information center comment period, NV5 will coordinate with NJDOT Local Aid and NJDOT Bureau of Environmental Program Resources (BEPR) for the completion of the Categorical Exclusion Document (CED). The CED is required to advance the project to the Final Design (FD) phase. Once the FD Phase begins, the project will be advanced, including additional details for proposed features, lighting / conduit design, specifications, etc. Another public information center will also be conducted during this phase to inform the public of the updated design. Following completion of FD Phase and an environmental re-evaluation by NJDOT BEPR, an FD Phase Submission will occur. Once comments are addressed, the Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) submission will be made, Pennington will put the project to bid, and construction will start.

The following in an anticipated schedule:

- PE Phase Completion: Fall 2023
- FD Phase Completion: Summer 2024
- Project Construction Start: Fall 2024

- Discussion regarding jurisdiction of the roadways in project limits

Response | The proposed project limits occur along Mercer County Route 640 South Main Street, East Delaware Avenue, and West Delaware Avenue as shown on the construction plans. South Main Street is under Mercer County jurisdiction while East Delaware Avenue / West Delaware Avenue are under Pennington Borough jurisdiction. While Mercer County maintains South Main Street from curb-to-curb, Pennington Borough will maintain the proposed improvements and lighting.

- If I want to plant bushes in the space between the curb and sidewalk like other homes have, do I have to ask.

Response | Planting and other improvements by adjacent property owners within the public right of way (maintained by Pennington Borough and Mercer County) are not permitted or approved and can be removed.

- Problem causing puddle near corner of West Delaware Avenue / South Main Street should be fixed.

Response | NV5, Pennington Borough, and Mercer County are aware of the flooding issue on the corner of West Delaware Avenue and South Main Street at the curb ramp. Based on coordination with Mercer County, repairs will be made in the form of milling asphalt to allow stormwater runoff to reach the existing inlets on the corner.

- Do not schedule construction on Pennington Day or during Memorial Day parade.

Response | Acknowledged – as the specifications and construction schedule are prepared, events such as Pennington Day, Memorial Day, etc. will be indicated to the contractor to avoid construction during such events (which must be identified).

7. Work outside scope of project:

- Shouldn't you remove the chains by bollards by Vito's Pizza (Phase I)

Response

Adjustments or removal of improvements constructed during the Phase 1 project are not included in the scope of this project.

C. Questions and comments during comment period (post PIC meeting):

1. Email 03/28/2023 8:23PM: Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee

Hello all,

Yes, we had a Streetscapes meeting and we recommended Tree Lilac (*Syringa reticulata*) for the replacement trees in the new work zone to carry forward with the existing street tree plantings on the Main Street Improvement zones.

Also, I have provided a number of "preferred trees" lists to the borough.

Response | Information will be added to the plans as directed by the Borough.

2. Email 03/30/2023 11:00AM:

Sorry I was not able to attend the public session for streetscape the other day.

I note on the consultant boards that specified streetlamps include 400K color temperature lamping. I think this is too cold and blue-ish and will detract from street character of historically appropriate street lamps.

Attached Lighting information from the same presentation board indicates that standard 2700K and 3,000K color temperatures are also available. 2700K would be preferred, but either 2,700K or 3,00K would be acceptable.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

Schedule

Symbol	Label	Image	Quantity	Manufacturer	Catalog Number	Description	Number Lamps	Lumens Per Lamp	Light Loss Factor	Wattage	Plot
(A)	A		14	American Electric Lighting	247L P104 XXXX 40K R3 AY	247L American Revolution LED, P104 Performance Package, 4000K CCT, P10 Distribution, Acrylic Reflector	1	4879	9.9	49.352	
(B)	B Existing		2	American Electric Lighting	247L P104 XXXX 40K R3 AY	247L American Revolution LED, P104 Performance Package, 4000K CCT, P10 Distribution, Acrylic Reflector	1	4879	9.9	49.352	

