

MEMORANDUM

March 31, 2023

To: Keith Hamas

Organization: North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority

From: Michael Blau (Toole Design), Karp Strategies, Equitable Cities

Project: North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Regional Active Transportation Plan

Re: Community Engagement Summary – FINAL REVISED (6/16/23)

Introduction

Community input is critical to understanding how people currently walk and bike, and what infrastructure and policy changes would increase use of active transportation in North Jersey. To engage the public, the NJTPA and the consultant team created a strategic Community Engagement Plan, and deployed various engagement methodologies to gather input from a diverse group of residents within the North Jersey region.

By engaging residents via pop-up events, focus groups, and interviews, the NJTPA heard a range of perspectives and experiences. Participants included those who frequently use various forms of active transportation, those who rarely walk and bike, and those who would like to do so more often. Ultimately, listening and engaging with residents from across the region means that the NJTPA is better positioned to create and implement a more effective Active Transportation Plan (ATP) that benefits all residents.

Purpose of Community Engagement

The NJTPA established four goals public engagement goals for engaging with residents in developing the ATP:

- To capture equitable geographical representation of the North Jersey region, with special consideration for stakeholders from geographies without prior representation.
- To emphasize the inclusion of disadvantaged communities that have historically been missing from the engagement process.
- To gather feedback from transportation professionals and advocates, as well as from the public, to best inform technical and strategic ATP elements.
- To ensure that stakeholders see themselves reflected in the ATP's findings.

To achieve these goals, the NJTPA and consultant team created a strategic Community Engagement Plan and deployed various engagement methodologies to receive input from a diverse group of residents within the North Jersey region.

Development of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The stakeholder engagement plan laid out the NJTPA's engagement goals (above) and synthesized research from similar active transportation projects that proactively incorporated the voices of a diverse group of residents, especially those in low-income communities and communities of color. The information reviewed included Plan 2050 (the NJTPA's Long Range Transportation Plan), the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Statewide Overburdened Communities Map, the NJTPA's Subregion Diversity Profiles, the NJTPA Public Engagement Plan, and the NJTPA Virtual Public Engagement Best Practices.

The plan listed potential engagement methodologies, which included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), focus groups, interviews, case studies, and public engagement events. To develop a list of stakeholders, in April 2022 the consultant team and the NJTPA staff created criteria for how to prioritize stakeholder groups and individuals to engage. The plan prioritized stakeholders who met the following criteria:

1. An equitable representation of geographies, built environment typologies, and modes of transportation;
2. Populations and organizational stakeholders who have not previously been engaged; and
3. Historically disadvantaged or underserved communities.

Engagement Strategies and Outcomes

A mix of public, organizational, and professional stakeholder engagement was key to success for the Active Transportation Plan. The NJTPA used the following tailored activities to engage different types of communities across the region: surveys at pop-up events, focus groups, a Technical Advisory Committee, small group interviews, and case study interviews. The feedback gathered from the various events allowed for a diverse group of stakeholders, both residents and experts, to inform the ATP.

Pop-Up Public Engagement at Existing Community Gatherings

Pop-up public engagement events enabled the NJTPA to meet stakeholders where they already gather, and to solicit input across various demographics and counties. These events allowed the NJTPA to interact with many individuals, as the events had significant foot traffic.

The NJTPA deployed 12 pop-ups at existing large community events throughout the region in the summer and fall of 2022. At each event, staff set up an informational booth with visually compelling posters and brochures about the ATP, and asked passersby about their experience using active transportation in North Jersey. Participants were prompted to complete a survey via iPad on their active transportation choices and preferences. A web-based map enabled participants to pinpoint specific areas that currently provide robust active transportation options, and areas that need improvement.

