



# ATTACHMENT 13

## Responses to Comments

**Glassboro-Camden Line FEIS**  
**February 2021**

**Prepared by:**



**Prepared for:**



Project information contained in this document, including estimated limits of disturbance that could result with construction or operation of the proposed GCL, is based on conceptual design parameters that represent a reasonably conservative basis for conducting environmental analyses. As the proposed GCL is advanced through preliminary engineering and construction, efforts will continue to be made to further refine the design and minimize the project footprint. These refinements may result in the potential to avoid and further reduce the adverse effects outlined in this document and as described within this Environmental Impact Statement.

# Contents

1	INTRODUCTION .....	3
2	LIST OF ELECTED OFFICIALS, INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS, AND LOCAL AGENCIES WHO COMMENTED	3
2.1	Elected Officials.....	3
2.2	Interested Individuals .....	4
2.3	Local Agencies.....	12
2.4	Organizations .....	13
3	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES .....	13
3.1	DEIS Comments.....	14
3.1.1	Purpose and Need.....	14
3.1.2	Land Form and Hydrological Features .....	15
3.1.3	Biological Resources.....	16
3.1.4	Land Use and Zoning.....	18
3.1.5	Hazardous Materials .....	19
3.1.6	Transportation .....	19
3.1.7	Cultural Resources .....	31
3.1.8	Socioeconomic Conditions.....	32
3.1.9	Neighborhood Character .....	32
3.1.10	Environmental Justice .....	35
3.1.11	Safety and Security.....	35
3.1.12	Parklands.....	41
3.1.13	Aesthetic Resources.....	42
3.1.14	Air Quality .....	43
3.1.15	Noise and Vibration .....	44
3.1.16	Construction Impacts.....	49
3.1.17	Acquisitions .....	50
3.1.18	EO-215 Public Outreach.....	51
3.2	General Comments on the Proposed Project .....	52
3.2.1	Alternatives Analysis.....	52
3.2.2	COVID-19 Pandemic.....	58
3.2.3	Funding Source.....	60
3.2.4	General Statement of Support.....	60
3.2.5	General Statement of Opposition.....	62
3.2.6	Project Alignment .....	65
3.2.6.1	Horizontal Alignment .....	65
3.2.6.2	Vertical Alignment.....	67
3.2.7	Project Construction (Methods) .....	68
3.2.8	Project Infrastructure/Components .....	68
3.2.9	Project Operations .....	71
3.2.9.1	Fare System.....	71
3.2.9.2	Frequency/Service .....	71
3.2.9.3	Fuel/Energy .....	73
3.2.9.4	Multimodal Connectivity.....	74
3.2.9.5	Operating Agency.....	75

3.2.9.6 Ridership/Forecast .....	75
3.2.10 Project Stations .....	76
3.2.11 Property Values .....	80
3.2.12 Resilience .....	80
3.2.13 Miscellaneous .....	81

## Appendices

Appendix 13-A: Full Comments

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This attachment to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) summarizes and responds to the substantive oral and written comments received during the public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for the proposed Glassboro-Camden Line. Public hearings on the DEIS were held on Tuesday, November 17, 2020, from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M., and on Thursday, November 19, 2020, from 3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions on public gatherings, the public DEIS meetings were conducted as virtual meetings utilizing the Zoom video communications and teleconferencing platform. Written comments were accepted through the close of the public comment period, which ended on Thursday, December 17, 2020 at 12:00 A.M (midnight).

Section 2 of this document identifies the elected officials, interested individuals, and local agencies who provided comments on the DEIS. Section 3 contains a summary of the relevant comments and a response to each. These comment summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Where appropriate, comments of a similar nature have been grouped together. The responses, in most cases, include detailed information from the DEIS and the reader is directed to particular sections of the DEIS, as appropriate, for additional information. Additionally, responses will identify information that is available from prior planning work, such as the Alternatives Analysis, Feasibility Study, or additional planning studies related to the proposed GCL. (Refer to <http://glassborocamdenline.com/> for additional information about the proposed GCL project and related planning studies to date.) The GCL Project Team has noted comments that were not directly related to the EIS or the proposed GCL project as well. The GCL project team appreciates all comments on this DEIS and looks forward to continued engagement with relevant agencies and the public as the proposed GCL advances into preliminary engineering.

## 2 LIST OF ELECTED OFFICIALS, INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS, AND LOCAL AGENCIES WHO COMMENTED

A list of elected officials, interested individuals, and local agencies who commented on the DEIS is provided in this section. Elected officials are listed first, interested individuals are listed second, and local agencies are listed third. Within each of these groups, commenters are listed in alphabetical order (last name, first name). For elected officials and local agencies, the commenter’s affiliation is provided after their name. The method through which the comment was submitted is listed as “oral testimony” for commenters who provided oral comments during one of two public hearings that were held on November 17, 2020 and November 19, 2020 or “written testimony” for commenters who provided written comments through the close of the public comment period on December 17, 2020; the date of each comment is provided as well. For commenters who provided multiple comments, the method and date of each comment is listed. Unique commenter IDs, which correspond to the comment summaries provided in Section 3, are provided for each commenter.

### 2.1 Elected Officials

1. Moen, Bill, New Jersey Legislative District 5 Assembly Member, oral testimony, 11/17/2020, (Assembly Member Moen)

2. Fleming, Bill, City of Woodbury Council Member, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Council Member Fleming)
3. Legge, John, Mantua Township Committeeman, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Committeeman Legge)

## 2.2 Interested Individuals

4. Adler, Deanne, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Adler)
5. Akass, Kim, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Akass)
6. Alio, Mellany, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Alio)
7. Amorates, Roseanne, written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Amorates)
8. Ancona, Michael, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ancona)
9. Andrews, Kelly, written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Andrews)
10. Appelby-Wineberg, Bryan, written testimony, 11/3/2020; written testimony, 11/3/2020 (Appelby-Wineberg)
11. Bakley, John, written testimony, 12/13/2020 (Bakley)
12. Bathurst, Paige E., written testimony, 12/17/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Bathurst)
13. Bauer, Denise, written testimony, 11/18/2020 (Bauer)
14. Bechta, Doris, written testimony, 12/3/2020 ; written testimony, 12/6/2020 (Bechta)
15. Beck, Dina, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Beck)
16. Bennett, Raymond, written testimony, 11/8/2020 (Bennett)
17. Beschler, Ross, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Beschler)
18. Biedron, Matylda, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Biedron)
19. Boddy, Christi and Mike, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Boddy)
20. Bohn, Elizabeth, written testimony, 11/28/2020; written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Bohn)
21. Bonin, Patricia and Robert, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Bonin)
22. Boyd, Michele, written testimony, 11/30/2020 (Boyd)
23. Boyle, Mat, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Boyle)
24. Brewer, Laurie, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Brewer)
25. Brittin, Ron, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Brittin)
26. Brooks, Ellen, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Brooks)
27. Brown, Matthew, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Brown, M)
28. Brown, Teresa, written testimony, 12/6/2020 (Brown, T)
29. Brush, Denise, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Brush)
30. Burk, Jamie, written testimony, 12/10/2020 (Burk)
31. Campbell, Lisa, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Campbell, L)
32. Campbell, Ryan, written testimony, 12/1/2020; written testimony, 12/7/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Campbell, R)
33. Canna, Lauren D., written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Canna)
34. Caraker, Eileen, written testimony, 12/14/2020 (Caraker)
35. Cargill, Megan, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Cargill)
36. Carlin, Matthew, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Carlin, M)
37. Carlin, Leslie and Matthew, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Carlin, L & M)
38. Carr, Ed, written testimony, 11/24/2020 (Carr)
39. Carrasquillo, Marci, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Carrasquillo)

40. Carroll, Anne, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Carroll)
41. Cassidy, Colleen, written testimony, 12/14/2020; written testimony, 12/14/2020 (Cassidy)
42. Cesare, Nicole, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Cesare)
43. Christensen, Beth, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Christensen, B)
44. Christensen, Chris, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Christensen, C)
45. Cokos, John T., written testimony, 12/11/2020 (Cokos)
46. Combs, Susan, written testimony, 11/28/2020; oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Combs)
47. Connelly, Christine, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Connelly)
48. Cooke, Dani, written testimony, 11/12/2020 (Cooke)
49. Cooper, Dan, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Cooper, D)
50. Cooper, Karen, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Cooper, K)
51. Cortés, Shelly, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Cortés)
52. Coulombe, Joe, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Coulombe)
53. Cox, Whitney, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Cox)
54. Crew, Melony, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Crew)
55. Crowley, Emily, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Crowley)
56. Crumrine, Patrick, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Crumrine)
57. Cureton, Julie, written testimony, 11/11/2020; written testimony, 11/11/2020; oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Cureton)
58. D., Matt, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Matt D)
59. Dadario, Jacqueline, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Dadario)
60. Dahlberg, Andrea, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Dahlberg)
61. Damon, Sharon E., written testimony, 12/10/2020 (Damon)
62. Daneker, Daniel, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Daneker)
63. DeGirolamo, Robin, written testimony, 12/8/2020; oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (DeGirolamo)
64. DeMasi, James, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (DeMasi)
65. Dickson, Mike, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Dickson, M)
66. Dickson, Robert, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Dickson, R)
67. DiDonna, Marlo, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (DiDonna)
68. Di Vietro, Lawrence, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Di Vietro)
69. Dobbins, Denise, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Dobbins)
70. Duffy, Jennifer, oral testimony, 11/19/2020; oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Duffy, J)
71. Duffy, Paul, written testimony, 12/5/2020; written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Duffy, P)
72. Dzinski, Robert, written testimony, 11/13/2020; oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Dzinski)
73. Eagan, Shaun, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Eagan)
74. Earley, William, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Earley)
75. Emerle, Nanette, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Emerle)
76. Errico, Dale, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Errico)
77. Everett, Jess, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Everett)
78. Everwine, Troy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Everwine)
79. Fagan, Lisa, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Fagan)
80. Feeney, Timothy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Feeney)
81. Ferrelli, Linda, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ferrelli, L)
82. Ferrelli, William, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ferrelli, W)

83. Fichera, Catherine, written testimony, 11/3/2020; written testimony, 11/3/2020 (Fichera)
84. Figueroa, Rick, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Figueroa)
85. Fisher, Alan, written testimony, 11/23/2020 (Fisher)
86. Flynn, David, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Flynn)
87. Foley, Dana, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Foley)
88. Follo, Michael, written testimony, 11/19/2020 (Follo)
89. Foster, Charles, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Foster)
90. Fournakis, Nicholas, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Fournakis)
91. Frantini, Guy, written testimony, 12/10/2020 (Frantini)
92. Freind, Bill, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Freind)
93. Fusco, Tom, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Fusco)
94. G., Nicky, written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Nicky G)
95. Gable, Diana, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Gable)
96. Galanti, Nicole, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Galanti)
97. Galbraith, Matt, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Galbraith)
98. Gandy, Rebecca, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Gandy, R)
99. Gandy, Stephen, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Gandy)
100. Gattinella, Vincent, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Gattinella)
101. Genovese, Dominic, written testimony, 11/19/2020 (Genovese)
102. Geortler, Jeff, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Geortler)
103. Gianotti, Patricia, written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Gianotti)
104. Giberson, Edith, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Giberson)
105. Glassmire, Nicholas, written testimony, 11/28/2020; written testimony, 11/30/2020 (Glassmire)
106. Gooch, Andrew, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Gooch)
107. Goodman, Elaine, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Goodman)
108. Gordy, Michael, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Gordy)
109. Graves, Jaclyn, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Graves, J)
110. Graves, Stephanie, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Graves, S)
111. Grayson, Dorothy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Grayson)
112. Guilfooy, Michael, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Guilfooy)
113. Gupta, Ashish, written testimony, 11/19/2020 (Gupta)
114. Hageman, Marie, written testimony, 12/12/2020 (Hageman)
115. Hamilton, Alan, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Hamilton, A)
116. Hamilton, Lyle, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Hamilton, L)
117. Hamilton, Melissa, written testimony, 11/12/2020 (Hamilton, M)
118. Hammond, Yvonne, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Hammond)
119. Hanson, Joshua, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 11/17/2020 (Hanson)
120. Hanstein, William, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Hanstein)
121. Harvey Jr., Rev. Charles, written testimony, 11/16/2020 (Harvey Jr.)
122. Harwell, Frances, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Harwell)
123. Hasse, John, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Hasse)
124. Hastings, Alison, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 11/17/2020 (Hastings)
125. Heller, David, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Heller)

126. Henjes, Paul, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Henjes)
127. Henry, Taylor, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Henry)
128. Herberg, Erin, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Herberg)
129. Hitchner, Josh, written testimony, 11/12/2020 (Hitchner)
130. Horn, Julia, written testimony, 11/30/2020 (Horn)
131. Hostetter, Elizabeth Ph.D., written testimony, 11/12/2020 (Hostetter)
132. Hovell, William, written testimony, 11/20/2020 (Hovell)
133. Howell, Ted, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Howell)
134. Hughes, Ryan, written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Hughes)
135. Hurst, Jackson, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Hurst)
136. Ilisco, Jody, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Ilisco)
137. Isaacson, Nina, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Isaacson)
138. Janda, Anna, oral testimony, 11/19/2020, oral testimony, 11/19/2020, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Janda)
139. Jagielski, Joe, written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Jagielski)
140. Johnson, Dara, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Johnson, D)
141. Johnson, Kamal, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Johnson, K)
142. Jordan, James, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Jordan)
143. Kae, Diane, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Kae)
144. Kaiser, Catherine, written testimony, 12/6/2020 (Kaiser)
145. Kautz, Andrew, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kautz, A)
146. Kautz, Natalie, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kautz, N)
147. Kearney, Caroline, written testimony, 12/11/2020 (Kearney, C)
148. Kearney, MaryKate, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Kearney, M)
149. Kearney, Sarah, written testimony, 12/9/2020 (Kearney, S)
150. Keck, Thomas, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Keck)
151. Kerby, Paige, written testimony, 12/11/2020 (Kerby)
152. Kerr, Eleanor, written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Kerr)
153. King, Rachel, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (King)
154. Kinmonth, Richard, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Kinmonth)
155. Kodakandla, Goutham, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kodakandla)
156. Kohler, Kurt, written testimony, 11/17/2020 (Kohler)
157. Kolek, Adam, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kolek)
158. Koniecki, Mary Beth, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Koniecki)
159. Kopp, Cindy, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kopp, C)
160. Kopp, Drew, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kopp, D)
161. Krimmel, John, written testimony, 11/3/2020 (Krimmel)
162. Krumanocker, Christine, written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Krumanocker)
163. Kurtz, Michael, written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Kurtz)
164. Kuski, Charles, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Kuski)
165. Kutza, Brian, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Kutza)
166. Lacina, Joseph and Michele, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Lacina)
167. Lahey, Bonnie, written testimony, 11/6/2020 (Lahey, B)



168. Lahey, Michael, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lahey, M)
169. Lassmire, Desiree, written testimony, 11/28/2020 (Lassmire)
170. Lauk, Kristel, written testimony, 12/6/2020; written testimony, 12/12/2020 (Lauk)
171. Lawton, Susanne, written testimony, 11/4/2020; written testimony, 11/4/2020; oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 12/14/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Lawton)
172. Layou, Scott, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Layou)
173. Lee, Oneda, written testimony, 11/11/2020 (Lee)
174. Levay, Melissa, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Levay)
175. Lierman, Ashley, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Lierman)
176. Lilley, Trish, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lilley)
177. Linhart, Ryan, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Linhart)
178. Lippincott, Joseph, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lippincott)
179. Lipsett, Amy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lipsett)
180. Lisle, Muriel, written testimony, 12/12/2020 (Lisle)
181. Litzinger, Robert E., written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Litzinger)
182. Lombardo, Rita, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Lombardo, R)
183. Lombardo, Thomas, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Lombardo, T)
184. Lovell, Joyce, oral testimony, 11/24/2020 (Lovell)
185. Lucci, Allison, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Lucci)
186. Ludwig, Anthony, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ludwig, A)
187. Ludwig, Tammy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ludwig, T)
188. Lund, Matthew, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Lund)
189. Lyons, Cathy, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lyons, C)
190. Lyons, Tom, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Lyons, T)
191. Machulsky, Ashley, written testimony, 12/3/2020; written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Machulsky)
192. Macris, Diane, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Macris)
193. Mandayam, Shreek, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Mandayam)
194. Martin, Paul, written testimony, 11/11/2020 (Martin)
195. Mas, Maria, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Mas)
196. Mason, Cristine, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Mason)
197. Mayer, Frankie, written testimony, 12/1/2020; written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Mayer)
198. McCandless, Bret, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (McCandless)
199. McClain, Patrick J. Sr., written testimony, 12/13/2020 (McClain)
200. McCollum, Brian, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (McCollum)
201. McCormick, Ryan, written testimony, 11/23/2020 (McCormick)
202. McIntyre, Paul, written testimony, 11/18/2020 (McIntyre)
203. McNulla, Ryan, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (McNulla)
204. Meagher, Steven, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Meagher)
205. Mecholsky, Al, written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Mecholsky)
206. Meil, Kristin, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Meil)
207. Merrian, Stuart, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Merrian)
208. Michalowski, Peg, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Michalowski)
209. Midgett, Joseph, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Midgett)
210. Miller, Anna, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Miller, A)

211. Miller, Jude, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Miller, J)
212. Miloszewski, Holly, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Miloszewski)
213. Mirigliani, Claudette, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Mirigliani)
214. Milward, Courtney, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Milward)
215. Monticone, Paul, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Monticone)
216. Moore, Elisha, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Moore)
217. Mor, Tom, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Mor)
218. Morency, John, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Morency)
219. Moreno, Amy, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Moreno)
220. Morison, Robert, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Morison)
221. Moscatelli, John J., written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Moscatelli)
222. Murphy, Jo, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Murphy, J)
223. Murphy, Kelly, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Murphy, K)
224. Neal, Shawn, written testimony, 12/11/2020 (Neal)
225. Nolan, Martin, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Nolan)
226. Noverati, Joseph, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Noverati, J)
227. Noverati, Rebecca, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Noverati, R)
228. O., Kim, written testimony, 11/12/2020 (O., Kim)
229. O'Connor, Regan, written testimony, 11/2/2020 (O'Connor)
230. Olshefski, Jonathan, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Olshefski)
231. O'Mara, Steven, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (O'Mara)
232. O'Neill, Anna, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (O'Neill, A)
233. O'Neill, Timothy Sr., written testimony, 12/9/2020 (O'Neill, T)
234. Offner, Judy, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Offner)
235. Orlando, Damian, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Orlando)
236. Ossman, Carol, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Ossman)
237. Pappas, Anna, oral testimony, 11/19/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Pappas)
238. Parks, Dawn, written testimony, 12/2/2020 (Parks)
239. Peterson, Andrew J., written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Peterson)
240. Petolicchio, Heather, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Petolicchio)
241. Phelan, Angelina, oral testimony, 11/19/2020, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Phelan, A)
242. Phelan, Frank, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Phelan, F)
243. Plenn, Lee, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Plenn)
244. Plourde, Bruce, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Plourde)
245. Pomilio, Kelly and Chris, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Pomilio)
246. Pontz, Mike, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Pontz)
247. Power, Mike, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Power)
248. Quigley, Kathryn, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Quigley)
249. Raiff, Bethany, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Raiff)
250. Reebenaker, Erik, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 11/18/2020; written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Reebenaker)
251. Rhodes, Carol, oral testimony, 11/19/2020; written testimony, 12/9/2020 (Rhodes)
252. Rich, Meghan, written testimony, 12/14/2020 (Rich)
253. Riccobene, Ryan, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Riccobene)