Luminaire Locations

No.	Label	Location				Aim				
		X	Y	Z	MH	Orientation	Tilt	X	Y	Z
3	A	411036.70	544357.00	10.00	10.00	270.00	0.00	411036.70	544357.00	0.00
4	A	410996.80	544336.20	10.00	10.00	90.00	0.00	410996.80	544336.20	0.00
5	A	411009.40	544241.60	10.00	10.00	82.00	0.00	411009.40	544241.60	0.00
10	A	411053.30	544249.10	10.00	10.00	270.00	0.00	411053.30	544249.10	0.00
11	A	411075.00	544581.90	10.00	10.00	170.00	0.00	411075.00	544581.90	0.00
12	A	411118.40	544586.90	10.00	10.00	170.00	0.00	411118.40	544586.90	0.00
13	A	411138.90	544552.40	10.00	10.00	350.00	0.00	411138.90	544552.40	0.00
14	A	410921.40	544563.40	10.00	10.00	175.00	0.00	410921.40	544563.40	0.00
15	A	410910.00	544523.40	10.00	10.00	355.00	0.00	410910.00	544523.40	0.00
16	A	410875.00	544556.70	10.00	10.00	175.00	0.00	410875.00	544556.70	0.00
17	A	410815.90	544548.30	10.00	10.00	170.00	0.00	410815.90	544548.30	0.00
18	A	410733.20	544537.40	10.00	10.00	174.99	0.00	410733.20	544537.40	0.00
19	A	410648.70	544526.70	10.00	10.00	170.00	0.00	410648.70	544526.70	0.00
20	A	411078.70	544543.90	10.00	10.00	353.00	0.00	411078.70	544543.90	0.00
1	B Existing	410975.00	544476.00	10.00	10.00	80.00	0.00	410975.00	544476.00	0.00
2	B Existing	410982.00	544425.00	10.00	10.00	80.00	0.00	410982.00	544425.00	0.00

PRODUCT OVERVIEW
American Revolution Deluxe LED Series ARDL-XL (Utility)

Features:

- Standard LED luminaire with 100-watt equivalent LED light source and integrated driver
- For high output applications up to 11,000 lumens
- Available in color temperatures of 2700K, 3000K, 4000K, and 5000K
- 100-watt equivalent LED luminaire option provides energy efficiency, versatility, and long life
- Standard luminaire height is 2000mm (6'7") for street lighting applications
- Available in 1000mm (3'3") and 1500mm (4'9") luminaire heights
- Available in 1000mm (3'3") and 1500mm (4'9") luminaire heights
- Available in 1000mm (3'3") and 1500mm (4'9") luminaire heights

Applications:

- Street lighting
- Parking lots
- Plaza lighting
- Walkways
- Sports arenas
- Industrial sites
- Warehouse lighting
- Security lighting
- Flood lighting
- Flood lighting
- Flood lighting

GRAPHIC PROVIDED BY COMMENTER

AVAILABLE IN COLOR TEMPERATURE CHOICES OF 2700K, 3000K, 4000K

RECOMMEND 2700 OR 3000 K INSTEAD OF 4000K, WHICH IS TOO BLUE/COLD.

Response

Annotated plan received via email from commenter

Following coordination between Pennington Borough and Public Service Electric and Gas (PSE&G), PSE&G is planning to install LED replacement lights for the Phase 1 portion of the project, which will match the proposed pedestrian lights in Phase 2 (this project) - the existing phase 1 lights (100W High Pressure Sodium [HPS]) will be replaced with the 4000K LED lights, since PSE&G will no longer stock and maintain the HPS Post top lights.. It is the understanding of NV5 that PSE&G only stocks 4000K LED lights in the post top Dayform Traditionaire luminaire for cost effectiveness and ease of maintenance. The 4000K LED (4,818 Lumens) is

more energy efficient (better light output) than the 2700K LED (4,360 Lumens) and 3000K LED (4,476 Lumens) for the same wattage (46W). While the Dayform Traditionaire luminaire is available from the manufacturer with 2700K and 3000K LEDs, PSE&G will not be able to maintain the luminaires for the reasons stated above.

3. Email 03/30/2023 1:45PM:

[Redacted], it was nice to meet you at the Phase 2 information session in Pennington this past Tuesday. When we spoke, you indicated you could send additional information regarding the County & Boro's plans for tree planting & removal (e.g., species list to be considered for the replacement trees). I would greatly appreciate any information you can send along.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

Response | Proposed tree species and additional information included in the previous responses.