The NJTPA interacted with more than 130 people at the following community events:

1. Plainfield National Night Out (August 2)
2. Somerset County 4-H Fair, Bridgewater (August 11)
3. Passaic County Fair, Woodland Park (August 12)
4. Wharton Canal Day Music & Craft Festival (August 20)
5. Hunterdon County 4-H Fair (August 26)
6. Union County Transportation Advisory Board Meeting (September 7)
7. Montclair Jazz Fest (September 10)
8. Bridgewater Chinese Mid-Autumn Lantern Festival (September 10-18)

9. New Brunswick Community Farmers Market (September 17)
10. Newark's Lincoln Park Sustainable Living Community Bike Festival (September 18)
11. Journal Square Green Market in Jersey City (September 21)
12. Milford Alive (September 24)

Focus Groups

Focus groups assemble small groups community members from a variety of sectors and socioeconomic, racial, and linguistic backgrounds, who may serve as representatives of these groups in a professional or advocacy capacity. Focused discussion drives participants towards surfacing values and priorities, and leaves room for stakeholders to learn from and challenge each other in a group setting with representatives from multiple organizations. For this plan, focus groups aimed to provide a safe space for those who may have been previously left out or marginalized in conversations about transportation, mobility, and active transportation to express their thoughts and feedback.

The NJTPA's consultant team organized and facilitated three focus groups to elevate the perspectives of people with disabilities, Latinx residents, and Black residents. These three demographics were selected based on the NJTPA's goal to gain meaningful input from populations representing historically disadvantaged or underserved communities. To identify participants within these demographics, the team reached out to community organizations and nonprofits in North Jersey. Each participant received a stipend for participating.

The focus groups were held virtually for 90 minutes each. The groups consisted of four to seven participants, with a total of 16 participants across the three focus groups (seven men and nine women). Participants ranged in age from 24-70 and lived in seven different counties.

Questions focused on individual experiences with active transportation, the available active transportation infrastructure in North Jersey, and how individuals' identities may impact their active transportation decisions and experiences. Focus group questions included the following (full list of questions included in Appendix A):

- On an average week or weekend, how do you currently get around North Jersey?
- Where do you use active transportation? If you don't currently use active transportation, why not?
- Are there currently places you feel that you need to drive to, but would prefer to use other forms of transportation to reach?
- What would make active transportation feel easier or more inclusive for you?

The focus groups surfaced overarching themes about active transportation and travel preferences across demographics. Safety concerns posed the greatest barrier to participants using active transportation methods more often, and encompassed accessible street design, adequate lighting, and reducing vehicle speed. Sidewalk and path maintenance was another common concern, particularly for participants with disabilities who use wheelchairs or other mobility devices and face challenges moving across paths that have not been cleared or maintained. Participants across all three groups also noted that many roads do not have sidewalks, limiting options for active transportation.

Within specific groups, the following themes emerged:

People with Disabilities

Seven participants spoke about their lived experiences in navigating North Jersey's active transportation network as people with disabilities. The unique disabilities of each participant resulted in a range of

preferred transportation modes, from wheelchair to tricycle. Given the challenges faced by these participants when commuting or moving through the region, they stressed the need for planners and municipalities to think through potential obstacles at all stages of a journey.

Participants with disabilities shared the following feedback:

- The lack of sidewalk access and curb ramps can be major barriers for many users.
- Design decisions such as the visibility of signs, the street grade, and the timing of traffic signals for crosswalks are critical safety features.
- Beyond the street design and infrastructure, maintenance is critical to ensure that sidewalks are level and navigable for users of all abilities.
- Bollards, other obstacles, and incomplete sidewalk pathways prevent wheelchair access.
- Irregular terrain makes it difficult for those with balance issues to walk.
- Infrequent sidewalk curb cutouts make it difficult to navigate in a wheelchair.
- Crosswalk and call buttons are often difficult to reach.
- Crosswalks could be improved by providing more time for pedestrians to cross.
- Recreational trails that are evenly paved are more accessible.
- More bike lanes would improve access to active transportation, particularly painted bike lanes.
- Signs indicating that an area is handicap accessible would allow residents with disabilities to feel more confident or included in spaces.