254. Riggs, Michael, written testimony, 12/9/2020 (Riggs)
255. Ritzler, William, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Ritzler, W)
256. Ritzler, William and Dawn, written testimony, 11/20/2020 (Ritzler, W & D)
257. Rizzo, Amelia, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Rizzo)
258. Robbins, Michael, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Robbins)
259. Roberts LeBeau, Lara, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Roberts LeBeau)
260. Robinson, Katelyn, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Robinson, K)
261. Robinson, Megan, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Robinson, M)
262. Rodriguez, Astrid N., written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Rodriguez, A)
263. Rodriguez, Omar, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Rodriguez, O)
264. Rogers, Kaylyn, oral testimony, 11/19/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Rogers)
265. Rudisill, Craig, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (Rudisill)
266. Rummel, Everet, written testimony, 12/9/2020 (Rummel)
267. Rutherford, Donna, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Rutherford)
268. Salvatore, Michael, written testimony, 12/4/2020; written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Salvatore)
269. Saracco, Benjamin, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Saracco)
270. Sammacicci, Nick, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Sammacicci)
271. Savage, Jennifer, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Savage)
272. Scher, Stacy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Scher)
273. Schneider, Dean, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Schneider)
274. Schwab, Carl, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Schwab)
275. Schwartz, Bruce, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Schwartz, B)
276. Schwartz, Dr. Timothy, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Schwartz, T)
277. Shaugnessy, Edward, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Shaugnessy)
278. She, Benjamin, oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (She)
279. Shute, Arlene, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Shute)
280. Siciliano, Mike, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Siciliano)
281. Slack, Peter, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Slack)
282. Smith, Dr. Edward, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Smith, E)
283. Smith, Jessie, written testimony, 12/5/2020; written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Smith, J)
284. Smith, Larry, written testimony, 11/26/2020 (Smith, L)
285. Smith, Trevor, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Smith, T)
286. Snow, Laura, written testimony, 12/4/2020; written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Snow)
287. Sparks, Harry, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Sparks)
288. Speak, Matthew, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Speak)
289. Speth, Peter M.D., oral testimony, 11/19/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Speth)
290. Staib, Elizabeth, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Staib)
291. Stewart, David, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Stewart)
292. Streater, Jon, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Streater)
293. Storms, John, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Storms)
294. Tamburello, Kelly, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Tamburello)
295. Tanzola, Gina written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Tanzola)
296. Taylor, Jeff, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Taylor, J)

297. Taylor, Lyndsay, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Taylor, L)
298. Taylor-Kearney, written testimony, 12/11/2020 (Taylor-Kearney)
299. Thorpe, Robert, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Thorpe)
300. Tinkham, Nancy, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Tinkham)
301. Toal, Brian, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Toal)
302. Tobin, Michele, oral testimony, 11/19/2020; written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Tobin)
303. Trafford, Russell, written testimony, 12/16/2020; written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Trafford)
304. Turner, Devin, written testimony, 12/15/2020; written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Turner, D)
305. Turner, Paule, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Turner, P)
306. Tyson, Charles, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Tyson)
307. Vanleer, Nicole, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Vanleer)
308. Vargas, Anthony M., written testimony, 12/13/2020 (Vargas)
309. Vitto, Cindy, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Vitto)
310. Votta, Gerald, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Votta)
311. Waddington, Amber, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Waddington)
312. Walker, Tim, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (Walker)
313. Wang, Ning, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Wang)
314. Ward, Renee, written testimony, 12/5/2020, (Ward)
315. Warren, Jonathan, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Warren)
316. Whitehead, Elizabeth, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Whitehead)
317. Whiteway, Nick, oral testimony, 11/17/2020; oral testimony, 11/19/2020 (Whiteway)
318. Williams, Steve, written testimony, 11/11/2020 (Williams)
319. Worthy, William, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Worthy)
320. Young, Neil, written testimony, 12/14/2020 (Young)
321. Zammarrelli, Elizabeth, oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Zammarrelli)
322. Zinader, Matthew, oral testimony, 11/17/2020 (Zinader)
323. Adejare, [First Name Not Provided], oral testimony, 12/17/2020 (Adejare)
324. [Last Name Not Provided], Alicia, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Alicia)
325. [Last Name Not Provided], Arianna, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Arianna)
326. [Last Name Not Provided], Daniel, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (Daniel)
327. [Last Name Not Provided], Edward, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Edward)
328. [Last Name Not Provided], Elliot, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Elliot)
329. [Last Name Not Provided], Eric, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Eric)
330. [Last Name Not Provided], Everet, written testimony, 12/9/2020 (Everet)
331. [Last Name Not Provided], Heather, written testimony, 12/4/2020 (Heather)
332. [Last Name Not Provided], Josh, written testimony, 12/3/2020 (Josh)
333. [Last Name Not Provided], Katie, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (Katie)
334. [Last Name Not Provided], Maryann, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Maryann)
335. [Last Name Not Provided], Michelle, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (Michelle)
336. [Last Name Not Provided], Rachel, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (Rachel)
337. [Last Name Not Provided], Ramon, written testimony, 12/13/2020 (Ramon)
338. [Last Name Not Provided], Samantha, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (Samantha)
339. [Last Name Not Provided], Tara, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (Tara)
340. Anonymous 1, written testimony, 11/2/2020 (A1)

341. Anonymous 2, written testimony, 11/9/2020 (A2)
342. Anonymous 3, written testimony, 11/9/2020 (A3)
343. Anonymous 4, written testimony, 11/13/2020 (A4)
344. Anonymous 5, written testimony, 11/17/2020 (A5)
345. Anonymous 6, written testimony, 11/29/2020 (A6)
346. Anonymous 7, written testimony, 11/30/2020 (A7)
347. Anonymous 8, written testimony, 12/1/2020 (A8)
348. Anonymous 9, written testimony, 12/5/2020 (A9)
349. Anonymous 10, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (A10)
350. Anonymous 11, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (A11)
351. Anonymous 12, written testimony, 12/7/2020 (A12)
352. Anonymous 13, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (A13)
353. Anonymous 14, written testimony, 12/8/2020 (A14)
354. Anonymous 15, written testimony, 12/9/2020 (A15)
355. Anonymous 16, written testimony, 12/11/2020 (A16)
356. Anonymous 17, written testimony, 12/13/2020 (A17)
357. Anonymous 18, written testimony, 12/14/2020 (A18)
358. Anonymous 19, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (A19)
359. Anonymous 20, written testimony, 12/15/2020 (A20)
360. Anonymous 21, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A21)
361. Anonymous 22, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A22)
362. Anonymous 23, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A23)
363. Anonymous 24, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A24)
364. Anonymous 25, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A25)
365. Anonymous 26, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A26)
366. Anonymous 27, written testimony, 12/16/2020 (A27)
367. Anonymous 28, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A28)
368. Anonymous 29, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A29)
369. Anonymous 30, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A30)
370. Anonymous 31, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A31)
371. Anonymous 32, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A32)
372. Anonymous 33, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A33)
373. Anonymous 34, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A34)
374. Anonymous 35, written testimony, 12/17/2020 (A35)

### **2.3 Local Agencies**

375. Franklin Township Environmental Commission, written testimony by Chairperson Barbara Halpern, 11/3/2020; written testimony, 11/3/2020; written testimony, 11/12/2020 (FTEC)
376. Wenonah Environmental Commission, oral testimony by Chairman Scott Barnes, 11/19/2020 (Wenonah Env. Comm.)
377. Westville Environmental Commission, written testimony by Commissioner Jeff Storms, 12/17/2020 (Westville Env. Comm.)

## 2.4 Organizations

378. Chamber of Commerce, Southern New Jersey, oral testimony by Manager of Government Affairs Hilary Chebra, 11/17/2020 (CCSNJ)
379. Consolidated Rail Corporation, written testimony by Eric B. Levin (submitted by Ryan M. Hill), 12/17/2020 (Conrail)
380. New Jersey Alliance for Action, oral testimony by President Jerry Keenan, 11/19/2020 (NJAA)
381. Southern New Jersey Development Council, oral testimony by President Marlene Asselta, 11/19/2020; written testimony by President Marlene Asselta, 11/19/2020 (SNJDC)
382. Tri-County Sustainability, oral testimony by Sean Mohen, 11/17/2020

## 3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This section contains summaries of comments received through oral testimony at the two public hearings held on November 17, 2020 and November 19, 2020 and written testimony provided through the close of the public comment period on December 17, 2020 and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Where appropriate, comments of a similar nature have been grouped together. Commenter IDs are provided at the end of each comment summary that correspond to the list of commenters provided in Section 2. Where unspecified, chapter and section references provided in responses to comments refer to the DEIS. The comments are organized into two groups, DEIS Comments and General Comments on the Proposed Project. Within these two main groups relevant sub-groups are provided for organizational purposes. An outline of this organization structure is provided below:

- DEIS Comments
  - Purpose and Need
  - Land Form and Hydrological Features
  - Biological Resources
  - Land Use and Zoning
  - Hazardous Materials
  - Transportation
  - Cultural Resources
  - Socioeconomic Conditions
  - Neighborhood Character
  - Environmental Justice
  - Safety and Security
  - Parklands
  - Aesthetic Resources
  - Air Quality
  - Noise and Vibration
  - Construction Impacts
  - Acquisitions
  - EO-215 Public Outreach
- General Comments on the Proposed Project
  - Alternatives Analysis

- COVID-19 Pandemic
- Funding Source
- General Statement of Support
- General Statement of Opposition
- Project Alignment (Horizontal)
- Project Alignment (Vertical)
- Project Construction (Methods)
- Project Infrastructure/Components
- Project Operations (Fare System)
- Project Operations (Frequency/Service)
- Project Operations (Fuel/Energy)
- Project Operations (Multimodal Connectivity)
- Project Operations (Operating Agency)
- Project Operations (Ridership/Forecast)
- Project Stations
- Property Values
- Resilience
- Miscellaneous

### 3.1 DEIS Comments

#### 3.1.1 Purpose and Need

The following comments received relate to the purpose and need for the proposed GCL:

- Gloucester county is a more rural area and does not need transit stations. (Bauer)
- There is no need for a passenger train in Sewell. (Amorates) (Katie) (Krumanocker)
- What is the purpose and need for this project as I do not see the reason to travel from Glassboro to Camden? (Biedron) (Cooper, D) (Dadario) (DeMasi) (Kearney, S) (O’Mara) (Phelan, F) (Rhodes) (Rutherford) (A34)
- The GCL will not meet needs of residents and business owners. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Figueroa) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lahey, M) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)
- Has anyone surveyed the need for this project? Who and how many people will use the GCL? (O’Neill, A)
- This is a poor use of public funds because ridership would be insufficient, there are better alternatives like a bus system, and the trains would be slow. (Kearney, C)
- The connection between Glassboro and Camden is unhelpful and unnecessary; it would not serve the larger communities in the region, the Rowan University campus in Sewell, many health care services, or shopping centers. (Taylor-Kearney) (Westville Env. Comm.)
- I do not see a need for the proposed GCL; there are currently alternative modes of transportation available. The GCL is unnecessary; there are alternate modes of transportation. (Samantha) (Scher) (Waddington)
- The GCL will only serve the small community of Rowan University, not the region as a whole. (Macris)

- Restoring passenger service to these communities does not make sense because they've changed since they were previously, originally served by rail transit. (Earley)
- This line is unnecessary. (Cassidy) (Gianotti) (Hanstein) (Kerby) (Kurtz) (Lyons, C) (Nicky G) (Riggs) (Shaugnessy) (Shute) (A19)
- We do not need the GCL; the cost is unjustified. (Combs) (Lyons, C)
- I do not think this will reduce people's commutes. (A31)

**Response:** The purpose of the proposed GCL is to improve public transportation in Southern New Jersey and provide a reliable and viable alternative to existing automobile dependency. The project is expected to contribute to a collective of public transportation improvements in the State aimed to support efforts to lessen the pace of automobile-dependent “sprawl” development and help reduce traffic congestion on the region’s already-burdened roadways. The GCL is also expected to increase mobility between and within local communities and established activity and employment centers and improve connectivity regionally by providing connections (in the City of Camden) to Philadelphia, Trenton, and other points in the region via the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) Speedline, the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE, and NJ Transit bus routes.

The GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they developed around transit. The entirety of corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the proposed GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e., would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e., greatest cost-benefit). Highway alignments would require extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. Refer to Section 1.2, “Project Purpose and Need,” for a discussion of travel demands, future growth, and the intended purpose of the GCL.

### 3.1.2 Land Form and Hydrological Features

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about impacts to farmland. (Storms)

**Response:** Comment noted. It is assumed that any potential significant adverse impacts that could be identified through ongoing consultation with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) would be mitigated in accordance with NJDEP guidance.

The proposed Mantua Boulevard Station would permanently affect one farmland parcel—Block 170, Lots 3 and 3.01—in Mantua Township. The construction of the station would affect approximately 4.41 acres of farmland due to the change in land use from



agriculture use to rail/transportation. The significance of this disturbance will be determined during coordination with NJDEP.

**Comment 2:** The GCL would affect water quality. (Kearney, C)

**Response:** As the proposed GCL progresses, the GCL Team will continue coordination with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) to ensure all applicable regulations and guidelines are followed. Prior to the construction of the GCL, all appropriate approvals and permits are acquired, including: Division of Land Resource Protection – Individual Freshwater Wetlands Permit; Section 401 Water Quality Certificate Flood Hazard Area Permit; Waterfront Development Permit; Stormwater Management Plan Review and Approval; Tidelands Conveyance; Bureau of Water Allocation – Well Permit; Bureau of Surface Water – Short Term De Minimis NJPDES Discharge to Surface Water Permit OR General Remediation Cleanup Permit; Bureau of Non-Point Pollution Control – General Permit for Construction Activities (5G3). For further information, refer to Section 1.9, “Licenses, Permits, and Certifications.”

### 3.1.3 Biological Resources

**Comment 1:** The proposed GCL would disturb soil and vegetation, degrade habitat and plant communities, and impact threatened/endangered species. (Biedron) (Boddy) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Galanti) (Genovese) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lacina) (Macris) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K) (Snow)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.2.4, "Biological Resources," impacts to habitats and natural resources have been minimized to the extent practicable. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) completed an initial review of the DEIS to identify potential impacts requiring mitigation, outlined in Chapter 4, "Avoidance Measures and Mitigation," as well as necessary approvals and permits, described in Section 1.9, "Licenses, Permits, and Certifications." Ongoing coordination with NJDEP will determine the significance of any potential adverse impacts to habitat and natural resources. At present, it is anticipated that further refinements to the project, as well as mitigation, minimization, and avoidance measures will ensure that no significant adverse impacts to natural resources would result from the construction and operation of the proposed GCL.

**Comment 2:** The proposed GCL would impact breeding and nesting habitats for the barred owl and red shouldered hawks, as well as foraging habitat for bald eagles. Wenonah is surrounded by conservation area with wildlife that will be negatively impacted. (Michalowski) (Pomilio)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.2.4, "Biological Resources," impacts to habitats and natural resources have been minimized to the extent practicable. Ongoing coordination with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) will determine the significance of any potential adverse impacts to habitat and natural resources. At present, it is anticipated that further refinements to the project, as well as mitigation,

minimization, and avoidance measures will ensure that no significant adverse impacts to natural resources would result from the proposed GCL.

**Comment 3:** I am concerned about the removal of trees along the tracks. (Petolicchio)

**Response:** Some vegetation within the proposed GCL corridor would be removed, however, this would primarily be herbaceous perennials, such as grasses, rather than trees. Some trees may be removed from within the right-of-way; such trees are likely to be successional growth or encroachment that would typically be removed as part of routine rail maintenance, thereby maintaining the character of the rail corridor. Refer to Section 3.4.9.1, "Proposed Track (Rail and Trackbed)," for further information.

**Comment 4:** Does the DEIS incorporate the findings of the 2019 Science and Technology Advisory Panel report? (Council Member Fleming)

**Response:** No. Refer to Chapter 7, "References," for the list of sources used in the DEIS for the proposed GCL.

**Comment 5:** Is it feasible to avoid impact to wetland area at the northern end of the proposed Woodbury Heights VMF? (A5)

**Response:** The design of the proposed Vehicle Maintenance Facilities would be refined as part of preliminary engineering. Impacts to wetlands would be avoided to the extent practicable. All potential impacts would be avoided or mitigated as part of the proposed GCL.

**Comment 6:** Who will be contracted to restore native habitat or do ecological landscaping for the proposed project? (Brown)

**Response:** The contractor selected for construction of the proposed project would be responsible for mitigation.

**Comment 7:** The GCL will negatively impact the environment by cutting down trees. What steps will be taken to mitigate/avoid tree removal? (Henjes) (Kearney, C)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.2.4, "Biological Resources," impacts to habitats and natural resources have been minimized to the extent practicable. Ongoing coordination with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) will determine the significance of any potential adverse impacts to habitat and natural resources. At present, it is anticipated that further refinements to the project, as well as mitigation, minimization, and avoidance measures will ensure that no significant adverse impacts to natural resources would result from the proposed GCL.

**Comment 8:** The EIS should include more detailed natural resource figures for all sites along the rail line. (Wenonah Env. Comm.)

**Response:** For figures detailing the impacts of the proposed GCL on natural resources—including the Wenonah Ravine Natural Heritage Priority Site—refer to Appendix 1-A, "Natural Resources Impact Locations," of Attachment 1, "Natural Resources Technical Report."

**Comment 9:** The EIS should consider the effects of vibration on wildlife. (Earley)

**Response:** Per the guidance in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (September 2018), analyses of vibration impacts were conducted for this project. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the FTA 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

### 3.1.4 Land Use and Zoning

**Comment 1:** The 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study references Sony Music as an activity center, however this facility is no longer active. Has the GCL Team considered using the closed Sony facility as a station? (Cureton)

**Response:** The Draft DEIS for the proposed GCL acknowledges that the Sony Digital Media Plant located in Pitman closed in 2011 and remains vacant. As a rezoning is not proposed for this location, it is reasonable to expect that a similar land use would occupy the currently vacant facility. As currently contemplated, the proposed Mantua-Pitman Station location is as presented in the DEIS. Refer to Section 2.3.2.2, "Station Areas," for additional information.

**Comment 2:** I am requesting that in instances where a rezoning is proposed as part of the project, they are rejected because they would impact surrounding residents. (Michalowski)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team considered all applicable policies and local town plans, and determined that the proposed project would be compatible with adjacent land uses. In cases where a rezoning is necessary, no unmitigated adverse impacts are anticipated. For further information, refer to Section 3.3.2.2, "Station Areas."