4. Email 04/09/2023 8:47PM:

Mayor Davy (Jim),

Thank you for all of the public notifications over several months regarding the Streetscapes project. I was on a business trip during the open house but am glad you and Nadine Stern and the Council go to the trouble to ensure awareness of projects like these. I have walked the project path and noted some issues that are not showstoppers but are important to know:

1. Maintenance – The Streetscapes project requires a great deal of maintenance and some replacement or repair. If you see the attached photos, you can see:

- The brick pavers have not aged well. They are chipped and heaving, creating uneven walking surfaces and pooling areas. They don't look great, and they are not that old.
- rusting metal garbage cans in need of replacement
- many lampposts where paint has come off in large sections and need to be repainted.

This is not an argument against the project but just an awareness that work needs to be done to maintain and also restore. Pavers are by nature higher maintenance than grass ways. I know you want to maintain the same look/feel as the first phase of the project but can more long lasting materials be chosen that look the same or similar?

Response | Maintenance of existing streetscape items for Phase 1 is outside the scope of services for this project. Future maintenance responsibilities for the Phase 2 improvements (this project) will be the responsibility of Pennington Borough. The intent of the project is to replace existing segments of concrete sidewalk with concrete while resetting existing paver sidewalk where present within the project limits.

2. Trees. I have heard at many committee meetings the statement that we cannot plant large growth shade trees because of the poles and wires. That may be true on the west side of Main Street but the east side seems to have unimpeded air space and room for large growth trees to be planted. The poles and wires are on one side of the street on all boro streets so maybe we could look at planting on the more amenable side to provide more shade and also more sturdy varieties that are not as prone to disease and damage. Given that we have had to take down nearly all of the large growth trees downtown on Main Street and East Delaware I think it is especially important to plant large growth trees that can create a shade canopy in years to come.

Response | Acknowledged – tree species are being coordinated with Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee.

3. Curbs – the polished curbs are extremely sharp. I have personally witness two people popping their tires when touching the curb. (thankfully not me!) I am guessing that many other tires have been popped. Maybe you can use the same material but not have such sharp edges on the street side?

Response | An updated detail for granite curb can be considered during Final Design phase and will require concurrence from NJDOT SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) as coordinated through NJDOT BEPR (Bureau of Environmental Program Resources).

Again, no show stoppers but things that would be good to contemplate during the design phase.

Thank you again and best regards,
[Redacted]

See Photos Below that were provided by Commentor:

Photos provided by Commentor above via email



5. Email 04/12/2023 7:45AM: Letter from Commentor

Comments Provided by [Redacted] - TA-2016 Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phase II Borough of Pennington • Transportation Alternatives (TAP) Project (11 April 2023)

- **Introduction** - I am a Pennington Borough resident & taxpayer, and I currently reside at [redacted], Pennington, New Jersey 08534. I attended the March 28, 2023, information session held at the Pennington Borough Hall, and I provided comments to one of the NV5 engineers, [Redacted], who was attending the event to answer questions regarding the project. My written comments in this document will restate many of the verbal comments I provided to this NV5 engineer. I appreciate the opportunity to provide written comments on the Phase II improvements, and I hope you will find these comments helpful.
- **Process Issue: Transmittal of Post-Session Follow-up Materials** - During the session, I asked the NV5 engineer [Redacted] questions about the individual shade trees that would be removed as part of project, and the types & species of shade trees that would be planted as part of the project. [Redacted] indicated he could not fully answer my questions at that time, but he indicated he could send follow-up materials to answer my questions if I could provide my email address. I provided my email on the written registration roster provided at the front door of the borough hall. Despite this conversation & a follow-up email I sent later in the week to NV5, I never received follow-up materials from [Redacted] or any other NV5 or Pennington Borough official or contractor on the discussed topics. It is my 'process' suggestion that if Pennington Borough does not wish to distribute follow-up materials to Pennington residents, Pennington Borough & its representatives should instruct all government & contractor officials present at these information sessions to tell Borough residents that the distribution of follow-up materials is not authorized. This approach would mitigate any confusion on this subject.