Latinx Residents

The second group centered on the Latinx community. All four participants identified as immigrants and, given their range of English proficiency, a Spanish language interpreter was present to support the discussion. The participants in this group were women with children, which resulted in a shared experience around traveling with young people. This translated into specific concerns about how to create active transportation systems for families.

Latinx participants shared the following feedback:

- Safety concerns, particularly when crossing streets, were a major deterrent for using active transportation, particularly when traveling or commuting with children.
- Litter on sidewalks and uneven pavement create inhospitable walking conditions.
- The lack of street lighting poses a safety concern for going outside in the evening.
- Participants were more likely to consider walking or biking in the spring and summer when the weather is warmer.
- Participants were less familiar with available recreational trails and bike paths.
- Language was not considered a barrier to using forms of active transportation.

Black Residents

Five participants provided insights into existing conditions in their neighborhoods and the changes they would like to see to feel more comfortable using active transportation. In this group, many participants were interested in using modes of active transportation more often, but felt that the design of their communities, particularly suburban neighborhoods, made it difficult or unsafe to travel unless in a car.

Black participants shared the following feedback:

- Participants noted a need for better multimodal connections between neighborhoods and stores/destinations.

- Safety is a major barrier to active transportation, particularly in areas with heavy traffic.
- Several participants noted their appreciation for trail systems, particularly in warmer weather.
- There is a need for better cross-transportation resources like space on PATH trains for bikes.
- More safety barriers and protected bike lanes would help residents consider biking more often without safety concerns.
- Campaigns to promote biking for all, and shift public perception of bicyclists away from highly confident road cyclists who are a fraction of all bicyclists but occupy an outsized and visible presence on the road; this would create a social change around who is seen as a “cyclist.”
- Trees and other design aspects to beautify a neighborhood make people want to walk and bike.

Technical Advisory Committee

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) consisted of local and regional agency staff, advocates, elected officials, and other stakeholders across the region who understand local community needs or obstacles and possess an in-depth technical understanding of active transportation best practices, tools, and strategies. TAC members assisted in the development of the ATP by establishing network development criteria, identifying missing supplemental data for network analysis, highlighting key challenges for active transportation connections across the region, and providing feedback on the proposed regional ATP network.

The NJTPA staff identified potential TAC members based on their subject matter expertise, ties to their community, and role within the ATP process, while also ensuring that the committee was geographically representative of the North Jersey region. A total of 22 TAC members were invited to join the TAC. Members represented city, county, and state-level agencies, community organizations, academic institutions, Transportation Management Associations, and the NJTPA’s Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).

The TAC met twice over during the project—in May 2022 and in November 2022. Each meeting included a progress update and TAC members provided important feedback at key points in the process. Specifically, TAC members were involved in providing direct feedback on the preliminary network and regional network analysis. Mentimeter, an interactive online collaboration tool, served as an interactive visual tool at each meeting during feedback discussions, allowing TAC members to see multiple responses at once and contribute to the discussion simultaneously.

During each TAC meeting, the project team used Mentimeter as an interactive visual aid during feedback discussions. This allowed TAC members to see multiple responses at once and contribute to the discussion simultaneously. TAC member responses were interpreted and summarized as they were shared in Mentimeter, and TAC members were encouraged to elaborate and share additional thoughts with the group.

TAC Meeting #1

The first TAC meeting was held virtually via Zoom in May 2022. The purpose of the first meeting was to obtain feedback from the TAC on the project’s outreach strategies and decision-making framework for project case studies. TAC members learned the overall purpose of the project, the project timeline, and their roles and responsibilities as TAC members. Following the project introduction and questions, TAC members participated in a discussion about the project’s approach, active transportation implementation challenges, and provided guidance on a decision-making framework for future case studies.