**Comment 3:** The southeast corner of Big Timber Creek is Westville's Public Works Yard. (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 4:** The existence of the proposed GCL will have an adverse impact to industrial growth along Conrail's existing rail corridor. The development of a light rail line on Conrail's right-of-way limits the potential for industrial development and will lead to the loss of current established businesses. Conrail has witnessed this previously with the development of the

New Jersey Transit River LINE Light Rail, and the GCL is located along the backbone of Conrail's industrial supply chain in Southern New Jersey. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 5:** There is no direct representation of the real estate impact to Conrail in the report within the DEIS. Conrail will require a detailed list of the properties required for the proposed GCL because a significant portion of the GCL alignment is proposed on Conrail property. It is currently impossible for Conrail to predict the impact these real estate requirements may have on its operations without more information. If real estate is ultimately required, Conrail will seek appropriate value for any conveyance or encumbrance upon its privately-owned property. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.1.5 Hazardous Materials

**Comment 1:** The GCL would have considerable impact at 34 known or potential contaminated areas of concern. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** The 34 known or potential contaminated areas of concern would require further investigation prior to construction in order to ensure contamination would not be encountered. The proposed GCL would be considered a Linear Construction Project (LCP) in accordance with New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Linear Construction Technical Guidance (dated January 2012) and would be assigned a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) for the project. The LSRP would make sure that the proposed project would be compliant with all applicable state and federal guidelines. For further information, refer to Section 3.3.3, "Hazardous Materials."

### 3.1.6 Transportation

**Comment 1:** Will the bicycle network connect to proposed GCL stations? Will there be amenities for riders to take bikes on trains? (Hasse)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team is aware of bicycle trail networks in Camden and Gloucester counties and will include bicycle facilities at all proposed stations. While access to one multi-use trail—the Trail within Deptford Township—would be temporarily affected during construction, no multi-use trail resources would be directly affected by the permanent features of the proposed GCL. Overall, the GCL is expected to improve access to parkland resources and multi-use trails. Refer to Section 3.3.4.3, "Pedestrian and

Bicycle Access," for further information on the connectivity of the proposed GCL with the existing bicycle network.

**Comment 2:** Will the Willow Avenue crossing be closed, or will it remain open? How will traffic move on Willow Street given the frequency of trains proposed? Will Cumberland Avenue be closed and, if so, do residents know? I am concerned about barricades on Cumberland Avenue and traffic generally. The proposed GCL will negatively impact the Cumberland Street at-grade crossing. (Amorates) (Bonin) (Lahey, B) (Lahey, M) (Mayer) (Phelan, F)

**Response:** All at-grade crossings throughout the corridor will maintain service in the future with the proposed GCL. At-grade crossings will be updated with safety equipment which includes four quadrant gate crossings, and at select locations where traffic impacts may occur, other mitigation measures including modification to roadway geometry and traffic signalization are proposed. During construction, installation of new tracks, reconstruction of existing crossings and relocation of gate and flasher infrastructure and equipment would require closure for at-grade crossings for a nominal period of time. During this time, detours would be established, where feasible, to provide drivers with alternate routes and minimize disruptions. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information on traffic operations and at-grade crossings.

**Comment 3:** The proposed GCL would disrupt traffic due to frequent trains. The at-grade crossings will disrupt traffic and pedestrians. I am concerned about safety when the grade crossings cause traffic to back up. (Brooks) (Harwell) (Kearney, C) (Lassmire) (Lyons, C) (Shute) (Taylor-Kearney) (Toal) (A11)

**Response:** Traffic delays and queues were analyzed at grade crossings throughout the corridor. The results of the analysis reveal that there would be minor delays throughout the corridor, with most at-grade crossings operating at Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) or Level of Service B (stable traffic flow) with delays up to 21 seconds per vehicle. Where potentially significant delays are anticipated, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce delays and improve the function of the crossing. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report" for further information on potential impacts and mitigation measures proposed.

**Comment 4:** Will there be train crossing grates to prevent cars from driving through? (Offner)

**Response:** All at-grade crossings will be updated with four quadrant gate crossings as part of the proposed GCL. Refer to Section 3.3.4, "Transportation," for further information.

**Comment 5:** The GCL will require parking at Tylers Mill Road and could warrant a traffic light. (Merrian)

**Response:** There are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. The proposed Mantua-Pitman Station is located along Lambs Road and would include the provision of parking facilities accessible from this roadway with approximately 475 spaces by 2025, and 1,200 spaces by 2040. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Section 3.3.4.2, "Parking" and Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information about parking.

**Comment 6:** The proposed GCL will lead to cars parked all over my neighborhood. The GCL would create parking issues since none is provided. I am concerned about high parking demands with the proposed GCL; commuter parking should be restricted to a limited number of parking spaces. (Andrews) (Brooks) (DiDonna) (Figueroa) (Janda) (Kearney, C) (Kurtz) (Lassmire) (Midgett) (Rudisill) (Samantha) (Smith, J) (Sparks) (Taylor-Kearney) (Young)

**Response:** There are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. Section 1.4.3.4, "Parking Facilities," includes a description of these proposed parking facilities. The demand for parking was estimated, and the proposed GCL would not result in a significant displacement of parking anywhere throughout the corridor. As preliminary engineering progresses, detailed parking surveys will be conducted, and the parking facilities proposed will be refined in order to meet demand for parking that might be generated by the GCL. Refer to Section 3.3.4.2, "Parking" and Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information about parking.

**Comment 7:** The GCL will impact on-street parking in Sewell. Will streets be protected from others parking near our homes? Where will people park, what will be the impact to people and homes on Atlantic Avenue, and on Fairview Drive? Please clarify what a "walk-up" station means; I believe that the proposed Sewell Station will increase demand for parking in our neighborhood. However, there may be room for parking facilities east of Sewell Station, on property owned by Conrail. (Alicia) (Campbell, R) (Katie) (Lacina) (Lawton) (O'Neill, A)

**Response:** There are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. The demand for parking was estimated, and the GCL would not result in a significant displacement of parking anywhere throughout the corridor. As currently contemplated, the proposed Sewell Station would be a walk-up station, which would not include any parking lots or structures, but rather would only include loading zones or limited temporary "kiss-and-ride" parking (intended for drop-offs). Since the Sewell Station is a walk-up station, commuters would either drive to the Mantua-Pitman Station to the south and the Mantua Boulevard Station to the north which are both park-and-ride stations. There would be no impacts to existing parking at

the station area. For additional information pertaining to the three station types proposed as a part of the proposed GCL, refer to Section 1.4.3.1, "Station Types."

**Comment 8:** The proposed GCL will attract strangers parking on our street. (Campbell, L)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 9:** Wenonah Station would eliminate a non-street parking area that is currently used extensively and would be a burden on parking. (Guilfoy)

**Response:** The Wenonah Station is proposed as a walk-up station. The GCL would result in impacts to public parking at the proposed Wenonah station in order to accommodate station and pedestrian infrastructure, resulting in the loss of approximately 11 parking spaces. The ridership model for the GCL estimates that there would not be any daily boardings from car trips at the proposed Wenonah station. Parking surveys would be conducted as part of preliminary engineering, and mitigation (e.g., creation of new parking spaces) would be developed as necessary.

**Comment 10:** Parking and shuttle service could help to leverage the mobility opportunities created by the proposed GCL. (Trafford)

**Response:** Comment noted. Shuttle service is not proposed as part of the proposed GCL. However, the GCL includes parking facilities at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. Additionally, New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) as a member of the GCL Project Team, has been involved in the development of the proposed GCL, and its integration into the larger transit network. NJ Transit has developed several small routing changes to bus routes in the vicinity of two proposed GCL stations (South Camden and Red Bank Avenue stations) to make transfers more convenient between the proposed GCL and regional bus routes. For further information on integration with bus routes, refer to Section 3.2, "Changes to Existing Network," of Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report," and for a description of parking facilities proposed, see Section 1.4.3.4, "Parking Facilities," of the DEIS.

**Comment 11:** I am concerned about building parking lots in Wenonah because it would impact residences, public space, aesthetics, and the character of the neighborhood. (Warren)

**Response:** The Wenonah Station is proposed as a walk-up station. There are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, however, no parking facilities are proposed in the vicinity of the proposed Wenonah Station. The ridership model estimates that there would not be any daily boardings from car trips at the Wenonah station.

**Comment 12:** The proposed GCL should be developed and integrated with the network for bikers/pedestrians. (Hasse)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team is aware of bicycle trail networks in Camden and Gloucester counties and will include bicycle facilities at all proposed stations. Overall, the GCL is expected to improve access to parkland resources and multi-use trails. Refer to Section 3.3.4.3, "Pedestrian and Bicycle Access," for further information on the connectivity of the proposed GCL with the existing bicycle network. Most roadways and intersections adjacent to or approaching station areas have appropriate pedestrian accommodations or the potential for accommodating bicycles and pedestrians. Stations generally provide some level of pedestrian accommodation or can be improved through the installation of sidewalk, striping of crosswalks (with associated traffic control devices), or installation of pedestrian signals where necessary.

**Comment 13:** Ridership projections for the proposed GCL appear to be outdated or incorrect. (Henjes) (Reebenaker)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team performed ridership and travel demand forecasts using the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) model. The model projects 16,500 daily boardings in 2025 and 18,000 daily boardings in 2040. Of these trips, 10,100 in 2025 and 11,000 in 2040 were estimated to be new transit trips, or trips that would otherwise be completed entirely by automobile. It is reasonable to assume that ridership and travel patterns in the future would be as assumed in the DEIS. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

**Comment 14:** I am concerned about the roadway impact to Railroad Avenue, and accessibility. (Kae)

**Response:** As currently contemplated, due to the track alignment of the proposed GCL just north of the proposed Gloucester City Station, South Railroad Avenue is expected to be narrowed between Cumberland Street and Little Somerset Street, and may become a one-way road northbound. This change in traffic direction on this segment of South Railroad Avenue would not result in significant adverse impacts to traffic in this area. As preliminary engineering progresses, the design of the proposed GCL and potential avoidance and mitigation measures will be refined to further reduce any potentially adverse effects. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information.

**Comment 15:** The proposed GCL crossings will impact residents' ability to enter and exit particular residential developments. The GCL will cross major corridors in my community. How will I be able to get around my town with this system in place? (Duffy) (Tobin)

**Response:** Comment noted. As the proposed GCL would be located primarily in an existing rail right-of-way, it would not physically divide neighborhoods, reduce access to, or disrupt the



cohesion of existing communities. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 16:** The DEIS does not sufficiently evaluate the impact of the proposed GCL on local traffic interruptions due to grade crossings and additional rail users on the road. The GCL will not improve traffic on major roadways and will create traffic delays at grade crossings. The GCL will lead to traffic congestion rather than reduction. (Bechta) (Boyd) (DeGirolamo) (DiDonna) (Earley) (Emerle) (Figueroa) (Flynn) (Foster) (Layout) (Lisle) (Litzinger) (Lombardo, R) (Martin) (O’Neill, A) (Ossman) (Petolicchio) (Rodiguez, A) (Samantha) (Speak) (Speth)

**Response:** The proposed GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. Major roadways that parallel the GCL, such as I-295, I-676, and New Jersey 55, would see reductions in traffic volumes based on projections by Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission’s (DVRPC) Glassboro-Camden Line Regional Model and the GCL Project Team. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be reduced by approximately two percent in both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours in build-years 2025 and 2040 and would not result in impacts to the highways. Reductions in overall VMT traveled can be seen in Appendix 5-A, “DVRPC and STOPS Model Information” of Attachment 5, “Traffic Analysis Technical Report.

Traffic delays and queues were analyzed at grade crossings throughout the corridor. The results of the analysis reveal that there would be minor delays throughout the corridor, with most at-grade crossings operating at Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) or Level of Service B (stable traffic flow) with delays up to 21 seconds per vehicle. Where potentially significant delays are anticipated, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce delays and improve the function of the crossing. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. For further information, refer to Attachment 5, “Traffic Analysis Technical Report.”

**Comment 17:** I am concerned with the adequacy of parking around Mantua Boulevard. (Adler) (Bechta)

**Response:** As part of the GCL, a parking lot in the vicinity of the Mantua Boulevard Station containing approximately 300 spaces would be constructed. For further information, refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 18:** The proposed GCL will increase traffic issues on Center Street in Sewell due to the high train frequency. (Geortler) (Midgett) (A6)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the

River LINE today. It is assumed that the proposed GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight), and on weekends and holidays, from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). The DEIS took a conservative approach and analyzed the potential for impacts based on 7.5-minute headways during the peak period. There are no anticipated unmitigated impacts as a result of the GCL with this service plan. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.2, "Service Plan."

The Center Street at-grade crossing was analyzed for traffic delays in the future with the proposed GCL. It was found that this intersection would not experience significant traffic delays and would remain in operation at a Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) - the highest Level of Service. See Section 3.3.4.1, "Traffic," for further information. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 19:** My community would be impacted by additional traffic resulting from the proposed GCL. I am concerned about impacts to traffic flow on Elm Avenue in Woodbury Heights. The proposed GCL would create increased traffic in the vicinity of the Wenonah Station. I am concerned about increased traffic at the crossing of East Maple to Ogden, near the Wenonah Elementary School. The GCL will create traffic in Mantua Township. The GCL will impact traffic at the Sewell Post Office. (Beck) (Cassidy) (Dobbins) (Graves, J) (Guilfoy) (Hanstein) (Ilisco) (Kerr) (Lacina) (Lyons, T) (Power) (Reebenaker) (Speth) (Tanzola) (Tobin) (A8)

**Response:** Projected traffic on local roadways in the future with the GCL is lower than in the No-Action Scenario (a future scenario without the implementation of the proposed GCL) from Westville to Sewell because of the assumed number of drivers switching to the GCL. Further, the GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information on the impact of the GCL on traffic patterns throughout the region.

**Comment 20:** While the GCL may reduce highway traffic, it would increase local traffic in the vicinity of proposed stations, specifically at the proposed Mantua Boulevard Station. (Michalowski)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the River LINE today. It is assumed that the GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight), and on weekends and holidays, from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). The DEIS took a conservative approach and analyzed the potential for impacts based on 7.5-minute headways during the peak period. There are no anticipated unmitigated impacts as a result of the GCL with this service plan. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.2, "Service Plan."

Projected traffic on local roadways in the future with the GCL is lower than in the No-Action Scenario (a future scenario without the implementation of the proposed GCL) from Westville to Sewell because of the assumed number of drivers switching to the proposed GCL. Further, the GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information on the impact of the GCL on traffic patterns throughout the region.

**Comment 21:** There should be a study to analyze traffic impacts in Glassboro. (Trafford)

**Response:** The DEIS for the proposed GCL includes a detailed traffic impact analysis. Refer to Section 3.3.4.1, "Traffic," for a summary of this analysis, and refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for more detailed information on the impact of the proposed GCL on traffic patterns in Glassboro and throughout the region. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 22:** I do not believe that the proposed GCL would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) significantly, leading to inconsequential time savings. (Taylor, J)

**Response:** Comment noted. For information regarding vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction, refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 23:** Mitigation techniques should be used to limit traffic disruption in Pitman. (Eric)

**Response:** As currently contemplated, no significant impacts to traffic are anticipated in Pitman with the proposed GCL. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information on the impact of the GCL on traffic patterns throughout the region and associated mitigation measures. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 24:** The GCL would increase traffic on Mantua Avenue, potentially requiring mitigation measures. (Warren)

**Response:** Traffic delays and queues were analyzed at grade crossings throughout the corridor. The results of the analysis reveal that there would be minor delays throughout the corridor, with most at-grade crossings operating at Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) or Level of Service B (stable traffic flow) with delays up to 21 seconds per vehicle. No potentially significant delays are anticipated on Mantua Avenue and, therefore, no roadway improvements are necessary. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report" for further information on potential impacts and mitigation measures proposed. As the

GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 25:** The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the local traffic conditions on particular roadways in Westville (Pine Street, Station Road, Woodbine Avenue, Delsea Drive, Duncan Avenue). (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** A detailed traffic analysis was performed at key intersections and roadways near the proposed GCL corridor based on several characteristics, such as the nearest proposed station, presence of at-grade rail crossing, jurisdiction of the roadway, signalization of the intersection, and a perceived level of congestion. The particular roadways discussed in this comment were not selected for detailed analysis. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report" for further information on potential impacts and mitigation measures proposed. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 26:** The residents of Mantua Township will experience increased car and foot traffic, as well as parking issues. (O'Neill, T)

**Response:** Projected traffic on local roadways in the future with the GCL is lower than in the No-Action Scenario (a future scenario without the implementation of the proposed GCL) from Westville to Sewell because of the assumed number of drivers switching to the GCL. Further, the GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. Most roadways and intersections adjacent to or approaching station areas have appropriate pedestrian accommodations. Stations generally provide some level of pedestrian accommodation or can be improved through the installation of sidewalk, striping of crosswalks (with associated traffic control devices), or installation of pedestrian signals where necessary. Additionally, there are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. Section 1.4.3.4, "Parking Facilities," of the DEIS includes a description of these parking facilities proposed. The demand for parking was estimated, and GCL is not anticipated to result in a significant displacement of parking anywhere throughout the corridor. As preliminary engineering progresses, detailed parking surveys will be conducted, and the parking facilities proposed will be refined in order to meet demand for parking that might be generated by the GCL. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information about traffic, parking, and pedestrians.

**Comment 27:** The proposed GCL will create additional traffic on local roads due to a lack of parking and cause frequent stoppages at grade crossings. (Kearney, S)

**Response:** Projected traffic on local roadways in the future with the GCL is lower than in the No-Action (a future scenario without the implementation of the proposed GCL) Scenario from Westville to Sewell because of the assumed number of drivers switching to the GCL. Further, the GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. Traffic delays and queues were analyzed at grade crossings throughout the corridor. The results of the analysis reveal that there would be minor delays throughout the corridor, with most at-grade crossings operating at Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) or Level of Service B (stable traffic flow) with delays up to 21 seconds per vehicle. Where potentially significant delays are anticipated, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce delays and improve the function of the crossing. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report" for further information on potential impacts and mitigation measures proposed. Additionally, there are parking facilities proposed at certain stations, as appropriate, based on ridership estimates and traffic models. Section 1.4.3.4, "Parking Facilities," of the DEIS includes a description of these parking facilities proposed. The demand for parking was estimated, and GCL is not anticipated to result in a significant displacement of parking anywhere throughout the corridor. As preliminary engineering progresses, detailed parking surveys will be conducted, and the parking facilities proposed will be refined in order to meet demand for parking that might be generated by the GCL. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information about traffic and parking.

**Comment 28:** Please add bike lanes adjacent to the rail line. (Crumrine)

**Response:** As currently contemplated, the proposed GCL would not include provisions for new bike lanes as part of the GCL, given space limitations within the right-of-way (ROW), and the scope of the project. However, there are parallel roadways that may provide opportunities for bike lanes to be developed as part of other, separate projects. As described in Section 3.3.4.3, "Pedestrian and Bicycle Access," and Section 3.4.8, "Parkland," of the DEIS, existing and proposed bikeways and multi-use trails in the vicinity of the GCL would remain in place with the GCL. Further, the GCL would include bicycle facilities at all proposed stations.