Response

We apologize for the delay in the response as NV5 and Pennington Borough had been preparing responses to the comments received both during and following the Public Information Center comment period. It is the intent of NV5 and Pennington Borough to be as transparent as possible with information to residents and the public. This detailed comment summary will be posted on the Borough website and included in project documents.

- **Process Issue: Poor Quality of Project Display Exhibits** - The project display exhibits intended to explain the streetscape improvements were difficult to understand & interpret for a number of reasons: (1) the display exhibits relating to the critical Main Street improvements, which run along a north-south axis, were displayed horizontally, effectively along an east-west axis, in an unintuitive fashion; (2) the main display

exhibits consisted of a series of aerial photos that included confusing, shadowy elements (e.g., tree shadows that spanned the streets & sidewalks in some cases), as well as faint printed markings (hard to see) that attempted to explaining the smaller components of the project (e.g., this tree will be removed, bench added here, etc.). I understand that the project budget is limited, and it is not my intention to nitpick the contractor displays; I am merely attempting to present an honest of appraisal of the display exhibits' adequacy in describing & explaining the individual elements of a complex project to members of the public.

Response

Comment acknowledged. The plan sheet index identified the respective construction plans on display during the Public Information Center. Aerials and annotations were included on the plans were for residents to identify their properties and local landmarks. Presentation boards were similar to those use at similar public meetings and staff available for assistance. The final construction plans that will be used to bid the contract for construction will not include aerial images or colors.

- **Process Issue: Where to Send Follow up Comments** - The PDF summary document distributed in relation to the information session indicates that Pennington residents are encouraged to send their follow up comments to Pennington Borough, and it explains generally that comments can be mailed or emailed to the Borough, but neither the PDF document nor the Pennington Borough website indicates clearly where these comments should be sent or emailed. As a standard matter, any Pennington Borough request for comments on a public matter should include detailed instructions on where these comments should be sent. These comments should be collected & maintained as part of the public record supporting the Borough's decision-making process.

Response

The Public Information Center Flyer sent to adjacent property owners as well as copies of the Flyer were available during the Public Information Center and identified contact information for Mayor Davy:

James Davy
Mayor – Pennington Borough
30 North Main Street
Pennington, NJ 08534-0095
P: 609-737-0276
E: jdavy@penningtonboro.org

A PDF copy of the plans has also been uploaded to the Pennington Borough website:
<https://www.penningtonboro.org/home/news/streetscape-public-information-session>

As a part of the public involvement process for Public Information Centers, comments have been collected / maintained in this Comment Resolution Summary, which will also be used by NJDOT Bureau of Environmental Program Resources (BEPR) for creation of the Categorical Exclusion Document (CED) – environmental document required to advance the project from Preliminary Engineering to Final Design phase.

- **Use of Granite Curbs in Phase II Streetscape Improvements** -The completed Phase I streetscape improvements along the northern & western portion of Main Street (e.g., roughly the area in front of Vito's restaurant) include the use of granite curbs. While I have no personal experience with the damaging effects of granite curbs, I am aware of complaints from multiple Pennington Borough residents who have suffered severe car tire damage due to the sharply abrasive properties of these granite curbs. When I raised this concern with an NV5 engineer attending the session, he replied he had heard similar stories about tire damage due to granite curbs. If Pennington residents & visitors perceive granite curbs as unduly harmful to car tires, they will likely park farther from the curb to avoid any possible contact with a granite curb, thereby potentially creating other traffic safety issues for the streets where granite curbs are used. This design topic should be researched & evaluated before granite curbs are included in the Phase II streetscape improvements.

Response

An updated detail for granite curb may be considered during Final Design phase.

- **Use of Complex Phase I Sideways Improvements in Phase II** - The completed Phase I streetscape improvements along the northern portion of Main Street (e.g., in front of Vito's restaurant) include complex sidewalk elements such as multi-level sidewalks and knee-high metal fencing. I believe this design is potentially dangerous since it creates an 'obstacle course' of sorts (step carefully up or down the multi-level sidewalk; navigate around the metal fencing) for an individual seeking to walk between his or her parked car and any of the commercial establishments on that portion of Main Street. I patronize the stores

along this portion of Main Street, and I find I must be extra cautious in navigating around or through these sidewalk elements to visit these stores. By contrast, the eastern side of Main Street includes a simpler, and I believe safer, design consisting of the sidewalk proper bordered by brick paving stones that clearly delineate a safety 'buffer' between the pedestrian sidewalk and the street.