Discussion questions during the first TAC meeting included general reactions to the project, but focused on TAC member priorities for case study selection in a latter project phase. The full set of discussion questions and Mentimeter results from TAC Meeting #1 are available in Appendix B.

TAC members were asked to indicate which case study criteria they consider to be most important when selecting case studies. Their input informed the case study selection process by adding and prioritizing factors for the project team. During the discussion, TAC members raised several key points to consider when selecting case studies, including land use context, community involvement, overall regional representativeness, coordination across county borders, safety and crash history, and constructability.

TAC Meeting #2

The second TAC meeting was held virtually via Zoom in November 2022. The purposes of the second meeting were to provide a project update, an overview of the Preliminary Network, and to obtain feedback from the TAC on their case study priorities. At the start of the meeting, TAC members were reminded of the project goals, provided with an updated project schedule, and received an overview of the project’s outreach activities and results. The remainder of the meeting included an in-depth presentation of the regional network analyses and preliminary network, and a feedback activity and discussion on preferred case study elements.

TAC member responses to the preliminary network and regional network analysis emphasized the importance of clearly displaying major regional connections in the ATP network maps, ensuring that on-road *and* off-road connections were incorporated into the network analysis, and noting the relationship between housing and transportation in the final plan.

The project team asked TAC members to indicate their preferences for specific case study elements based on the shortlist of candidate locations. The most preferred elements were First and Last Mile Connections to Transit, On-street Bike Facilities, and Complete Streets. The question and Mentimeter results from TAC Meeting #2 are available in Appendix C.

Project Website, Map, and Survey

To capture a broad audience across the NJTPA region, as well as those who may not be able to attend in-person events, the NJTPA provided a [project website](#) as a venue to solicit public input through a survey and interactive map activity that was available from June to October 2022. The survey received more than 650 responses.

The interactive map activity received nearly 400 responses from every county in the region. While these responses are not a representative sample of the North Jersey population, they do provide some insight on public priorities regarding active transportation needs and potential improvements. The map responses were clustered in Jersey City, Newark, Hackensack, and Elizabeth. More than 78 percent of the segments noted in the map are within or intersect an area identified as Overburdened Communities (OBC). Participants could categorize their responses in the map activity. Table 1 provides the number of responses for each category (participants could select more than one category for each line they drew on the map). Most respondents noted desired improvements and/or current walking/biking use along local roadways.

Table 1. Responses by interactive map activity category

This is a comment about:	Number of responses
Where I currently walk/bike	153
Where I would like to walk/bike more	283

This is a comment about:	Number of responses
Space to walk	159
Space to bike	159
Space to scooter or skateboard	97
Vehicle speeding	126
Aggressive driving	117
Poor sidewalk or pavement conditions	114
Safer crossings	160
Accessibility / Accommodations for people with disabilities	49
Transit	43
Bike parking	38
Street lighting	42
Street trees or greenery	30
Flooding	8
Other	33

Integrating Engagement Throughout Plan Development

ATP Strategy Guide Small Group Interviews

Conducting four small group interviews helped develop recommended strategies for local active transportation project implementation in subregions and municipalities across North Jersey. Small group interviews are 90-minute sessions wherein 6-8 people participate in a facilitated discussion. City, county, regional, and state stakeholders were invited to describe their methods and approaches to successfully implementing active transportation projects. Findings from the small group interviews were a key input for developing a set of informed, successful strategies for implementing active transportation projects and programs at the subregional and local levels.

To identify candidates for the small group interviews, active transportation projects across the North Jersey region were compiled and shortlisted by considering the following factors: geographic representation, place types, and degree of active transportation implementation. A roster of local and county staff members from each candidate project location was compiled upon confirmation by the NJTPA. Small group interview participants are listed in Appendix D.

Potential interview participants were categorized into four small groups. The project team scheduled one interview session for each participant category. Participants were notified of the small group interview opportunity and invited via email in December 2022.