**Comment 29:** Traffic data used in the DEIS does not account for the construction project currently underway that is anticipated to change traffic patterns. (Biedron) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Campbell, R) (Ferrelli, W) (Ferrelli, L) (Hamilton, L) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** This project was acknowledged and analyzed by the GCL Project Team as part of the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study. While this project eliminates a dangerous weave pattern, none of its improvements add

significant highway capacity, hence the need for mass transit. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 30:** The pedestrian analysis is based on old information and travel patterns have changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. (Robinson, M)

**Response:** While transit ridership, travel patterns, and economic conditions have changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is reasonable to assume that conditions in the no build condition and future with the proposed GCL would be as presented in the DEIS. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

**Comment 31:** Train crossing stoppages will be longer than what are being suggested. Traffic will increase at grade crossings due to extended train stoppages. (Taylor, J)

**Response:** Traffic delays and queues were analyzed at grade crossings throughout the corridor. The results of the analysis reveal that there would be minor delays throughout the corridor, with most at-grade crossings operating at Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) or Level of Service B (stable traffic flow) with delays up to 21 seconds per vehicle. Where potentially significant delays are anticipated, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce delays and improve the function of the crossing. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report" for further information on potential impacts and mitigation measures proposed. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 32:** Can you provide further information on the municipal parking garage at the proposed Glassboro Station? (Kutza)

**Response:** Throughout coordination efforts, discussion with the municipality has included shared parking for the proposed Glassboro Station area as part of the Rowan Boulevard Redevelopment Project. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed parking analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 33:** Why does Westville have the largest surface parking lot? (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** Demand for new parking was developed using results of the Federal Transit Administration's Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) Model, and proposed parking facilities were sized by using the estimated number of passenger vehicle trips at each station. Additionally, the parking facility for the proposed Crown Point Road Station area has received municipality support. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for additional information regarding parking.

**Comment 34:** How was the timing calculated for the stop at WRTC and the transfer to PATCO? (Lahey, M)

**Response:** Transfer timing was documented through an operating plan and allows for the standard amount of time—similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE—to transfer between the two systems located on separate levels.

**Comment 35:** The parking facility in the vicinity of Westville Station should be in a different location to reduce potential harm. (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** An Alternatives Analysis was completed in 2009 (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study), which recommended the proposed GCL to be advanced to environmental review. As indicated in Section 3.3.4.2, "Parking" and Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," no unmitigated parking impacts would result with the proposed GCL.

**Comment 36:** The current GCL proposal does not address the traffic congestion along Route 42, I-295, and I-76 and would affect local traffic circulation patterns. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** The purpose of the proposed GCL is to improve public transportation in Southern New Jersey and provide a reliable and viable alternative to existing automobile dependency. The project is expected to contribute to a collective of public transportation improvements in the State aimed to support efforts to lessen the pace of automobile-dependent "sprawl" development and help reduce traffic congestion on the region's already-burdened roadways. The GCL is also expected to increase mobility between and within local communities and established activity and employment centers and improve connectivity regionally by providing connections (in the City of Camden) to Philadelphia, Trenton, and other points in the region via the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) Speedline, the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE, and NJ TRANSIT bus routes.

The GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they developed around transit. The entirety of corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the proposed GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e., would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e., greatest cost-benefit). And lastly, considered highway alignments would require extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was

selected. Refer to Section 1.2, "Project Purpose and Need," for a discussion of travel demands, future growth, and the intended purpose of the GCL.

The proposed GCL is anticipated to reduce traffic on highways and major thoroughfares. Major roadways that parallel the GCL, such as I-295, I-676, and New Jersey 55, would see reductions in traffic volumes based on projections by Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's (DVRPC) Glassboro-Camden Line Regional Model and the GCL Project Team. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be reduced in both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours in build-years 2025 and 2040 and would not result in impacts to the highways. Reductions in overall VMT traveled can be seen in Appendix 5-A, "DVRPC and STOPS Model Information" of Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report. As the GCL project advances into preliminary engineering more detailed traffic analysis will be conducted, as necessary, but no substantial changes to conditions are expected.

**Comment 37:** Four quadrant gates are proposed at all grade crossings. "Quiet zones" are not being considered as a part of the project. Coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration is required to ensure the proper vetting of at-grade crossings is completed. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. Per FRA guidance, "quiet zones" cannot be included as part of the GCL project. Individual municipalities must apply to the FRA for "quiet zone" designations. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.1.7 Cultural Resources

**Comment 1:** The proposed GCL would threaten the integrity of historic districts and properties. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Macris) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** An assessment of the project's potential impacts to all National Register-listed and eligible properties will be required in a Determination of Effects Report after New Jersey Historic Preservation Office concurrence with the results of all intensive-level surveys (individual properties and historic districts/streetscapes) and once the project designs have progressed, the number of right-of-way acquisitions and temporary construction easements would be refined as the project progresses. As necessary, a Memorandum of Agreement will be prepared to outline minimization and mitigation measures. Additional information regarding historic architectural and archaeological resources can be found in Attachment 7, "Cultural Resources Technical Report."

**Comment 2:** Is the building at Center Street and Atlantic Avenue a historic structure? What are plans for this building? Replacing the historic building in Mantua with an industrial platform will diminish neighborhood character. (Hanson) (Janda) (Lawton)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would not affect the Sewell Train Station (782 Atlantic Avenue). The Sewell Train Station property was identified as eligible for listing in the National Register



of Historic Resources. The DEIS discusses the potential effects to listed and eligible properties, and as the project advances, continued coordination with the NJ Historic Preservation Office will determine if any effects are anticipated. Additional information is provided in Attachment 7, "Cultural Resources Technical Report." In addition, as the GCL project advances, the design team will work with the municipalities to develop a station design that complements the urban fabric of the surrounding community.

### 3.1.8 Socioeconomic Conditions

**Comment 1:** The proposed GCL will not create new jobs. (Martin)

**Response:** The construction phase of the proposed GCL is projected to support full-time equivalent construction and ancillary employment of approximately 15,560 jobs. The operation and maintenance expenditures are projected to support total annual employment of approximately 651 jobs related to the operations of the GCL. Refer to Section 3.4.3.3, "Economic Output, Job Creation, and Income" for additional information pertaining to the total economic effect of the GCL with regard to construction, operation, and maintenance.

### 3.1.9 Neighborhood Character

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about the proposed GCL bisecting my town and ruining its character. This project will generally change the quiet atmosphere in my community. The GCL has the potential to dissect neighborhoods along the line, separating community facilities from the people they serve. Can you provide details regarding analysis for individual towns? (Connelly) (DeGirolamo) (Gable) (Litzinger) (Morison) (Phelan, A) (Pomilio) (Siciliano) (Whiteway) (Shute) (Figueroa)

**Response:** Given that the proposed GCL would run within an existing rail corridor, the proposed project would not physically divide neighborhoods, reduce access to, or disrupt the cohesion of existing communities. Further, the alignment of the GCL would not compromise the access to roads, buildings, neighborhoods, or the railway in the event of an emergency. Refer to Section 3.4.4, "Neighborhood Character," for information regarding the impact of the GCL on neighborhood character generally, Section 3.4.4.5, "Neighborhood Assessments," for an assessment of each neighborhood that would be affected by the GCL, and Section 3.6.2.1, "Neighborhoods," of Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report," for a discussion of mitigation measures that would be employed to reduce potential impacts to neighborhoods resulting from the proposed GCL.

**Comment 2:** The proposed GCL would negatively change my calm, gentle, and quiet neighborhood due to frequent trains passing by. (Lawton) (Reebenaker) (Rudisill)

**Response:** Comment noted. As noted in Section, 1.6.2, "Service Plan," the proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the River LINE today. It is assumed that the GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight), and on weekends and holidays, from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). For further information on mitigation measures that would be employed to reduce potential impacts to neighborhoods resulting from the proposed GCL, Refer to Section 3.6.2.1, "Neighborhoods," of Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report."

**Comment 3:** The proposed GCL would change the quiet, peaceful character of my neighborhood, create noise, disrupt lives, and impose a safety hazard. The GCL in combination with other proposed developments would negatively affect my neighborhood character. (Ilisco) (Janda) (Smith, J) (Ward)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to Section 3.4.4, "Neighborhood Character," for information regarding the impact of the GCL on neighborhood character generally, Section 3.4.4.5, "Neighborhood Assessments," for an assessment of each neighborhood that would be affected by the GCL, and Section 3.6.2.1, "Neighborhoods," of Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report," for a discussion of mitigation measures that would be employed to reduce potential impacts to neighborhoods resulting from the proposed GCL.

**Comment 4:** The proposed GCL should not go through residential neighborhoods at grade where it would affect residents and their homes; this project would change the character of our towns since there is not an established transportation network in place. (Janda)

**Response:** The proposed GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they historically developed around transit. Within ½ mile of the proposed GCL alignment, there are established communities consisting primarily of residential and commercial land uses. The GCL alignment through these communities would encourage growth and economic development consistent with the long-term planning goals at local, State, and regional levels. Given that the proposed alignment is primarily located on or along existing railroad right-of-way, the proposed project would not substantially change the current land uses within the land use and zoning study area. For further information, refer to Section 3.3.2, "Land Use and Zoning," for a description of land use changes precipitated by the proposed GCL at the corridor and station area levels. Additionally, the impacts within a minority or low-income community would not be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than those that would be experienced in non-minority or non-low-income communities. Refer also to Section 3.4.5.3, "Displacements and Relocations," and Section 3.4.5.5,

"Neighborhoods," for assessments of impacts to communities of concern with regard to acquisitions and neighborhood character.

**Comment 5:** Will there be any mitigation measures to preserve neighborhood character in communities along the line? (Phelan, A)

**Response:** Refer to Section 3.6.2.1, "Neighborhoods," of Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report," for a discussion of mitigation measures that would be employed to reduce impacts to neighborhoods resulting from the proposed GCL.

**Comment 6:** The proposed GCL would bring noise and crime to my quiet, small town. Residents chose to live in these communities for the quiet and undisturbed neighborhood atmosphere, which the GCL would change. (Beck) (Combs) (Cooper, K) (Dickson, R) (Lawton) (Lisle) (Lyons, C) (Miloszewski) (Murphy, K) (O'Mara) (Riccobene) (Samantha) (Zammarelli)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 7:** The GCL would require fencing, which would negatively impact my quaint neighborhood. (Kohler)

**Response:** As currently contemplated, fencing would be placed between the existing freight and proposed light rail tracks at designated locations on railroad right-of-way, specifically, the proposed stations. Fencing would also be placed in designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail right-of-way. Locations for fencing will be identified during preliminary engineering in coordination with the transit operator's risk management and safety departments following completion of the preliminary hazard assessments. Refer to Section 3.4.7.2, "Design Elements to Provide Safe Operations," for additional information pertaining to rail, vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. Refer also to Section 3.4.4, "Neighborhood Character," for information regarding the impact of the proposed GCL on neighborhood character generally, and to Section 3.4.4.5, "Neighborhood Assessments," for an assessment of each neighborhood that would be affected by the GCL.

**Comment 8:** I believe the proposed GCL will negatively affect the small-town atmosphere of my neighborhood, making it a less desirable place to live. The GCL will bring people from outside the neighborhood. (Bohn) (Cooper, D) (Genovese) (Hamilton, M) (Krumanocker) (Machulsky) (A9)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 9:** The proposed GCL would disrupt the quiet communities along the line with a high frequency of trains, traffic, pollution, and noise. (Biedron) (Brown, M) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Daneker) (Earley) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Grayson) (Hamilton, L) (Hanstein) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K) (Scher) (Tanzola) (Walker)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzed the effects of noise and traffic on neighborhood character and did not identify any adverse impacts on neighborhood character. For further information, refer to Section 3.4.4, "Neighborhood Character," for information regarding the impact of the proposed GCL on neighborhood character generally, and Section 3.4.4.5, "Neighborhood Assessments," for an assessment of each neighborhood that would be affected by the GCL. Further, as discussed in Section 3.4.10, "Air Quality," no impacts related to air quality are anticipated with the proposed GCL.

**Comment 10:** Please quantifiably demonstrate how this project would not destroy our towns. (Snow)

**Response:** The DEIS includes quantified analyses for those impact categories that contribute to the character of a neighborhood. Refer to Section 3.4.4, "Neighborhood Character," for information pertaining to the cumulative effects of travel patterns, acquisitions, noise and vibration, and aesthetic features on neighborhood character.

### 3.1.10 Environmental Justice

**Comment 1:** A disproportionate amount of parking is proposed in Westville, which is a low-income community. (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** Demand for new parking was developed using results of the Federal Transit Administration's Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) Model, and proposed parking facilities were sized by using the estimated number of passenger vehicle trips at each station. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for additional information regarding parking.

**Comment 2:** I am concerned about the GCL disproportionately affecting low income/minority populations in Camden with regards to air and noise pollution. (Biedron) (Gandy, R)

**Response:** Any impacts that would occur within or near potential environmental justice communities would not represent a disproportionate burden on these communities, i.e., the impacts within a minority or low-income community would not be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than those that would be experienced in non-minority or non-low-income communities. For further information pertaining to environmental justice, refer to Appendix 3A, "Environmental Justice," to Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report."

**Comment 3:** This line is proposed in a black community. (Harvey Jr.)

**Response:** Comment noted.

### 3.1.11 Safety and Security

**Comment 1:** The GCL would create delays in EMS response times due to traffic stopping. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Combs) (Crew) (Dickson, R) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli,

W) (Hamilton, L) (Johnson, D) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Layout) (Macris) (Meil) (Milward) (Ossman) (Pomilio) (Robinson, K) (Tobin)

**Response:** The development of transit projects (specifically rail) do have the potential to delay law enforcement and emergency services when these vehicles are required to wait for the light rail to cross an intersection. The GCL Project Team estimates that delays at-grade crossings resulting from GCL service will range between 40 and 80 seconds for each train movement and corresponding gate activation. Several police and fire stations, as well as two medical facilities, are located within the GCL corridor. However, the proposed GCL would not compromise the access to roads, buildings, neighborhoods, or the railway in the event of an emergency. No long-term negative impact on law enforcement or emergency response services would be anticipated. Additional information can be found in Attachment 3, "Man-Made Resources Technical Report," and Attachment 8, "Safety and Security Technical Report."

**Comment 2:** I am concerned about increased police costs. (Brooks)

**Response:** It is not anticipated that the proposed GCL would cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement or emergency response services. The service provider will have their own police force for handling events related to the train line. Additional safety and security measures are detailed in Attachment 8, "Safety and Security Technical Report."

**Comment 3:** I am concerned that the proposed GCL will delay emergency response and create a need for additional first responders/equipment/training, etc. (Hanstein) (Toal)

**Response:** The proposed GCL alignment would operate on separate tracks from the existing freight tracks, and temporally separated (i.e., will not operate at the same time as freight service) in the southern portion from freight operations, with proper signal systems to reduce risk of train collisions. Gates with an active warning system would be used at all grade crossings, and provisions would be made to minimize conflicts between trains and automobiles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. With respect to emergency responder training, New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) has partnered with the New Jersey Emergency Preparedness Association and others to provide a rail safety course to emergency responders. Additionally, the New Jersey EMS Task Force has developed a Passenger Rail Security Plan that provides for first responders and EMS personnel the actions to take during a railway incident.

Further, the proposed GCL will be designed in a manner that would not compromise the access to roads, buildings, neighborhoods, or the railway in the event of an emergency. It is not anticipated that the proposed GCL would cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement or emergency response services. Therefore, no long-term negative impact on law enforcement or emergency response services would be

anticipated. The service provider will have their own police force for handling events related to the train line. Additional safety and security measures are detailed in Attachment 8, "Safety and Security Technical Report."

**Comment 4:** The GCL will make communities along the corridor less safe and require a higher police presence. (Bauer) (Beck) (Cassidy) (Geortler) (Hanstein) (Kerby) (Krimmel) (Martin) (O'Connor) (Rizzo)

**Response:** Comment noted. As discussed in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," the proposed GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and/or Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would be responsible for providing transit police on GCL vehicles and at station areas. All station areas and facilities would be designed with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts which work to deter criminal activity at the proposed stations and along the proposed GCL corridor. The GCL would provide a center of activity at the transit stations that would provide the opportunity for increased pedestrian traffic and more natural surveillance of the transit facilities and the surrounding community, resulting in a positive impact on safety and security within the communities.

**Comment 5:** I believe the proposed GCL would delay emergency response, increase crime and accidents, and require additional law enforcement. (Bechta) (Ilisco) (Michalowski)

**Response:** As discussed in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and/or Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would be responsible for providing transit police on GCL vehicles and at station areas. All station areas and facilities would be designed with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts which work to deter criminal activity at the proposed stations and along the proposed GCL corridor. The GCL would provide a center of activity at the transit stations that would provide the opportunity for increased pedestrian traffic and more natural surveillance of the transit facilities and the surrounding community, resulting in a positive impact on safety and security within the communities.

The proposed GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. The proposed GCL will be designed in a manner that would not compromise the access to roads, buildings, neighborhoods, or the railway in the event of an emergency. Therefore, no long-term negative impact on law enforcement or emergency response services would be anticipated.

**Comment 6:** I am concerned that the proposed GCL will increase crime and the potential for drugs to enter our communities. (Ancona) (Andrews) (Bohn) (Combs) (Cooper, K) (Crew) (Dadario) (Emerle) (Genovese) (Gianotti) (Lassmire) (Murphy, K) (Phelan, F) (Pomilio) (Tara) (Taylor, L) (Toal) (Waddington) (A8) (A11) (A14)

**Response:** Comment noted. As discussed in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," the proposed GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would use a combination of design, public education, and operations measures to lower the potential for crime and to minimize potential conflicts among trains, people, and other vehicles.

**Comment 7:** Increased traffic due to Wenonah Station would create a safety hazard for children at Wenonah Elementary School. (Guilfoy)

**Response:** The intersection of N East Avenue and Mantua Avenue was analyzed for traffic delays in the future with the proposed GCL. It was found that this intersection would not experience significant traffic delays and would remain in operation at a Level of Service A (free-flow traffic) - the highest Level of Service. See Section 3.3.4.1, "Traffic," for further information.

In addition, as described in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including wayfinding signage, walkways, and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings to direct pedestrians and bicyclists to designated areas to safely cross the rail line. Pedestrian and bicycle crossings would also be provided between the park-and-ride facilities and the station platforms. Fencing would be placed in designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail right-of-way. Further, the project sponsor of the GCL is expected to partner with New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL) which is a nonprofit, public safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and trespassing on or near railroad tracks. NJOL will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

**Comment 8:** This project will create safety issues in my community. (Campbell, R) (Fichera) (Gable) (Gianotti) (Graves, J) (Graves, S) (Josh) (Kurtz) (Layout) (Levay) (Macris) (O'Neill, A) (Petolicchio)

**Response:** Comment noted. As discussed in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," the proposed GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would use a combination of design, public education, and operations measures to lower the potential for crime and to minimize potential conflicts among trains, people, and other vehicles. New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL) will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

**Comment 9:** The GCL will create a safety hazard for children and pedestrians crossing the tracks; signage is insufficient. How will people safely cross the tracks with additional train traffic?