Response | Comment acknowledged – proposed improvements associated with the Phase 1 Improvements are outside the scope of this project. Phase 2 Improvements (this project) do not include multi-level segments of curb or sidewalk.

- **Any Removal of Existing Shade Trees** – I am hopeful that Pennington Borough decisionmakers will be open and transparent about any Phase II plan elements that involve the removal of existing shade trees, especially in relation to the large oak trees and sycamore/plane trees located in the Main Street portion of the Phase II streetscape improvements. Despite severe tree losses in recent years due to storms and disease, some of our large trees have managed to survive, and they continue to add beauty and distinction to our small commercial district.

Response | Comment acknowledged. The goal of the project was to maintain existing trees where possible. Following coordination with Pennington Borough, Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee, and Mercer County, some trees require removal due to damage, disease or reaching their end of life. The proposed improvements include replacing trees to be removed.

- **New Shade Tree Plantings** - When I asked the NV5 engineer questions about the new shade tree plantings for the project, he replied that he could not yet provide detailed information on the selection of tree species to be planted, and he added that he believed these decisions would be made by Pennington Borough at a later project stage. In recent years, windstorms and disease have eliminated many of the large trees that have defined our Borough's main thoroughfares for decades. The Phase II project offers an important opportunity to begin to reverse this decline, and significantly enhance the Borough's shade tree resources. For example, the Borough can choose to plant, and provide care for, tree species that have the potential to grow to be worthy replacements for the tall trees that have longed graced Pennington's main streets. Even where potential power line conflicts exist (e.g., west side of Main Street), the Borough can opt to select smaller, attractive shade tree species that can co-exist with existing power lines. Again, I am hopeful that Borough decisionmakers will be open and transparent about the process for the design and implementation of these new shade tree plantings.

Response | Following coordination with Pennington Borough and the Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee, the following tree species has been selected for the project to match the Phase 1 project.

Botanical Name	Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk'
Common Name	Ivory Silk Lilac Tree
Mature Height	15 - 25 feet
Mature Spread	10 - 15 feet
Sun Exposure	Full Sun
Soil	Widely Adaptable
Growth Rate	Medium
Flower Color	Creamy, White
Foliage	Green
Pollinator Friendly	Yes



6. Email 04/12/2023 11:21AM: In-Person Comment received by Pennington Borough

A resident came into today to comment on the handicapped spot-on W. Delaware and how it is often not accessible due to deliveries at Vito's. She wondered if it could be part of the streetscape plan to ensure there was both a loading area and an accessible spot.

Response | The parking space in question is signed for handicap parking only. Parking violations are an enforcement issue. The comment is acknowledged by the Borough.

7. Email 05/09/2023 9:39PM: Pennington Borough Council Input:

Hello Mayor Davy -

The Shade Tree Committee reviewed the comments during our meeting tonight. There were no substantive comments regarding these responses. The Committee reiterated its preference for the Lilac tree as the street tree, due to the preference for continuation with the existing street trees and the limitations posed by the physical environment.

It was also suggested that perhaps an educational session for residents on the physical limitations for tree plantings, such as the need for the roots to fully disintegrate, and in some cases the roots give off chemicals for several years (8-10), that prevent the ability for a new tree to grow in that location, could be a useful endeavor. Not just for this project, but for all the street tree concerns in the Borough. These physical root issues, along with the more obvious ones of overhead wires and underground utilities, limit our choices for street trees.

Please let me know if there are any other questions from Borough Council.

Thanks!

Kate [Katherine Fullerton, Pennington Borough Shade Tree Committee]

Response | [Comment received.](#)

8. Email 05/17/2023 4:18PM: Pennington Historic Preservation Commission Chair Input

Dear Mayor Davey:

Streetscape improvement comments and responses were discussed at the Preservation Commission meeting last night, attended by all but two members.

There were no objections or comments other than additional comments regarding the use of 4,000K light sources in new sidewalk street lamps.