1. NJTPA staff
2. City and county staff focused on planning or policy
3. City and county staff focused on engineering and public works
4. A subset of members from the NJTPA Active Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Participants for the ATP Strategy Guide small group interviews represented NJTPA staff, city or county staff in planning or policy, city or county staff in engineering or public works, and members of the NJTPA

ATP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). A total of 45 potential interviewees were invited to participate in a small group interview, and a total of 27 participants joined one of the four small group interviews. The greatest number of participants (10) participated in the TAC subset interview, followed by the NJTPA staff group (7), the city and county planning and policy group (6), and the city and county engineering and public works group (4). It should be noted that the city and county interviews each included a blend of staff members from both sets of professions, planning and policy, and engineering and public works.

The project team facilitated the small group interviews as formal listening sessions, wherein interview participants would individually respond to a discussion prompt from the facilitator. In a listening session, participants may elect to respond directly to the prompt or to each other over the course of the discussion. The discussions in the small group interviews followed a series of predetermined questions to cover themes applicable to active transportation implementation at the county and local levels.

Facilitators used four sets of discussion questions to guide the small group interviews. Each set of prompts contained questions specific to the participant group, as well as questions posed to all groups. Common questions between all four interviews were about equity and environmental justice, community engagement and outreach, interdepartmental or multijurisdictional collaborations, and a catch-all question for advice to local municipalities. Other questions in the small group interviews were about funding, public engagement, and data and performance measures. Appendix E shows all small group interview questions by interview group.

Participant statements were noted during the interview using Otter.AI, an automated transcription tool. The use of Otter.AI allowed facilitators to fully engage with the participants in conversation. During the discussion period, a facilitator highlighted key takeaways directly in the transcript to return to during the analysis of the small group interviews. For the small group interview analysis, the project team identified common responses among participants by paraphrasing and consolidating the main takeaways from each small group interview. The outcomes from the interviews formed several core themes and set the framework for the ATP Strategy Guide. The core themes in the ATP Strategy Guide are:

1. Interjurisdictional and multisectoral collaboration
2. Building success for active transportation within municipal organizations
3. Equity and environmental justice
4. Measuring success and data
5. Community engagement and outreach
6. Funding for active transportation delivery

Case Study Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder identification and engagement were critical in understanding the needs of each of the case study locations as well as input on the proposed recommendations. There were two stakeholder meetings held in April 2023 with identified stakeholders. The goal of these meetings was to provide an update on case studies as well as to gather feedback. A summary of participants, discussion and feedback is contained within the discussions of each case study in the Case Studies Memorandum.

Incorporating Engagement Findings into the Plan

The interactive webmap allowed community members to provide comments based on specific locations in their communities. The webmap was also used during direct outreach at pop-ups and other engagement activities to obtain specific feedback from the public. To ensure that the feedback directly informed the

proposed regional ATP network, the webmap comments were compiled and summarized into main takeaways, which were referenced during network development.

Main takeaways were informed by summary-level geographic analysis of webmap comments. The interactive webmap allowed the project team to identify spatial trends to inform the main takeaways because each webmap comment was associated with a geographic location along a corridor or at a specific point in the study area. The main takeaways that were developed using webmap responses in September 2022 are in Appendix F.

The preliminary network also underwent extensive review with NJTPA staff, the project TAC, subregions, and RTAC members to ensure the most appropriate routes were included in ATP recommendations, and that the most updated existing and proposed network information from previous plans and studies was included.