(Alicia) (Bonin) (Brooks) (Cooper, K) (DiDonna) (Hamilton, M) (Ilisco) (Jordan) (Koniecki) (Lacina) (Lassmire) (Mecholsky) (Michalowski) (Michelle) (Ossman) (Pomilio) (Rizzo) (Rudisill) (Samantha) (Scher) (Siciliano) (Snow) (Speth) (Streater) (A6) (A15) (A17)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including walkways and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings, as well as between the park-and-ride facilities and the station platforms. Rail crossings would be limited to dedicated locations and clearly marked with signage and safety equipment. Rail crossing gates would be used to stop vehicles and pedestrians at the railroad tracks and the gates would include an active warning system that would alert authorities of any interference with the gates. Fencing would be placed designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail right-of-way. Further, the project sponsor of the proposed GCL is expected to partner with New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL) which is a nonprofit, public safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and trespassing on or near railroad tracks. NJOL will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

Additionally, the GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would use a combination of design, public education, and operations measures to lower the potential for crime and to minimize potential conflicts among trains, people, and other vehicles.

**Comment 10:** The GCL will require an adjustment to public safety concerns and planning. (Warren)

**Response:** As discussed in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," the proposed GCL is not anticipated to cause an increase or decrease in the demand for local law enforcement services. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and/or Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) would be responsible for providing transit police on GCL vehicles and at station areas.

Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including walkways and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings. Pedestrian and bicycle crossings would also be provided between the park-and-ride facilities and the station platforms. Fencing would be placed in designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail right-of-way. Further, the project sponsor of the GCL is expected to partner with New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL) which is a nonprofit, public safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and trespassing on or near railroad tracks. NJOL will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

**Comment 11:** I am concerned about the GCL being a target for terrorism. (Toal)



**Response:** Comment noted. New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) are actively engaged in efforts to improve and reduce security threats to transit patrons and employees. Both agencies operate under a set of Standard Operating Procedures that are updated on an annual basis. All NJ Transit and DRPA employees are identifiable through agency issued badges and ID cards that grant them authorized access to the NJ Transit and DRPA facilities in which they work.

**Comment 12:** I am concerned that there are no lights or railings when the train comes by. (Machulsky)

**Response:** Rail crossings would be limited to dedicated locations and clearly marked with signage and safety equipment. Rail crossing gates would be used to stop vehicles and pedestrians at the railroad tracks and the gates would include an active warning system that would alert authorities of any interference with the gates. Bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including walkways and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings. Further, as required by the Federal Railroad Administration, horns would be used to alert motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists that a train is approaching the crossing. For additional information regarding grade crossing safety, refer to Section 3.4.7.2, "Design Elements to Provide Safe Operations."

**Comment 13:** I am concerned for the safety of pedestrians and children who walk to school, due to the GCL and increased traffic. The parking/station area proposed on Chestnut Avenue/Academy Avenue will bring additional traffic down our small streets where our children play. (Hanstein)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.4.7, "Safety and Security," bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including walkways and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings. Pedestrian and bicycle crossings would also be provided between the park-and-ride facilities and the station platforms. Fencing would be placed in designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail right-of-way. Further, the project sponsor of the proposed GCL is expected to partner with New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL) which is a nonprofit, public safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and trespassing on or near railroad tracks. NJOL will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

Further, at the request of the municipality, approximately 25 parking spaces are proposed for the Woodbury Heights Station located off Elm Avenue and West Jersey Avenue. For additional information regarding parking, refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report."

**3.1.12 Parklands**

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about impacts to parklands, especially Green Acres encumbered land. How would mitigation for parklands encumbered by Green Acres requirements be handled? (Morison) (Storms)

**Response:** Mitigation for parklands with regard to Green Acres requirements would include, but would not be limited to, coordination of the project sponsor and local municipality, which would serve as the applicant to Green Acres; adhering to Green Acres compensation requirements; replacement of any trees affected by the proposed project; negotiation of a lease or use agreement for a portion of the open space parcel; and an agreement requiring the applicant (local municipality) to use all the proceeds from the compensation provided to support operating, maintenance, or capital expenses for the municipality's funded parkland or overall recreation program. A comprehensive overview of mitigation measures for parklands is outlined in Section 4.4.3.1, "Parkland Mitigation/Green Acres Coordination." Further information is also available within Section 8, "Mitigation and Compensation," of Attachment 9, "Parklands Technical Report."

**Comment 2:** Please discuss the impact of the proposed GCL on Veterans Park and the planned 911 memorial near Woodbury Heights Station. (A5)

**Response:** The impacts to Veterans' Park are discussed in detail in Section 3.4.8.1, "Direct Impacts," and mitigation measures are discussed in Section 4.4.3.1, "Parkland Mitigation/Green Acres Coordination." Further information is also available within Attachment 9, "Parklands Technical Report."

**Comment 3:** Wenonah is surrounded by conservation area with hiking trails that will be negatively impacted. I am concerned that the proposed GCL would take away from the hiking trails and wooded conservation land in Wenonah. (DiDonna) (Pomilio)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to Section 3.4.9.2, "Proposed Stations," for discussion pertaining to the visual impact and aesthetic features of the proposed stations. While access to one multi-use trail—the Mantua Creek Trail within Deptford Township—would be temporarily affected during construction, no multi-use trail resources would be directly affected by the permanent features of the proposed GCL. Overall, the GCL is expected to improve access to parkland resources and multi-use trails.

**Comment 4:** Noise and vibration from the GCL would negatively impact parkland resources. (Earley)

**Response:** Per the guidance in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (September 2018), analyses of vibration impacts were conducted for this project. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the FTA 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations

throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

### 3.1.13 Aesthetic Resources

**Comment 1:** The conceptual design of proposed train stops is not visually attractive. (Lawton)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to Section 3.4.9.2, "Proposed Stations," for discussion pertaining to the visual impact and aesthetic features of the proposed stations. In addition, as the GCL project advances, the design team will work with the municipalities to develop a station design that complements the urban fabric of the surrounding community.

**Comment 2:** Will the current landscape change in the area? If land is taken and landscape is changed, what will replace it? The proposed GCL would be aesthetically unappealing. The GCL will introduce unappealing fences. This would remove the barriers between my home and the rail line. (Boddy) (Hamilton, A) (Lahey, B) (Ludwig, A)

**Response:** The GCL is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts related to aesthetic features. Refer to Section 3.4.9, "Aesthetic Features," for further information regarding impacts to the visual environment with the proposed GCL.

**Comment 3:** What would the tracks in Wenonah look like from our house? Would there be a wall? (Lahey, M)

**Response:** The DEIS considered the visual effects of the proposed GCL throughout the proposed corridor. Refer to Section 3.4.9.1, "Proposed Track (Track and Rail Bed)" for a description of the change to the visual environment with the introduction of the proposed GCL.

**Comment 4:** The DEIS states that the removal of trees in right-of-way is part of routine maintenance, and not part of the proposed project. The DEIS should recognize that this will represent a change to the visual environs surrounding the rail corridor. (Wenonah Env. Comm.)

**Response:** Some vegetation within the proposed GCL corridor would be removed, however this would primarily be herbaceous perennials, such as grasses, rather than trees. Some trees may be removed from within the right-of-way; such trees are likely to be successional growth or encroachment that would typically be removed as part of routine rail maintenance, thereby maintaining the character of the rail corridor. Refer to Section 3.4.9.1, "Proposed Track (Rail and Trackbed)," for further information.

**Comment 5:** What exact landscaping will be done on streets along the tracks (specifically S West Ave in Wenonah)? Please define "extent practicable" from the Aesthetic Features. (Lahey, M)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team will work with municipalities to make sure that the anticipated removal of mature trees in the vicinity of Wenonah Station and Pitman Station would be

mitigated through careful landscaping of station sites. Detailed plans and designs for landscaping will be developed as part of preliminary engineering. The landscaping needs and feasibility of different landscaping options will be determined as the project advances. For further information, refer to Section 3.4.9.2, "Proposed Stations."

### 3.1.14 Air Quality

**Comment 1:** The proposed GCL will negatively impact air quality in my community. I am concerned about the pollution caused by the GCL. The GCL would create emissions, expanding our carbon footprint and impacting residents' health. The EIS should analyze greenhouse gas emissions more thoroughly and consider new battery-powered trains. A diesel train would produce air pollution that would affect humans and wildlife; electric trains would be an improvement. (Alicia) (Biedron) (Brush) (Campbell, L) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Connelly) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Flynn) (Foster) (FTEC) (Gandy, R) (Hamilton, L) (Harwell) (Hasse) (Henjes) (Kae) (Kearney, C) (Kearney, S) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lahey, M) (Lassmire) (Lisle) (Lombardo, R) (Lyons, C) (Lyons, T) (Machulsky) (Macris) (Mecholsky) (Meil) (Midgett) (Miloszewski) (Milward) (Murphy, K) (O'Neill, T) (Parks) (Petolicchio) (Pomilio) (Reebenaker) (Robinson K) (Rodriguez, O) (Rogers) (Rudisill) (Shute) (Siciliano) (Snow) (Tanzola) (Tobin) (Whiteway) (A34)

**Response:** As described in the DEIS, the proposed GCL would not result in any adverse impacts regarding Air Quality, including greenhouse gas emissions. For analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed that GCL vehicles would be powered by standard diesel, which is a high emission fuel type. For further information, refer to Section 3.4.10, "Air Quality."

**Comment 2:** Low carbon concrete should be used in construction of the proposed GCL. (Hasse) (TCS)

**Response:** Comment noted. Detailed project design and construction information will advance as the proposed GCL moves into the preliminary engineering phase. Thus, construction methods and activities described in the DEIS are based on industry standards, professional judgement, and other projects of a similar nature with regard to construction methods and activities. Refer to Section 1.7, "Description of the Construction Phase," for the currently anticipated construction methods, activities, and sequencing.

**Comment 3:** The impact of idling vehicles on residential health should be analyzed. Cars waiting for train crossings will idle and pollute. (Speth) (Storms)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.4.10, "Air Quality," the proposed GCL would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and emissions from vehicular traffic in the region. As shown in the tables, the project will improve or have no effect on Level of Service at most intersections in the project area, while only several intersections would experience a deterioration in Level of Service. Of the intersections that experience a deterioration in Level of Service, none would result in a significant adverse impact.

**3.1.15 Noise and Vibration**

**Comment 1:** Some homes are closer to the proposed GCL than the noise receptors used to estimate effects. Are effects to properties closer to the line considered? (Whiteway)

**Response:** Establishing transit noise impact is not solely a function of distance from train tracks. Ambient noise levels in a particular area are used to set thresholds for moderate and severe impact ranges per the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). For example, an existing noise level of 60 dBA has a different moderate impact range than that of an area with an existing noise level of 70 dBA. This is illustrated in Table 3, "Noise Levels Defining Impact for Transit Projects" of Attachment 11, "Noise and Vibration Technical Report." Furthermore, future train noise exposure levels depend on a number of factors: the proposed transit service operations; distance to the tracks; shielding caused by obstacles between the tracks and the receptor; and any additional noise generated by wheel squeal or horn soundings, if they occur, that contribute to the overall future estimated rail transit noise exposure. These combined factors determine the overall estimated future noise exposure at the receptor.

**Comment 2:** I am concerned about noise impacts due to the frequency of trains in my neighborhood. Would there be a sound barrier? I am concerned about noise impacts to homes near the tracks in Pitman, and I do not believe that proposed mitigation would be sufficient. (Alicia) (Boyd) (Campbell, R) (Cassidy) (Duffy, J) (Fichera) (Genovese) (Josh) (Kearney, S) (Committeeman Legge) (Lisle) (Machulsky) (Mayer) (Mecholsky) (Morency) (O'Neill, A) (O'Neill, T) (Parks) (Reebenaker) (Rogers) (Tobin) (Whiteway) (A17)

**Response:** Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the proposed GCL would be mitigated.

**Comment 3:** There should be designated "quiet zones" in residential neighborhoods. I am requesting a quiet zone for Wenonah; how do we establish a "quiet zone" in our town? The proposed GCL should not have train horns/bells as better warning/detection systems exist. (Caraker) (Schwartz, B) (Young)

**Response:** Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the proposed GCL would be mitigated. Per FRA guidance,

“quiet zones” cannot be included as part of the GCL project. At-grade crossings are being designed with four quadrant gates, providing the opportunity for jurisdictional entities to apply to the FRA for a "quiet zone" if so desired.

**Comment 4:** I am concerned about noise from the train itself, the train wheels, the train horn, and the train crossing bells. The frequent train horns, as well as the train itself, would be disruptive to residents near the line. The noise from train horns will be disruptive to our community and schools. The noise and vibration impacts assessed in the DEIS do not sufficiently assess the impact of train horns sounding at every street crossing. (Andrews) (Bechta) (Brooks) (Dzinski) (Earley) (Hamilton, M) (Harwell) (Janda) (Jordan) (Kae) (Kearney, C) (Ludwig, A) (Merrian) (Michalowski) (Michelle) (Midgett) (Miloszewski) (Mor) (Snow) (Speak) (Speth) (Trafford) (A15) (A31)

**Response:** Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the GCL would be mitigated. Per FRA guidance, “quiet zones” cannot be included as part of the GCL project. At-grade crossings are being designed with four quadrant gates, providing the opportunity for jurisdictional entities to apply to the FRA for a "quiet zone" if so desired.

**Comment 5:** The proposed GCL would create vibration impacts to our homes. I disagree with the finding that vibration impacts will be mitigated. (Bechta) (Burk) (Ilisco) (Janda) (Johnson, K) (Kae) (Lahey, B) (Lyons, C) (Michalowski) (Pappas) (Petolicchio) (Samantha) (Speak) (Whiteway) (Worthy)

**Response:** Comment noted. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

**Comment 6:** The noise from train horns would be disruptive to the elementary school. (Speth)

**Response:** Comment noted. Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration").

**Comment 7:** Electric trains would be quieter than diesel-powered trains and mitigate noise impacts. (Henjes)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to Section 4.4.6, "Noise and Vibration," for a description of noise mitigation measures.

**Comment 8:** I believe the proposed GCL will cause adverse noise impacts to my neighborhood. People hate that freight trains come through town and make noise. The noise from the GCL will disrupt communities. (Beck) (Campbell, L) (DiDonna) (Foster) (Gable) (Galanti) (Glassmire) (Graves, J) (Graves, S) (Hanstein) (Harvey Jr.) (Jaglieski) (Kerr) (Lassmire) (Levay) (Litzinger) (Lombardo, R) (Lyons, T) (Miller, A) (Murphy, K) (Petolicchio) (Pomilio) (Power) (Storms) (Ward) (Worthy) (A8) (A12) (A32) (A34)

**Response:** Comment noted. Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration").

**Comment 9:** I hope noise impacts are mitigated. How will noise impacts be mitigated? (Eric) (Lahey, M) (Phelan, A)

**Response:** Refer to Section 4.4.6, "Noise and Vibration," for a description of noise mitigation measures.

**Comment 10:** I am concerned that the DEIS downplayed the effects of noise pollution on human health. The proposed GCL would cause harmful health effects due to noise pollution. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Cooper, K) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Flynn) (Gandy, R) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lyons, C) (Meil) (Milward) (Mirigliani) (Robinson, K) (Shute)

**Response:** Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the proposed GCL would be mitigated.

**Comment 11:** I am concerned about noise impacts due to construction. (Storms)

**Response:** Construction activities would generally occur during day time hours from 7 A.M. to 6 P.M. on weekdays. There would be times when certain construction activities could take place during weekends or other times. All noise impacts associated with the operation of the proposed GCL would be mitigated.

**Comment 12:** I am concerned with the noise and vibration caused by the proposed GCL. (Bechta) (Janda)

**Response:** Comment noted. Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). Further, estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations throughout the corridor.

**Comment 13:** I moved to Sewell to get away from a noisy environment. (McCormick)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 14:** I am concerned about the vibration impacts due to construction and daily train operation. (Storms)

**Response:** Comment noted. Per the guidance in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (September 2018), analyses of vibration impacts were conducted for this project. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the FTA 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

During construction, performance standards would also be established for construction equipment to reduce vibration associated with the construction activities. Control measures would be implemented to reduce or eliminate, to the extent feasible, the potential for vibration-related impacts to humans and damage to buildings. It is expected that a vibration mitigation plan would be prepared when more details regarding construction operations are known. For further information, refer to Section 4.5.3.2, "Vibration Sensitive Receptors."

**Comment 15:** I am concerned about negative noise effects, even though they are technically below impact thresholds. While below impact thresholds, increased noise in my neighborhood will negatively affect me. (Dobbins) (Reebenaker)

**Response:** Comment noted. Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the proposed GCL would be mitigated.

**Comment 16:** The proposed GCL will violate the Mantua Township noise ordinance. (Connelly)



**Response:** Comment noted. Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration, including effects related to train horns, that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration"). All noise impacts associated with the operation of the GCL would be mitigated.

**Comment 17:** What would be the impact of noise and vibration at 150 feet? (Lahey, M)

**Response:** Section 3.4.11, "Noise and Vibration," provides a comprehensive overview of the potential effects related to noise and vibration that would result from the proposed GCL for both transit service operations and park-and-ride facilities. Potential impacts that were identified are addressed in the avoidance measures and mitigation section (Section 4.4.11, "Noise and Vibration").

**Comment 18:** If this train is sponsored by the DRPA, why can't they pick up the cost for "quiet zones" in all towns along the corridor? (Lahey, M)

**Response:** Per FRA guidance, "quiet zones" cannot be included as part of the GCL project. At-grade crossings are being designed with four quadrant gates, providing the opportunity for jurisdictional entities to apply to the FRA for a "quiet zone" if so desired.

**Comment 19:** Quiet zones, while necessary to prevent detrimental health effects from train horns, are expensive for municipalities. (Lahey, M)

**Response:** Per FRA guidance, "quiet zones" cannot be included as part of the GCL project. At-grade crossings are being designed with four quadrant gates, providing the opportunity for jurisdictional entities to apply to the FRA for a "quiet zone" if so desired.

**Comment 20:** Foundations of homes could be disrupted. (Harvey Jr.)

**Response:** Comment noted. Per the guidance in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (September 2018), analyses of vibration impacts were conducted for this project. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the FTA 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all locations throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

**Comment 21:** Who will pay for the damage to my home's foundation due to vibration? (Snow)

**Response:** Comment noted. Per the guidance in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (September 2018), analyses of vibration impacts were conducted for this project. Estimated vibration levels from GCL operations were projected to be below the FTA 72 Vibration Decibel (VdB) impact threshold at all

locations throughout the corridor. For further information, refer to Section 4.4.6.2, "Vibration Mitigation Measures."