The following comments were made by several members with general agreement by all:

- 4000K is uncomfortably cold and bright, and out of character with a historic downtown.
- In response to consultant note that 4000K lamps offer increased lumen output, we note that substantial light output is not needed at these lamps, and is in fact detrimental. The street already has streetlights, these sidewalk lights should offer a softer aesthetic, more in keeping with the ambience of the tree-lined downtown. These streetlamps are really secondary light sources providing “aesthetic” lighting.
- In response to consultant note that 4000K lamps are longer lasting, we note that all LED lamps have a substantially longer life than lamp types used previously. Given the long life of LED lamps in general, we question the value of the slightly longer life of a 4000K vs 3000K vs 2700K lamp.
- Softer, warmer lighting is better for birds and wildlife.

If Municipal purchasing plus PSE&G involvement add up to these fixtures being available only with 4000K lamps (take it or leave it), then we would recommend that the Borough independently swap out the offending 4000K lamps and install 2700K in their place.

Also note that the only issue with the proposed streetlamps is the color temperature of the lamps – the fixture itself is historically and visually appropriate, and has full cut-off (dark sky).

Response | [Following coordination with PSE&G, PSE&G does not offer 2700K or 3000K LED bulbs, only 4000K.](#)

9. Email 05/21/2023 5:19PM: Pennington Councilmember Input

I think we need to know for certain that there is no alternative softer lighting from PSE&G. Please do reach out. If I am not mistaken these are lights that we are installing for ambiance not safety because we already have the larger ones, so I assume there is no safety requirement that applies here. I would hate for us get stuck with lighting we don't appreciate based on assumptions. Someone... I assume PSE&G has just installed an incredibly white light on Park at the intersection of Weidel. I am really hesitant to see that kind of light installed in the vintage looking lights on Main Street. It just misses the mark entirely as the light is bright and very cool. If this is where PSE&G is headed for their utility lights, and given that the LEDs last a really long time, it seems worth it for Pennington to do all we can to prevent two layers of such lighting on our Main business district. Reaching out to be absolutely sure that no alternative can be offered seems prudent.

Response | [From NV5: Following additional coordination with PSE&G, PSE&G does not offer 2700K or 3000K LED bulbs, only 4000K.](#)

[Please understand that your comment about this not being a safety project conflicts with the Borough's federal Transportation Alternatives grant funding this project. The grant application includes/promotes safe pedestrian travel. The lighting layout is based upon needs to](#)

| illuminate the sidewalk.

10. June 4, 2023 7:48 PM: Pennington Historic Preservation Commission Chair Input

It appears from the Design Consultant's response that PSE&G is inflexible about providing streetlamps with anything less than 4000K Lamping.

As one last follow-up, I contacted the local representative for the fixture manufacturer, questioning whether there would be a possibility of swapping the lamp after installation if, as I believe, the quality of light will be obtrusive.

I spoke with XXXXXXX, local rep for Acuity Brands (contact info redacted Eric Holtermann).

First, he noted that you can't "change the bulb later". These LED lamps have "light engines" that are integral to the manufacture of the fixture.

He then said questions have been raised in other towns about PSE&G's inflexibility with 4000K lamps. The town of Dover recently cancelled their contract (or at least did not proceed) with PSE&G because they didn't want 4000K lamps. He said the same question has also come up in other NJ towns served by PSE&G, specifically some that were concerned about quality of light in historic downtowns.

However, he said if you stay with the PSE&G contract program, which includes maintenance, then you have to live with the 4000K lamps.

He went on to say that discussion in other towns questions whether PSE&G maintenance program is a good deal or not, since LED lamped fixtures don't need anywhere near the maintenance of older lamp types. He expects that some towns will be dropping the PSE&G program, at least in part to have more control over lamping options.

For now, it seems that the 4000K lamps may be baked in to this grant-funded streetscape program.

I walked through the crossroads last night, and was reminded how nice the warm glow of existing lamps is.

Personally, I would recommend deleting any new sidewalk lampposts from the proposed phase 2 streetscape design altogether (they are not really necessary), and just keeping the ones we already have at the crossroads.

Response | [The Borough is investigating other lower luminaire options.](#)