Appendix A: Focus Group Questions

- On an average week or weekend, how do you currently get around North Jersey?
- Active transportation refers to human-powered travel, like walking, using a wheelchair, bicycling, and riding a scooter or skateboard. Do you use active forms of transportation? If so, which ones? Why do you use that/those?
- Where do you use active transportation?
- If you don't currently use active transportation, why not?
- Are there forms of active transportation you'd like to be taking more often, but currently do not?
- What is your barrier to traveling that way instead?
- For those of you who use active transportation, how does it feel?
- What is your experience, if any, with any recreation trails paths near you?
- Are there currently places you feel that you need to drive to, but would prefer to use other forms of transportation to reach?
- How does your identity inform the way you use transit or move around North Jersey? Identity could mean race, ethnicity, language, ability, gender, or other term that you feel makes up your identity.
- What are the greatest barriers to physical access to trails and bike paths?
- What would make active transportation feel easier or more inclusive for you?

Appendix B: TAC Meeting #1 Questions

1. What are your gut reactions to what you've heard so far?

Choices	Votes
Very favorable	4
somewhat favorable	14
Neutral	2
Somewhat unfavorable	0
Very unfavorable	0

2. What are the main challenges to developing active transportation connections locally?
 3. As part of this project, what are the most important criteria for selecting potential corridors for further study?

Choices	Votes
Presence of active transportation trip generators	12
Multimodal considerations at different scales	10
Presence of EJ communities	8
Land use context	6
Community involvement	6
Population density	5
Level of bike/ped activity	4
Presence of transit	2
Overall regional representativeness	2
Project type (construction, reconstruction, or retrofit)	1
Alignment with project goals	0

4. As part of this project, what are the most important elements of technical assistance needed to advance AT planning at the local level?

Choices	Votes
Implementation guidance	13
Stakeholder and public engagement	10
Design guidance	9

Preliminary alignments for proposed projects	7
Infrastructure recommendations	7
Existing conditions assessment	4
Policy and program recommendations	3
Other	3

5. What does success look like as part of this effort?

Appendix C: TAC Meeting #2 Questions

1. What case study elements are you most interested in?

Choices	Votes (%)
First and Last Mile Connections to Transit	13
On-street Bike Facilities	13
Complete Streets	12
Temporary Demonstrations	10
Access to Downtown/Business District	10
Enhancing Access to Existing Trails	10
Rail to Trail Development	8
Micromobility	7
Access to Natural Recreation Areas	7
Safe Routes to School	5
Wayfinding	4
Curbside Management	1

Appendix D: Small Group Interview Participants

Organizations

- Avenues in Motion
- Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center at Rutgers University
- Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
- EZ Ride
- New Jersey Bike & Walk Coalition
- New Jersey Transit
- NJTPA (including Long Range, Systems Planning, Local Project Development, Capital Projects)
- Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
- Tri State Transportation Campaign

Counties and Municipalities

- Franklin Township
- Hoboken
- Hudson County
- Jersey City
- Middlesex County
- Morris County
- Passaic County
- Somerset County
- Warren County

Appendix E: ATP Strategy Guide Small Group Interview Questions by Interview Group

Group #1 (TAC subgroup)

1. Consider the lifecycle of an active transportation project from concept to final design and construction. At what point does outreach start with the community? How does this affect community buy-in and local politics? Separately, what are the approval processes and interdepartmental collaborations that occur?
2. How are equity and environmental justice incorporated into the planning and funding of active transportation projects?
3. Think about the active transportation projects and programs you were involved in. What local successes do you want to highlight? Why?
 1. What was unique about their approach to:
 1. Local politics?
 2. Community buy-in?
 3. Policy commitments?
 4. Leadership and interagency/department collaboration?
4. What role did you/your agency or organization play?
5. Who were key players or collaborators that brought the project to fruition?
6. What were some unexpected challenges? How were they resolved?
7. What would you do differently next time?
8. Any additional comments on the planning, funding, or implementation of a local active transportation project?