**Comment 22:** I am concerned about the DEIS statement that the "No-Impact" range is simply a nuisance. (Biedron)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 23:** The noise analysis presented is inadequate because it only examines the level of sound in isolation and does not consider the duration or frequency of sounds. (Earley)

**Response:** The basic parameters of environmental noise that affect human subjective response are (1) intensity or sound level; (2) frequency content; (3) variation with time (e.g., intermittent or continuous); and (4) context (e.g., compared to level and nature of existing sound environment; necessity; time of day). Intensity, or level, is determined by how much the sound pressure fluctuates above and below the atmospheric pressure and is expressed on a logarithmic compressed scale in units of decibels (dB). By using this scale, the range of normally encountered sound can be expressed by values between 0 and 120 decibels. On a relative basis, a 1-decibel change in sound level generally represents a barely noticeable change outside the laboratory. A 3–5 decibel change is readily perceptible, whereas a 10-decibel change in sound level would typically be perceived as a doubling (or halving) in the loudness of a sound.

**Comment 24:** The light from the train at night will disrupt residents. (Harvey Jr.)

**Response:** As the proposed GCL design advances to preliminary engineering, best practices will be employed at proposed stations to ensure that lighting meets safety standards and local ordinances, as applicable, and minimizes offsite lighting effects.

### 3.1.16 Construction Impacts

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about construction impacts in my neighborhood. (Janda) (Rogers)

**Response:** Construction specifications would require that construction contractors comply with applicable environmental regulations and obtain necessary permits for the duration of construction. Construction of the project would follow applicable Federal, State, and local laws for building and safety, as well as local noise ordinances, as appropriate. In an effort to avoid and/or minimize potential adverse effects during construction of the project, a number of environmental commitments and mitigation measures are identified and described in Section 4.5, "Construction Impacts." As such, these environmental commitments and mitigation measures would be included as part of the project's construction contracts and/or permit conditions. Construction activities would generally occur during daytime hours from 7 A.M. to 6 P.M. on weekdays, and truck trips would be

directed to designated truck routes and only occur during non-peak hours to minimize any potential disturbance to communities along the corridor.

**Comment 2:** What freight line(s) will be used in the construction of the proposed GCL? (Williams)

**Response:** The movement of building materials will be determined as the proposed GCL progresses through later project phases.

**Comment 3:** The report identifies several impacts of construction, but the substantial impact to Conrail's operation is not identified or considered in any capacity. Conrail will have to supply significant resources to the proposed GCL project, and operational disruptions to Conrail and its customers would be required to complete certain aspects of the project. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.1.17 Acquisitions

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about displacements resulting from the acquisition of properties along the train line. Will some residents be told they need to relocate because the train is taking their property? Will eminent domain be offered for homes near the track? If eminent domain won't be used, how will homeowners near the track be compensated? (Bennett) (Boddy) (Brooks) (Lahey, B) (Lahey, M) (Meagher) (Michalowski) (Pappas) (Rutherford) (Slack) (Storms) (A19)

**Response:** As stated in Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Technical Report," properties would be acquired pursuant to the Eminent Domain Act of 1971 (N.J.S.A. 20:3-1). Details including the properties anticipated to be acquired as part of the proposed GCL can be found in Attachment 12. The list of properties to be acquired as part of the GCL will continue to be minimized and refined as the project advances into preliminary engineering. Properties would be acquired prior to construction of the GCL.

**Comment 2:** Eminent domain is expensive and insufficient to address the effects of the GCL. (Janda)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3:** How will reimbursements be made to homeowners due to proximity of their home to the tracks and the decrease in value due to location? (Lahey, M)

**Response:** The proposed GCL includes provisions for the acquisition of properties which would be directly impacted by the implementation of the project. For details on properties that would be acquired as part of the GCL, refer to Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report."

**Comment 4:** What compensation will there be to homeowners living near the proposed GCL? Will you purchase homes since people do not want a train line running nearby? (Machulsky) (Reebenaker)

**Response:** The proposed GCL includes provisions for the acquisition of properties which would be directly impacted by the implementation of the project. For details on properties that would be acquired as part of the proposed GCL, refer to Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report."

**Comment 5:** Why is the acquisitions rate in Westville the second highest? (Storms)

**Response:** The proposed GCL follows the existing and active Conrail right-of-way in order to minimize property impacts and acquisitions along the corridor. The list of properties to be acquired as part of the GCL will continue to be minimized and refined as the project advances into preliminary engineering. Of the 27 acquisitions expected in Westville, 22 would be *de minimis* (sliver) acquisitions, which entail the purchase of a small, minor portion of a parcel that would not adversely affect the features, attributes, or activities on the property. For further details, refer to Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report."

**Comment 6:** Can you explain the impact of the proposed GCL to my property in Sewell/Mantua Township? (Carr)

**Response:** As described in Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report," the property indicated is not being considered for acquisition. The proposed GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts. For additional information, refer to Chapter 4, "Avoidance Measures and Mitigation."

**Comment 7:** Need to address impacts of the proposed GCL on Wenonah Municipal Building and Wenonah Community Building. (Smith, L)

**Response:** As described in Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report," the properties indicated are not being considered for acquisition. The proposed GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts. For additional information, refer to Chapter 4, "Avoidance Measures and Mitigation."

### 3.1.18 EO-215 Public Outreach

**Comment 1:** Opportunities for public outreach have been insufficient, and the public's opposition is being ignored. (Bauer) (Cassidy) (Duffy, J) (Janda) (Kearney, C) (Lovell) (Rhodes) (Rizzo) (Rudisill) (Sammaciacchi) (Whiteway)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL project team has attempted to maximize public outreach throughout the project planning process and has conducted over 125 outreach meetings

with members of the public, municipalities, and key stakeholders. Following the publication of the DEIS, two virtual meetings were held on November 17th and 19th, which allowed for interested members of the public to join either during daytime or evening hours. These two public hearings had significantly higher attendance (116 and 118 attendees respectively) compared to previous scoping and Alternatives Analysis public meetings, and produced substantially more oral comments. Further, the GCL Project Team included additional avenues for public review that would not otherwise be offered including the provision of electronic and physical copies of all DEIS materials and public libraries and municipal buildings along the corridor. In addition to the virtual hearings provided, other avenues for comment including a project e-mail address, a project hotline for phone comments, an online form, and physical comment boxes at public buildings throughout the GCL corridor to ensure that all interested members of the public had the opportunity to comment. The GCL DEIS is publicly available online on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. Hard copies of the DEIS are also being held at various libraries and municipal buildings along the corridor, which are listed at the same webpage. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 2:** I request meetings with community planners or engineers in Pitman. (Robinson, M)

**Response:** Comment noted. Several meetings with local Pitman officials as well as public open houses have been held within the study area and, as the proposed GCL project progresses, additional outreach will be conducted.

**Comment 3:** Can you post the presentation from the public hearings online? (Rummel)

**Response:** A recording of the presentation from the November 17<sup>th</sup> and November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Public Hearings is now available on the GCL project website: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>.

## 3.2 General Comments on the Proposed Project

### 3.2.1 Alternatives Analysis

**Comment 1:** I don't think the proposed GCL is the best alternative because the area is not high density. The GCL should be built to serve the most densely population areas. (Brittin) (Kohler) (Linhart) (Petolicchio)

**Response:** The proposed GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they historically developed around transit. The entirety of the corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e. would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e. greatest cost-benefit). And lastly, considered highway alignments would require

extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 2:** The proposed GCL should be operated by NJ TRANSIT and should be an extension of the River LINE; it should also be rerouted to serve the Camden waterfront. (Follo)

**Response:** The proposed GCL presented in the DEIS was selected through the process of a Feasibility Study (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study, 2005) and an Alternatives Analysis (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, 2009). The GCL corridor allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Highway alignments considered in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study required extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 3:** The proposed GCL should consider alternatives to mitigate noise impacts. (Riccobene)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzed the potential for impacts with the proposed GCL, and found that the GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts, including noise. As such no underground station alternatives were considered.

**Comment 4:** Public-private-partnership implementation could reduce the impact of NJT by shifting responsibility to the public-private-partnership entity. I would like to add the following article to the project record: Courier Post Article “COMMENTARY: Proposed light-rail line is inferior option” By: J. WILLIAM VIGRASS - Published 12:17 a.m. ET Apr. 25, 2015 (Ritzler, W & D)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 5:** When was the chosen alternative selected and the others discarded? (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzes the alternative that was selected during the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study. The Alternatives

Analysis was a continuation of a Feasibility Study for the proposed GCL—the Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study—which was published in 2005. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study and 2005 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study are available at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>

**Comment 6:** A PATCO-type line would have been a better alternative. The proposed GCL can and should be interoperable with the PATCO system to provide a direct connection to Philadelphia. The GCL requires more duplicative infrastructure when compared with a light rail extension of PATCO. (Morency) (Ritzler, W) (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to the 2005 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study Final Report, which evaluates the feasibility of a Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO)-type system along the Conrail corridor and is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 7:** What alternatives were considered that do not disrupt small communities? (Tobin)

**Response:** An Alternatives Analysis was completed in 2009 (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study), which recommended the proposed GCL to be advanced to environmental review. The DEIS included analyses of the three alternatives: the No-Action Alternative, No Impact Alternative (the proposed GCL), and 13 New Stations Alternative. Of the examined alternatives in the DEIS, the proposed GCL is the only one that meets the purpose and need of the proposed project. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>.

**Comment 8:** A light rail line should be considered along Route 55 instead of the proposed GCL. (Janda)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzed the potential for impacts with the proposed GCL, and found that the GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts. The GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they developed around transit. The entirety of the corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the proposed GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e. would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e. greatest cost-benefit). And lastly, considered highway alignments would require extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New

Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>.

**Comment 9:** I am concerned that the Feasibility Study and Alternatives Analysis are outdated. (Cassidy)

**Response:** The purpose and need of the proposed GCL have not changed, and remain consistent with the Feasibility Study (completed in 2005) and Alternatives Analysis (completed in 2009). The GCL and the analysis of its potential impacts have continued to be refined to reflect current conditions as appropriate through the environmental review stage, and will be further refined as the project advances to preliminary engineering. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>.

**Comment 10:** The proposed GCL would be better if it ran along a major road. The GCL should consider alternative routes along Route 55, Route 42, and I-676. (Brown, M) (Connelly) (Cortés) (Dahlberg) (DeGirolamo) (Earley) (Elliot) (Flynn) (Gianotti) (Grayson) (Hamilton, A) (Hamilton, L) (Johnson) (Kerby) (Lahey, B) (Lahey, M) (Lisle) (Macris) (Matt D) (Mayer) (Michelle) (Midgett) (Morency) (Moreno) (Ossman) (Pomilio) (Reebenaker) (Rudisill) (Rutherford) (Speth) (Streater) (Tara) (Taylor-Kearney) (Tobin) (Young) (A18) (A31)

**Response:** The proposed GCL corridor allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Highway alignments considered in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study required extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 11:** I believe there are alternative options, i.e., less stations or route adjustments that could accommodate residents. (Riccobene)

**Response:** The GCL corridor allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Highway alignments considered in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study required extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/> (all future project updates, information, and



documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available). The DEIS included analyses of the three alternatives: the No-Action Alternative, No Impact Alternative (the proposed GCL), and 13 New Stations Alternative. Of the examined alternatives in the DEIS, the proposed GCL is the only one that meets the purpose and need of the proposed project.

**Comment 12:** The GCL should incorporate innovative solutions and new technologies like modern sensor technologies to detect obstacles in the way rather than using train horns or underground stations. (Riccobene) (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Comment noted. The DEIS conservatively analyzes a conventional technology. Different and innovative technologies would be explored as the project advances and is further refined in preliminary engineering.

**Comment 13:** I think the GCL should run adjacent to the former Underwood Memorial Hospital in Woodbury and utilize the existing parking garage. (Taylor, J)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would run approximately 0.2 miles east of the former Underwood Memorial Hospital in the City of Woodbury. While the GCL would be near this facility, the proposed Red Bank Avenue Station will be served by an existing municipal parking lot. The former Underwood Memorial Hospital parking structure could be looked as an alternative to shared municipal parking as the project advances into preliminary engineering.

**Comment 14:** Our goal of strategically expanding mass transit sustainably and effectively includes exploring other less intrusive and less expensive proposals. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** The purpose and need of the proposed project is to encourage a modal shift from automobile to transit and contribute to reductions in congestion, travel times, vehicle miles of travel, air pollutants, and greenhouse gases. The proposed GCL is the culmination of a Feasibility Study (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study) and an Alternatives Analysis (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study) which recommended the proposed GCL be advanced to environmental review. As compared to other alternatives considered in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL would require significantly lower capital expenditure than other options considered. Of the three examined alternatives in the DEIS, the GCL is the only one that meets the purpose and need of the proposed project. The DEIS analyzed the potential for impacts with the GCL, and found that the GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts.

**Comment 15:** The Alternatives Analysis was fundamentally flawed because it did not analyze PATCO light rail extension. (Ritzler, W)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to the 2005 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study Final Report, which evaluates the feasibility of a Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO)-type system along the Conrail corridor and is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 16:** Requests to add PATCO light rail extension to 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study were not honored. (Ritzler, W)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to the 2005 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study Final Report, which evaluates the feasibility of a Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO)-type system along the Conrail corridor and is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 17:** The DRPA is biased and should redo Alternatives Analysis and environmental work. (Ritzler, W)

**Response:** Comment noted. Refer to the 2005 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Transit Study Final Report, which evaluates the feasibility of a Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO)-type system along the Conrail corridor and is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 18:** Other options like busing should be looked at. (Jordan) (Lawton) (Riggs)

**Response:** For a detailed explanation of all alternatives considered, refer to the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Extension Alternative Analysis Study, which can be found on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 19:** Electrification and automation are better alternatives. (Frantini) (Hamilton, L)

**Response:** Comment noted. As shown in the DEIS, for analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed that GCL vehicles would be powered by standard diesel, which is a high emission fuel type. Cleaner burning fuel options are available, and could be explored during project implementation, which would further reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the proposed GCL in operation. Different and innovative technologies, such as automation, could be explored in future project phases.

**Comment 20:** The proposed GCL should utilize battery electric vehicles as they would reduce noise and air pollution, and would not require overhead catenary systems or the third rail of traditional electric light rail. (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Comment noted. The DEIS conservatively analyzes a conventional technology, specifically diesel-powered light rail vehicles, known as Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles, similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE. Different and innovative technologies and fuel types could be explored in future project phases.

**Comment 21:** GCL vehicles are proposed as light DMUs, similar to the existing New Jersey Transit River LINE. More research will be required to evaluate the possibility of heavy rail equipment being utilized along the GCL. Light DMUs will restrict Conrail's operational flexibility on a shared right-of-way. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.2 COVID-19 Pandemic

**Comment 1:** The COVID-19 pandemic has altered school, business, and commuting patterns, reducing the need for a train system. (Bauer) (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Duffy, J) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lacina) (Lahey, M) (Lawton) (Meil) (Milward) (Petolicchio) (Pontz) (Rhodes) (Robinson, K) (Siciliano) (Toal) (A8) (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Figueroa) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K) (A17)

**Response:** Comment noted. While transit ridership, travel patterns, and economic conditions have changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is reasonable to assume that conditions in the no build condition and future with the proposed GCL would be as presented in the DEIS. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.3, "Ridership Demand Forecast." In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

**Comment 2:** I don't think the virtual public hearing is sufficient for community involvement and outreach. (Gianotti)

**Response:** The GCL project team has attempted to maximize public outreach during the DEIS Process. The two virtual meetings held on November 17th and 19th, which allowed for interested members of the public to join either during daytime or evening hours, had significantly higher attendance (116 and 118 attendees respectively) compared to previous scoping and 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study public meetings, and produced substantially more oral comments. Further, the GCL Project Team included additional avenues for public review that would not otherwise be offered including the provision of electronic and physical

copies of all DEIS materials and public libraries and municipal buildings along the corridor. In addition to the virtual hearings provided, other avenues for comment including a project e-mail address, a project hotline for phone comments, an online form, and physical comment boxes at public buildings throughout the GCL corridor to ensure that all interested members of the public had the opportunity to comment. The GCL DEIS is publicly available online on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. Hard copies of the DEIS are also being held at various libraries and municipal buildings along the corridor, which are listed at the same webpage. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 3:** The COVID-19 pandemic is distracting the public from realizing this project is occurring. (Alicia)

**Response:** In order to maximize public outreach during the COVID-19 pandemic, two virtual meetings were held on November 17th and 19th, 2020, which allowed for interested members of the public to join either during daytime or evening hours. These public meetings had significantly higher attendance (116 and 118 attendees respectively) as compared to previous scoping and Alternatives Analysis public meetings and produced substantially more oral comments. Further, the public outreach process included additional avenues for public review that would not otherwise be offered including the provision of electronic and physical copies of all DEIS materials at public libraries and municipal buildings along the corridor.

**Comment 4:** The proposed GCL should not be considered during the COVID-19 pandemic because residents are struggling economically and are distracted; the economic impact of the pandemic is yet to be realized; New Jersey does not have the financial resources to repair existing roadways and infrastructure; and remote work will continue after the pandemic is over. (Shute)

**Response:** While transit ridership, travel patterns, and economic conditions have changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is reasonable to assume that conditions in the no build condition and future with the proposed GCL would be as presented in the DEIS. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

**Comment 5:** The proposed GCL will have lower ridership due to the COVID-19 pandemic. (Earley) (Janda) (Rhodes) (Rogers)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team performed ridership and travel demand forecasts using the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) model. The model projects 16,500 daily boardings in 2025 and 18,000 daily boardings in 2040. Of these trips, 10,100 in 2025 and 11,000 in 2040 were estimated to be new transit

trips, or trips that would otherwise be completed entirely by automobile. While transit ridership, travel patterns, and economic conditions have changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is reasonable to assume that conditions in the no build condition and future with the proposed GCL would be as presented in the DEIS. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

### 3.2.3 Funding Source

**Comment 1:** Is the project receiving federal funding? (Council Member Fleming)

**Response:** As currently contemplated, the proposed GCL is not anticipated to receive federal funds.

**Comment 2:** How will the project be funded? (Alicia) (Heller) (Michalowski) (Pontz) (Reebenaker)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would be built using State funds, similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE funding.

**Comment 3:** Is there a place to locate the anticipated cost for the line as well as ROI projections? (Rogers)

**Response:** Comment noted. Information related to the economic output, job creation, and income is provided in Section 3.4.3.3, "Economic Output, Job Creation, and Income." Additional project information will be provided on the project website <http://glassborocamdenline.com> as the project advances.

**Comment 4:** Throughout the design and construction of the project, there will be a significant amount of effort required from Conrail's engineering, legal, transportation, real estate, and environmental departments to ensure the proposed GCL is not adversely impacting our operation, the information is accurate, Conrail is compensated for the loss of its operating property and increased maintenance expenses, environmental risk is properly handled, and the proper agreements are negotiated. All of Conrail's effort shall be at the expense of the GCL project. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.4 General Statement of Support

**Comment 1:** I support the proposed GCL. (Adejare) (Appelby-Wineberg) (Brown, T) (CCSNJ) (Eric) (Errico) (Council Member Fleming) (Fusco) (Galbraith) (Gattinella) (Goodman) (Hastings) (Heller) (Henjes) (Herberg) (Kae) (Kaiser) (Linhart) (Lombardo, T) (Mandayam) (McCollum) (Miller, J) (Offner) (Plenn) (Robinson, M) (Saracco) (She) (Tamburello) (Thorpe) (Tinkham) (A1) (A35)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 2:** I support the GCL because:

- It would decrease noise pollution. (Hageman)
- The benefits of the proposed GCL outweigh the costs. (Canna) (Cox) (Smith, E)
- It aligns with the goals of New Jersey’s Energy Master Plan, Section 6, Strategy 1 “Reduce Energy Consumption and Emissions from the Transportation Sector.” (A24)
- It will increase transit mobility, accessibility, and connectivity in the region, while also reducing auto dependency. (Arianna) (Bathurst) (Beschler) (Boyle) (Carrasquillo) (Carroll) (Christensen, C) (Cokos) (Cooke) (Crowley) (Coulombe) (Cox) (Dickson, M) (Di Vietro) (Everet) (Everwine) (Fagan) (Freind) (Gooch) (Gupta) (Hammond) (Hastings) (Herberg) (Hitchner) (Horn) (Hostetter) (Howell) (Hurst) (Kautz, N) (Keck) (Kopp, C) (Kopp, D) (Kuski) (Lippincott) (Lund) (Mason) (McCandless) (McNulla) (Assembly Member Moen) (Moore) (Moscatelli) (Murphy, J) (Neal) (NJAA) (Nolan) (Orlando) (Quigley) (Raiff) (Rich) (Riccobene) (Robbins) (Roberts LeBeau) (Savage) (Schwartz, B) (Schwartz, T) (Smith, T) (SNJDC) (Staib) (Stewart) (Tinkham) (Trafford) (Turner, D) (Turner, P) (Tyson) (Whitehead) (Vargas) (Votta) (A2) (A3) (A10) (A21) (A22) (A25) (A26) (A27) (A30)
- Because communities along the rail line were developed as a result of historic passenger rail service; it makes sense that the rail service is reactivated in an existing rail right-of-way. (Asselta) (Christensen, C) (Crumrine) (Di Vietro) (Everwine) (Hageman) (Henry) (Herberg) (Kautz, N) (Lierman) (Lund) (McCandless) (Assembly Member Moen) (Roberts LeBeau) (Schneider) (Wang) (A24) (A25)
- It would be an environmentally sound investment for the region's future that would reduce carbon emissions. (Akass) (Cesare) (Christensen, B) (Coulombe) (Crumrine) (Di Vietro) (Everett) (Freind) (Gandy) (Hammond) (Hasse) (Herberg) (Howell) (Isaacson) (Kautz, N) (Keck) (King) (Kolek) (Kopp, C) (Kopp, D) (Kuski) (Lierman) (Lippincott) (Lund) (Mas) (Moore) (Moscatelli) (NJAA) (Peterson) (Quigley) (Riccobene) (Rich) (Roberts LeBeau) (Schwartz, B) (Smith, T) (SNJDC) (Wang) (Whitehead) (A3) (A21) (A23) (A24) (A27) (A30)
- Because it would improve commuting from communities along the rail line. (Beschler) (Coulombe) (McIntyre) (A10)
- It will support economic development, the revitalization of downtowns, and job growth. (Bathurst) (Brewer) (Boyle) (Canna) (Cesare) (Christensen, B) (Cooke) (Coulombe) (Feeney) (Gandy) (Gordy) (Gupta) (Hasse) (Herberg) (Hovell) (Hurst) (Isaacson) (Kautz, N) (King) (Kopp, C) (Kuski) (Lee) (Lierman) (Lilley) (Lippincott) (Lund) (Mas) (Monticone) (Moore) (Moscatelli) (Murphy, J) (NJAA) (Nolan) (Orlando) (Peterson) (Rich) (Robbins) (Smith, T) (SNJDC) (Staib) (Trafford) (Vargas) (Wang) (A3) (A21) (A22) (A23) (A28)
- It will create jobs. (NJAA) (SNJDC) (A31)
- It would alleviate congestion on increasingly overburdened roadways in this region. (Arianna) (Boyle) (Brewer) (Coulombe) (Cox) (Crowley) (Crumrine) (Hageman) (Hammond) (Henry) (Herberg) (Isaacson) (Kautz, A) (Kautz, N) (Keck) (King) (Kolek) (Kopp, D) (Kuski) (Lund) (Mason) (Assembly Member Moen) (Monticone) (Moore) (Moscatelli)

- (NJAA) (Olshefski) (Plourde) (Quigley) (Robbins) (Roberts LeBeau) (Savage) (Schwartz, B) (Smith, T) (SNJDC) (Tinkham) (Trafford) (Vitto) (Wang) (Whitehead) (A21) (A25) (A27)
- It would increase property values in the connecting communities. (Coulombe) (Freind) (Ramon) (Schwartz, B) (Staib) (Vitto) (A10)
  - It would improve safety. (Henry) (Hammond) (NJAA) (A28)
  - It would be a general benefit to the community. (Bathurst) (Cesare) (Christensen, C) (Crowley) (Everett) (Gooch) (Hageman) (Nolan) (Ramon) (Smith, E) (Staib) (A10) (A22)
  - It will bring culture to the area. (Coulombe) (Lilley) (Rich) (Stewart)
  - It will bring young people to the area. (Rich)
  - It would be consistent with Smart Growth principles and limit sprawl. (Crumrine) (Schwartz, B) (SNJDC)
  - It would increase collaboration between institutions along the rail line. (Crumrine) (Kuski) (McNulla) (Murphy, J) (Staib)
  - It would inspire diversity, equity, and inclusion. (Cesare) (Lierman) (Murphy, J) (Turner, P) (A30)
  - It would benefit university students and staff. (Akass) (Fagan) (Gooch) (Hammond) (Henry) (Herberg) (Kautz, N) (King) (Mason) (McCandless) (Monticone) (Olshefski) (Schneider) (Votta) (A26) (A27) (A28)
  - It would benefit seniors. (Vitto)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3:** I look forward to the proposed GCL being built, and I appreciate the thoroughness of the DEIS; I expect mitigation measures and construction to be handled carefully. (Brush)

**Response:** Comment noted. Information related to construction and mitigation measures is provided in Section 3.5, “Construction Impacts” and Section 4, “Avoidance Measures and Mitigation.” Additional project information is provided on the project website <http://glassborocamdenline.com/> and will be added to the project website as the project advances.

### 3.2.5 General Statement of Opposition

**Comment 1:** I do not support the proposed GCL (Ancona) (Bechta) (Beck) (Boddy) (Boyd) (Brittin) (Campbell, R) (Crew) (Combs) (Cortés) (Dadario) (Daniel) (Dahlberg) (DeGirolamo) (Dickson, R) (DiDonna) (Duffy, P) (Eagan) (Edward) (Flynn) (Foley) (Foster) (Fournakis) (Gable) (Galanti) (Gandy, R) (Hamilton, A) (Heather) (Hughes) (Johnson, K) (Jordan) (Josh) (Kearney, M) (Kearney, S) (Krimmel) (Koniecki) (Lauk) (Layout) (Levay) (Lipsett) (Lombardo, R) (Ludwig, A) (Machulsky) (Macris) (Maryann) (Matt D) (Mayer) (McCormick) (Mecholsky) (Michalowski) (Midgett) (Miloszewski) (Murphy, K) (Noverati, J) (Noverati, R) (O’Connor) (O’Neill, A) (O’Neill, T) (Parks) (Petolicchio) (Pomilio) (Pontz) (Power) (Rachel) (Reebenaker) (Rhodes) (Rodriguez, A) (Rodriguez, O) (Rogers) (Rutherford) (Salvatore) (Schwab) (Shute) (Siciliano) (Tanzola) (Vanleer) (Waddington) (Ward) (Worthy) (Zammarrelli) (A11) (A13) (A14) (A32) (A33)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 2:** I oppose the GCL because:

- It will bring crime. (Cargill) (Emerle) (Figuroa) (Hughes) (Ilisco) (Johnson, D) (Kerby) (Machulsky) (Riggs) (Tara)
- Existing public transit in this area is sufficient. (Bauer) (Machulsky) (A19)
- It would change the character of my neighborhood. (Andrews) (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Cassidy) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Figuroa) (Hamilton, L) (Hughes) (Johnson, D) (Kerby) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Kohler) (Lawton) (Meil) (Milward) (Pomilio) (Riggs) (Robinson, K) (Rodriguez, A) (Rodriguez, O) (Streater) (Tara) (Toal) (Tobin) (A16) (A17) (A19)
- Increased noise and/or vibration. (Alio) (Boyd) (Figuroa) (Johnson, D) (Kerby) (Machulsky) (Mecholsky) (Mor) (Moreno) (Speth) (A16) (A17) (A19)
- Increased traffic. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Combs) (Emerle) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Figuroa) (Frantini) (Gable) (Glassmire) (Hamilton, L) (Hughes) (Janda) (Johnson, D) (Ludwig, A) (Meil) (Michelle) (Parks) (Pomilio) (Robinson, K) (Rudisill) (Speth) (A9) (A17) (A19) (A27)
- Would not reduce traffic. (Earley) (Kohler) (Lacina) (Lahey, M) (Martin) (Rodriguez, A)
- As a diesel train, the GCL would increase air pollution. (Figuroa) (Kerby) (Mecholsky) (Rodriguez, O) (Taylor-Kearney)
- Increased safety hazards, particularly for children. (Hughes) (Kerby) (Machulsky) (Mecholsky) (Moreno) (Rodriguez, O) (Shute) (Sparks) (Speth) (Taylor-Kearney) (Toal) (A17)
- It would negatively impact families along the corridor. (Elliot) (Genovese)
- It would change the environment. (Genovese)
- Its harmful effects would last for many years. (Genovese)
- It would affect the livelihood of communities along the train line. (Cassidy)
- I am concerned about eminent domain. (Figuroa) (A19)
- Its impact on natural resources. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Meil) (Robinson, K)
- Its impact on historic resources. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Meil) (Robinson, K)
- I am opposed to the clearing of forested areas in Woodbury Heights. (Biedron)
- The GCL would be more disruptive than beneficial. (Brooks) (Carlin, M) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Earley) (Hanstein) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (McClain) (Meil) (Robinson, K)
- Because of graffiti. (Mor)
- It would be disruptive for residents and students. (Emerle)

**Response:** Comment noted. As described in Chapter 4, “Avoidance Measures and Mitigation,” all potential impacts would be mitigated. Information related to safety and security, transportation, neighborhood character, noise and vibration, air quality, acquisitions, biological resources, historic resources, and aesthetic resources is provided in Chapter 3,



“Environmental Consequences.” Additional project information will be provided on the project website <http://glassborocamdenline.com/> as the project advances.

**Comment 3:** The GCL would be expensive, unprofitable, and unsustainable; it would also increase taxes and be a poor use of public funds. (Bakley) (Bauer) (Biedron) (Brooks) (Campbell, L) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Crew) (Connelly) (Dickson, R) (Dobbins) (Earley) (Emerle) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Figueroa) (Frantini) (Genovese) (Gianotti) (Hamilton, L) (Hughes) (Ilisco) (Janda) (Jordan) (Kearney, C) (Kearney, S) (Kerby) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Kohler) (Lahey, M) (Lawton) (Levay) (Lipsett) (Lyons, C) (Machulsky) (Macris) (McClain) (Meil) (Miloszweski) (Milward) (Moreno) (Murphy, K) (O’Neill, T) (Ossman) (Rhodes) (Robinson, K) (Rogers) (Scher) (Shaugnessy) (Shute) (Siciliano) (Snow) (Taylor-Kearney) (Toal) (Westville Env. Comm.) (A4) (A12) (A15) (A17) (A29)

**Response:** Comment noted. Information related to the economic output, job creation, and income is provided in Section 3.4.3.3, “Economic Output, Job Creation, and Income.” Information related to project purpose and need is provided in Section 1.2, “Project Purpose and Need.” Additional project information will be provided on the project website [http://glassborocamdenline.com](http://glassborocamdenline.com/) as the project advances.

**Comment 4:** The data that supports this rail line is outdated and was not proofed for accuracy or continuity. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kerr) (Kinmonth) (Lipsett) (Meil) (Milward) (Ossman) (Pontz) (Robinson, K) (Speth) (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team performed ridership and travel demand forecasts using the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) model. The model projects 16,500 daily boardings in 2025 and 18,000 daily boardings in 2040. Of these trips, 10,100 in 2025 and 11,000 in 2040 were estimated to be new transit trips, or trips that would otherwise be completed entirely by automobile. It is reasonable to assume that ridership and travel patterns in the future would be as assumed in the DEIS. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows.

**Comment 5:** Money would be better spent fixing failing school infrastructure. (Frantini)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 6:** The DRPA is pushing this through because of a few people who want it in Trenton. (Pomilio)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 7:** A similar project was implemented nearby and created issues. (Bauer)

**Response:** Comment noted.

### 3.2.6 Project Alignment

#### 3.2.6.1 Horizontal Alignment

**Comment 1:** Will current tracks be removed? What will replace them? (Lahey, B)

**Response:** As part of the proposed GCL, the existing Conrail track will be shifted within the existing right-of-way to allow for greater space between the proposed GCL track and Conrail track in the project corridor. Existing Conrail track will not be removed. Refer to Chapter 1, "Project Description," for information regarding the proposed alignment of the GCL and the operation of Conrail and the GCL along the project corridor.

**Comment 2:** The terminus in Glassboro would make future extension of the line more difficult. The proposed GCL should be planned such that future expansion of service to Vineland and Philadelphia are possible. (Fisher) (Hovell) (Offner)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzes the alternative that was selected during the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study (herein, the proposed GCL). The purpose and need of the proposed GCL include improving mobility, easing traffic congestion, and supporting smart growth within Camden and Gloucester counties. Future extensions or expansion of service beyond Camden and Gloucester counties is not explicitly considered in the DEIS, and would require additional study.

**Comment 3:** There are better options than the alignment through these neighborhoods. (Duffy, P)

**Response:** The GCL corridor allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they developed around transit. The entirety of the corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the proposed GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e., would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e., greatest cost-benefit). And lastly, considered highway alignments would require extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 4:** The GCL should primarily utilize double tracks, as single track can create delays. (Fisher)

**Response:** The proposed GCL will primarily run on a double track system. As part of coordination with Conrail, the freight service currently operating in the project corridor, the proposed GCL was refined to have a portion of the alignment between Gloucester City and Woodbury run single track in order to provide for sufficient space to allow the GCL and Conrail to operate along the corridor concurrently. The single track portion of the GCL is not anticipated to interfere with the provision of fast, frequent and consistent service throughout the corridor. Refer to Chapter 1, "Project Description," for further information on the configuration of tracks with the GCL and the operations of the GCL and Conrail freight service.

**Comment 5:** Will new tracks be to the east or west of existing tracks? (Lahey, B) (Lahey, M)

**Response:** The proposed new GCL track would be located to the east of the existing Conrail track. For further information, refer to Section 1.4.2, "Alignment."

**Comment 6:** Throughout the report, the use of the existing Conrail rail corridor between Camden and Glassboro is referenced frequently. Conrail has not been a party to any discussions regarding the intent to secure Conrail property for the project, and Conrail has no written agreement with the GCL to allow the project within its right-of-way. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 7:** The report indicates areas where only a 17-foot track center spacing is established between Conrail tracks and those of the proposed GCL. In those areas, the report indicates fencing will be installed to separate the two operations. Conrail has previously indicated to the GCL team that 25-foot track center spacing is required to avoid Conrail and Federal Railroad Administration enforced adjacent track protection rules becoming a part of the routine maintenance for each operation. This distance is in accordance with Conrail's engineering standards. If 25-foot track centers are not obtainable, more research is needed to establish the best practice of safely separating the operations and allowing for the safe performance of maintenance. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 8:** The report states specific corridor ownership by various entities. Conrail's Real Estate department will need to verify these claims. Research will also need to be conducted regarding rail usage rights for the corridor. There are areas where Conrail may not own tracks, but has the exclusive usage rights. The usage of these areas by both Conrail and the proposed GCL will need to be discussed and agreed upon prior to the GCL being put into service. Agreements shall be established that indicate the GCL will be responsible for the cost burden of potential rail freight customers locating on or across the GCL. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.6.2 Vertical Alignment

**Comment 1:** I am opposed to street grade crossings, especially in Wenonah, that are not contained within a designated “quiet zone.” (Young)

**Response:** Per FRA guidance, “quiet zones” cannot be included as part of the GCL project. At-grade crossings are being designed with four quadrant gates, providing the opportunity for jurisdictional entities to apply to the FRA for a “quiet zone” if so desired.

**Comment 2:** Is it feasible to construct an overhead pedestrian walkway over the proposed GCL at pedestrian walkway adjacent Woodbury Heights Elementary School? (A5)

**Response:** As currently proposed, the proposed GCL would not include provisions for an elevated pedestrian walkway, however, pedestrians would be directed to designated crossing areas that are protected. For further information, refer to Section 3.3.4.3, “Pedestrian and Bicycle Access,” and Section 3.4.7.2, “Design Elements to Provide Safe Operations.”

**Comment 3:** The proposed GCL should operate below or above grade in Pitman because the train would intersect the town's four major roads. (Dzinski) (Robinson, M)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzed the potential for impacts with the proposed GCL, and found that the GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts. The proposed GCL corridor was selected in part because it allows for the reactivation of passenger rail that once served the same corridor. Neighborhoods along the GCL corridor are natural transit-oriented developments, as they developed around transit. The entirety of the corridor does not need to be high density for successful transit/ridership. Further, of the corridors analyzed, the GCL corridor produced the most new transit riders (i.e., would take more cars off the road) and the lowest cost per new rider (i.e., greatest cost-benefit). And lastly, considered highway alignments would require extensive infrastructure (e.g., pedestrian walkways and parking lots) and would require all riders to drive to train stations. For these, and other reasons elaborated in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, the GCL corridor was selected.

**Comment 4:** Please consider creating above- or below-grade crossings throughout Wenonah with safety being the top priority. (Morency)

**Response:** As described in Section 3.4.7, “Safety and Security,” bicycle and pedestrian crossings (including walkways and crosswalk signal boxes) would be provided at rail crossings. Pedestrian and bicycle crossings would also be provided between the park-and-ride facilities and the station platforms. Fencing would be placed in designated locations to deter pedestrian intrusion in the rail ROW. Further, the project sponsor of the proposed

GCL is expected to partner with New Jersey Operation Lifesaver (NJOL), which is a nonprofit, public safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and trespassing on or near railroad tracks. NJOL will provide educational programming about rail safety to students and other interested parties throughout the corridor.