Group #2 (NJTPA staff)

1. Consider the lifecycle of an active transportation project from concept to final design and construction. At what point does outreach start with the community? How does this affect community buy-in and local politics? Separately, what are the approval processes and interdepartmental collaborations that occur?
2. How are equity and environmental justice incorporated into the planning and funding of active transportation projects?
3. Think about the active transportation projects across the region. Are there any local projects that have been particularly successful? Why?
 - a. What was unique about their approach to:
 - i. Local politics?
 - ii. Community buy-in?
 - iii. Policy commitments?
 - iv. Leadership and interagency/department collaboration?
4. What role did you/your agency or organization play?
5. Consider an active transportation project (failed or successful) with challenges which seemed insurmountable—what was the most important lesson learned? What would you do differently next time?
6. What funding advice would you provide to a local municipality looking to plan, design, and construct an active transportation project?
7. How can regional active transportation projects achieve greater attention and implementation amongst all projects?

8. Any additional comments on the planning, funding, or implementation of a local active transportation project?

Group #3 (City & County staff – planning & policy)

1. Consider the lifecycle of an active transportation project from concept to final design and construction. At what point does outreach start with the community? How does this affect community buy-in and local politics? Separately, what are the approval processes and interdepartmental collaborations that occur?
2. How are equity and environmental justice incorporated into the planning and funding of active transportation projects?
3. What does a fellow town looking to implement their own project need to pay attention to in the process?
4. Which operational policies have been key to the success of the project, if any? Or, which policies required changing or updating?
5. Do you use any performance measures to track progress on active transportation planning?
6. Any additional comments on the planning, funding, or implementation of a local active transportation project?

Group #4 (City & County staff – engineering & public works)

1. Consider the life cycle of an active transportation project from concept to final design and construction. What are the approval processes and interdepartmental collaborations that occur?
2. How are equity and environmental justice incorporated into the implementation and funding of active transportation projects?
3. What does a fellow town looking to implement their own project need to pay most attention to when designing and constructing an active transportation project?
4. What are common obstacles that you face when designing and constructing active transportation projects? How do you resolve them through design, planning, and policy?
5. What types of operations and maintenance challenges do you encounter with your active transportation infrastructure? Does this create concern or pushback when new projects are proposed?
6. Any additional comments on the planning, funding, or implementation of a local active transportation project?

Appendix F: Main Takeaways from Interactive Webmap Comments

- Generally, the webmap responses are clustered in Jersey City, Newark, Hackensack, and Elizabeth. Over 78 percent (n=118) of the segments noted in the survey are within or intersect an area identified as overburdened communities (OBC).
- A majority of the respondents noted desired improvements and/or current use along local roadways. These denoted roadway segments are much shorter distances than the roadways included in the draft network. Very few (<5) respondents notate high-volume corridors as places where they currently walk and bike or *would* walk and bike. Instead, respondents largely selected smaller roadways parallel to or crossing the draft network corridors as places where they would like to see improvements to access destinations.
- The average and median response segment lengths are 0.61 miles and 0.28 miles, respectively (n=150). This indicates that a majority of the responses identify quarter-mile segments in the survey as places where they walk/bike, desire improvements, or have concerns. Few respondents drew longer, continuous corridors in their survey response. It should be noted that some respondents denoted crosswalk segments or bridge crossings which could skew the median and mean segment lengths.
- There are very few instances where survey respondents identify roadway segments that overlap or intersect with the draft corridor network (26.67 percent, n=40). Of those matched segments, the average and median lengths are 2.39 miles and 1.28 miles, respectively (n=40). It should be noted that some of these segments are along railways with a noted desire for rail-to-trail conversions at these locations. This could skew the median and mean segment lengths.
- The multiple-choice question shows:
 - "Vehicle speeding" was the top concern (36.3 percent of respondents), followed by "aggressive driving" (29.9 percent) and "poor sidewalk or pavement conditions" (27.9 percent). Vehicle speeding and aggressive driving were concerns across the region, although these were the most consistent concerns in responses about roadway segments outside of the urban centers and western counties.
 - "Other" concerns (not in combination with other options) were left turns at an intersection without a left-turn signal, and bicyclists riding the wrong way on a one-way bike path.