### 3.2.7 Project Construction (Methods)

**Comment 1:** When is the project anticipated to start construction and begin operation? (Janda) (Pappas) (Reebenaker)

**Response:** Construction of the proposed GCL will begin once the design of the alignment is completed.

**Comment 2:** What is the likelihood that this project will move forward? Who gives final approval on the proposed GCL? (Reebenaker)

**Response:** The continuance of the proposed GCL will be determined by the project sponsor as it progresses through project phases. As described in Section 1.1, "Summary," the proposed GCL is currently sponsored by the Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA).

**Comment 3:** Temporary construction easements will be needed for areas of Conrail's property where GCL's contractor requires access, laydown areas, or other uses. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 4:** The report incorrectly identifies fouling as four feet from the nearest railroad track. GCL employees and contractors are fouling when within 15 feet of the centerline of track. (Conrail)

**Response:** Section 1.7.2, "Overview of Construction Methods and Activities," of the DEIS has been updated to reflect that GCL employees and contractors are fouling when within 15 feet of the centerline of the track. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.8 Project Infrastructure/Components

**Comment 1:** Is there green energy potential at the VMFs? (Errico)

**Response:** Any opportunities or design considerations related to alternative energies will be explored during preliminary engineering.

**Comment 2:** Will the proposed GCL be designed similarly to the PATCO Speedline? (Lahey, B)

**Response:** The proposed project would use diesel-powered light rail vehicles, known as Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles, similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE and the Denton County Transportation Authority A-train. Light rail DMU vehicles can operate on an exclusive guideway or in-street (as in the City of Camden), but cannot integrate with the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) Speedline to directly access Center City Philadelphia. For further details, refer to Chapter 1, "Project Description."

**Comment 3:** I want to see proof that the bridges and overpasses are structurally sound enough to handle the GCL. (Kearney, C)

**Response:** In total, 14 bridges, three elevated viaducts, and two culverts would be used, modified, or constructed as a part of the proposed GCL. Of these, nine would be newly constructed structures, seven would be modifications to existing structures, one would be a complete replacement of the structure, and one structure would be used by the GCL without modification. Detailed engineering designs for the GCL would be developed in a safe and informed manner, and grade crossings and railroad bridges would be modified or reconstructed where appropriate. For further information refer to Section 1.4.4.1, "Bridges, Culverts, and Elevated Viaducts."

**Comment 4:** What is the type of rail? (Harwell)

**Response:** The proposed project would use diesel-powered light rail vehicles, known as Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles, similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE and the Denton County Transportation Authority A-train. The proposed GCL passenger rail line would operate along the corridor on either dedicated GCL tracks, or on tracks where passenger and freight service are temporally separated. For further details, refer to Chapter 1, "Project Description."

**Comment 5:** I have concern regarding shared use with Conrail, including potentially increasing costs and reliance on a private entity for management. There may be a need for additional trackage for sidings when coordinating commuter trains with concurrent freight train service. (Linhart) (Schneider)

**Response:** Comment noted. See also Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report," for further information on the GCL-Conrail interface.

**Comment 6:** The proposed GCL would require the use of Conrail property and right-of-way for a significant portion of its alignment. This existing freight corridor is at the heart of Conrail's operation in South Jersey and an important link in the industrial supply chain of the region. The proposed construction, occupation, and operation of the GCL will have an impact on existing freight rail transportation as well as curtail the future growth potential of freight rail customers located along Conrail's right-of-way. Conrail's foremost concern is the preservation of its existing freight transportation franchise. Accordingly, Conrail

believes the following guiding principles are critical in the advancement of any iteration of the proposed project:

- Any proposed implementation of the proposed project must have the ability to preserve current freight service levels and access to freight rail customers throughout the entire existing Conrail right-of-way.
- Any proposed alignment must provide sufficient capacity that does not preclude future expansion of freight service on the current Conrail right-of way.
- The proposed project should provide opportunities for synergies in rail infrastructure investments that would benefit both passenger and freight rail service. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 7:** In previous meetings with the GCL team, Conrail indicated several projects that are critical to Conrail for the preservation of its operation:

a. Woodbury to Thorofare Siding

b. New Wye Track at Eagle Point

c. Pavonia Yard Through-Track Capacity Improvement

d. 23' vertical clearance under Hunter Street Overhead Bridge

e. Extension of Conrail's existing siding 2.25 miles south to Woodbury heights, with the incorporation of an interlocked middle crossover

While the Hunter Street Bridge and extension of the siding into Woodbury Heights, albeit not 2.25 miles, was included, the other improvements were not included as a part of the report. Conrail's approval and the use of its property is contingent upon these projects being completed prior to the construction of the GCL. The completion of these projects will mitigate the negative impact to Conrail's critical operations. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 8:** The report references existing railroad bridges that will need to be modified as part of the project. Conrail will need to further evaluate the condition of existing structures impacted by the project, and what will be required should maintenance or replacement be needed in the future. Conrail may require its existing bridges impacted by the proposed GCL be replaced at the time of the GCL construction to mitigate any future impacts on Conrail's operations once the GCL is placed into service. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

**Comment 9:** All proposed structures, retaining walls, bridges, ditches, etc. will need to meet Conrail requirements for clearance from Conrail's tracks, both horizontally and vertically.

All utilities affected by the GCL project on Conrail's right-of-way shall be modified or relocated in accordance with Conrail specifications. All plans for these changes must be reviewed and approved by Conrail's engineering department to verify adherence to Conrail's requirements. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.9 Project Operations

#### 3.2.9.1 Fare System

**Comment 1:** What would the train fare be? Will fares be integrated with NJT/PATCO systems? (Offner) (She)

**Response:** For analysis purposes, the proposed GCL fare is based on the existing New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE. As the project advances, appropriate fare price and structure will be determined by the GCL operator.

#### 3.2.9.2 Frequency/Service

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about the high train frequency proposed as part of the GCL. (Burk) (Cassidy) (Combs) (DeMasi) (Dzinski) (Earley) (Glassmire) (Janda) (Lahey, M) (Committeeman Legge) (Ludwig, T) (Offner) (O'Neill, T) (Reebenaker) (Tobin) (Whiteway)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the River LINE today. It is assumed that the GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight), and on weekends and holidays, from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). The DEIS took a conservative approach and analyzed the potential for impacts based on 7.5-minute headways during the peak period. There are no anticipated unmitigated impacts as a result of the GCL with this service plan. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.2, "Service Plan."

**Comment 2:** Will hours of operation accommodate late night workers and weekend bar crowds? Will there be extended hours of operation in Camden on concert nights? (Zinader)

**Response:** For the purposes of the DEIS, it is assumed that the proposed GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight) and weekends and holidays; normal hours of



revenue service would be from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). Details related to the operation of the GCL would be refined by the operating agency.

**Comment 3:** How many GCL trains would run each day and how fast would they be going? (Lawton)

**Response:** The proposed operating plan for the GCL would provide a high quality of service to passengers, with trains operating every 15 minutes during peak periods and midday every 30 minutes during the late nights. Vehicles would travel at speeds up to 65 mph but would limit its speeds in heavily developed areas. It is assumed that the proposed GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight) and weekends and holidays; normal hours of revenue service would be from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight).

**Comment 4:** I am concerned that 30 minute headways at evening are infrequent for light rail. (Henjes)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights. This operating plan is similar to the operation of the River LINE today. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.2, "Service Plan."

**Comment 5:** The GCL would be slow; It would not be as fast as previous passenger rail service along the corridor, or a grade separated high-speed train line. (Appelby-Wineberg) (Dobbins) (Kearney, C) (Schwartz, B) (Shute)

**Response:** Comment noted. Vehicles on the proposed GCL would travel at speeds up to 65 mph but would limit its speeds in heavily developed areas. The average one-way running time for the entire 18-mile GCL alignment between the WRTC and Glassboro is estimated at approximately 35-40 minutes. For further information, refer to Section 1.6, "GCL Operations."

**Comment 6:** The large volume of trains will impact nearby homes and residents. (Whiteway)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the River LINE today. There are no anticipated unmitigated impacts as a result of the GCL with this service plan. For further information, refer to Section 1.6.2, "Service Plan."

**Comment 7:** I am concerned about the high frequency and speed of the trains. (Kerby) (Kurtz) (Lawton) (Speth) (Tobin)

**Response:** The proposed GCL would have an operating plan with trains running every 15 minutes during the peak, and every 30 minutes during late nights, similar to the operation of the River LINE today. It is assumed that the proposed GCL would run on weekdays, from 5:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight), and on weekends and holidays, from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 A.M. (midnight). The DEIS took a conservative approach and analyzed the potential for

impacts based on 7.5-minute headways during the peak period. There are no anticipated unmitigated impacts as a result of the GCL with this service plan. Vehicles would travel at speeds up to 65 mph but would limit its speeds in heavily developed areas. For further information on travel speeds and service frequency for the GCL, refer to Section 1.6, "Operations."

**Comment 8:** The DEIS proposes a Conrail operating window south of Woodbury between 9:00 P.M. and 5:00 A.M. Service windows have a severe negative impact on freight. The lack of service flexibility, especially when limiting access during standard business operating hours, will force Conrail's customers to consider other methods of transportation. The reduced service window will also restrict the possibility of industrial growth in the area, which is a detriment to not only Conrail, but the economic sustainability of the Southern New Jersey community as a whole. (Conrail)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team looks forward to continuing to work with you in future project phases.

### 3.2.9.3 Fuel/Energy

**Comment 1:** The GCL should utilize electric trains as they would be more effective in stopping climate change and alleviating air quality issues and would be easier to maintain, require less infrastructure, and cost less in the long run. Why aren't the trains electric? Can they be made electric in the future? (Appelby-Wineberg) (Brush) (Crowley) (FTEC) (Henjes) (Kaiser) (Linhart) (Offner) (Saracco) (Siciliano) (Speth) (Tamburello) (Whiteway)

**Response:** The 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study was a rigorous comparative evaluation of alternatives conducted in order to determine the alternative that best served the study area. This analysis and decision-making process was advanced through an open public participation environment that featured extensive public and stakeholder outreach and agency coordination. The alternative selected from this process was a train with diesel-powered light rail vehicles, known as Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles, similar to the New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 2:** This project will not create all electric mass transit. (Speth)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3:** The proposed GCL will be obsolete in the future because it runs on diesel. A diesel train running at the proposed frequency near residential homes should not be considered. I

would support the project if the GCL were electric. (Christensen, B) (Crumrine) (Kearney, C) (Rhodes) (Young)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 4:** The proposed GCL uses diesel, which is an older, less clean technology. Is there no concern for the environment? Do we not look toward the future when we make our plans? (Taylor-Kearney)

**Response:** As described in the DEIS, the proposed GCL would not result in any unmitigated impacts. For analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed that GCL vehicles would be powered by standard diesel, which is a high emission fuel type. Cleaner burning fuel options are available, and could be explored during project implementation, which would further reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the GCL in operation. In addition, the GCL is primarily located within an existing rail right-of-way which would minimize environmental impacts.

**Comment 5:** Using electric powered buses would be less expensive, as the infrastructure already exists. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, M)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 6:** The GCL would need to be upgraded to electric trains in the future to meet carbon emission goals. (Biedron) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Kinmonth) (Meil) (Milward) (Robinson, K)

**Response:** As described in the DEIS, the proposed GCL would not result in any adverse impacts regarding Air Quality, including greenhouse gas emissions. For analysis purposes it was conservatively assumed that GCL vehicles would be powered by standard diesel, which is a high emission fuel type. Cleaner burning fuel options are available, and could be explored during project implementation, which would further reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the GCL in operation. For further information, refer to Section 3.4.10, "Air Quality."

#### 3.2.9.4 Multimodal Connectivity

**Comment 1:** How will the GCL interact with bus service in the area? How will NJ Transit bus routes interact with stations? (Henjes) (Linhart)

**Response:** New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) has developed several small routing changes in the vicinity of two proposed GCL stations (South Camden and Red Bank Avenue stations) to make transfers more convenient between the proposed GCL and regional bus routes. No changes were proposed at other station locations, as bus routes either pass directly by

the proposed stations or do not serve the nearby area. For further information, refer to Section 3.2, "Changes to Existing Network," of Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 2:** I am concerned with the transfer to the PATCO Speedline for service to Philadelphia. (Alio) (Duffy, J) (Hamilton, L) (Henjes) (Kae) (Lahey, M) (Martin) (Offner) (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** The transfer associated with the proposed GCL is exactly as it is for the existing New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) River LINE. Additionally, the GCL train schedule has been developed in coordination with the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) schedule for ease of transfer.

**Comment 3:** If the GCL will not be directly interoperable with the existing PATCO system, it should be designed in a way so as to not preclude future compatibility with the PATCO line. (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Comment noted.

#### 3.2.9.5 Operating Agency

**Comment 1:** Who will operate the GCL? (A7)

**Response:** The proposed GCL is currently sponsored by the Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA). As the project advances to preliminary engineering through construction and operation, the project sponsor could change.

**Comment 2:** The proposed GCL should be operated by PATCO and should be a DMU, but should connect to the PATCO High Speed Line in Camden. (Follo)

**Response:** The DEIS analyzes the alternative that was selected during the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study. Projects other than the proposed GCL are beyond the scope of this study.

#### 3.2.9.6 Ridership/Forecast

**Comment 1:** Have citizens been surveyed for ridership potential? (Offner)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team performed ridership and travel demand forecasts using the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) model. This model has been used to determine travel patterns, trip origins and destinations and corridor level travel times both during the planning and design stages of the proposed GCL and also to support the transportation analyses reported in the DEIS. Public input has informed the development and refinement of the GCL throughout the process. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station

pedestrian flows. For further information, refer to Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 2:** I do not think the GCL would have sufficient ridership. The GCL will not get enough ridership to be viable. Ridership levels would be low. (Brooks) (Burk) (Caraker) (Connelly) (DeGirolamo) (Dobbins) (Emerle) (Figueroa) (Hamilton, L) (Hanstein) (Hughes) (Kohler) (Lacina) (Mecholsky) (Miloszweski) (Nicky G) (Ossman) (Tara) (A15) (A19) (A29) (Alicia)

**Response:** Comment noted. The GCL Project Team performed ridership and travel demand forecasts using the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed Simplified Trips-on-Project Software (STOPS) model. This model has been used to determine travel patterns, trip origins and destinations and corridor level travel times both during the planning and design stages of the proposed GCL and also to support the transportation analyses reported in the DEIS. Public input has informed the development and refinement of the GCL throughout the process. In addition, as the project advances into preliminary engineering, ridership estimates will be updated and refined to confirm vehicle capacity needs and station pedestrian flows. For further information, refer to Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 3:** How will PATCO accommodate GCL riders? (Maryann)

**Response:** The DEIS assessed the effect of increased ridership on other transit services in the area. For further information, refer to Section 6.6, "Capacity on Other Services," of Attachment 6, "Transit Analysis Technical Report."

**Comment 4:** I am requesting rider demographics. (Rogers)

**Response:** Regional demographic information was analyzed in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study. For further information, refer to Section 2, "Existing Study Area Conditions" of the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study.

### 3.2.10 Project Stations

**Comment 1:** Where will stations and parking lots be located? (Rutherford)

**Response:** There are fourteen new stations and six parking facilities proposed as part of the proposed GCL project; in addition, three parking facilities are anticipated at three stations as part of municipal plans. Refer to Section 1.4.3, "Stations," for further discussion of proposed station locations and parking facilities.

**Comment 2:** I am requesting information regarding the Sewell Station platform and site. (Hanson)

**Response:** The proposed Sewell Station would be located adjacent to West Atlantic and Atlantic Avenues, north of Center Street. The at-grade, walk-up station would be built within the existing right-of-way and would include two side platforms surrounded by extensive landscaping consistent with the railway corridor landscape. Refer to Section 1.4.3, "Stations," for further discussion of station type and design.

**Comment 3:** Has the Woodbury Station location been adjusted to account for the (partial) closing of Sony and Inspira Woodbury? (Cureton)

**Response:** The DEIS for the proposed GCL acknowledges that the Sony Digital Media Plant, located in Pitman, closed in 2011 and remains vacant. Further, the DEIS also considers that the Inspira Health Center - Woodbury has been converted to a smaller satellite facility. During the Alternatives Analysis (Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, 2009), potential station areas were screened, including the SONY facility, and the current location for the proposed Woodbury Station was determined to be the most suitable of all locations analyzed. The proposed Woodbury Station location is described in Section 2.3.2.2, "Station Areas."

**Comment 4:** The Sewell Station location is not suitable for transit because there is no access to parking, businesses, or major roadways. (Rizzo)

**Response:** The Sewell Station is proposed as a walk-up station to serve the residents of the adjacent neighborhood. Beginning in 2009, and continuing through 2018, a series of Station Area Planning meetings were hosted by the GCL Project Team and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA)/Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) agency staff at each of the municipalities in which a proposed station was planned. During these meetings, the GCL Project Team engaged the public and local government officials to refine station locations for each municipality. See Section 1.4.3, "Stations" for a description of the stations proposed.

**Comment 5:** I'm fine with a station at Rowan University. (Krimmel)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 6:** Can you connect the proposed GCL to Center City Philadelphia? Can you connect the GCL to Woolwich Township? (O., Kim)

**Response:** Beginning in 2009, a series of Station Area Planning meetings were hosted by the GCL Project Team and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA)/Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) agency staff at each of the municipalities in which a proposed station was planned. During these meetings, the GCL Project Team engaged the public and local government officials to refine station locations for each municipality. See Section 1.4.3, "Stations" for a description of the stations proposed.

**Comment 7:** Where will the stop near Mantua Blvd be located? (Adler)

**Response:** The proposed Mantua Boulevard Station is anticipated to be located within the Conrail right-of-way, north of the grade crossing at Mantua Boulevard.

**Comment 8:** Where will the Mantua Blvd, Sewell, and Mantua Pitman stations be located. (Meagher)

**Response:** The proposed Sewell Station would be on Center Street between East and West Atlantic Avenues. The proposed Mantua Pitman Station would be located on Lambs Road, south of Woodbury Glassboro Road in Mantua Township. The proposed Mantua Boulevard Station is anticipated to be located within the Conrail right-of-way, north of the grade crossing at Mantua Boulevard. The proposed station designs will be refined during preliminary engineering. For further information, refer to Section 1.4.3, "Stations."

**Comment 9:** Residents of Wenonah do not want a station in our community. I believe that the Wenonah Station should be moved to an alternate location. (Guilfooy) (A16)

**Response:** Comment noted. The DEIS includes an analysis of the 13 New Stations Alternative, which comprises the proposed GCL without the Wenonah Station; this alternative would only partially meet the purpose and need of the proposed GCL.

**Comment 10:** Why are large parking facilities proposed at stations with low ridership? (Henjes)

**Response:** Demand for new parking was developed using results of the STOPS Model. The model considered both unconstrained and constrained parking scenarios in order to estimate boardings and alightings by mode at each station. Proposed parking facilities were sized by using the number of passenger vehicle trips at each station. Refer to Attachment 5, "Traffic Analysis Technical Report," for further information.

**Comment 11:** The GCL should have a stop in Pitman. (Brewer)

**Response:** As presented in the DEIS, there is a proposed Pitman Station located north of Pitman Avenue and adjacent to Broadway in Pitman Borough. Refer to Section 2.3.2.2, "Station Areas," for additional information.

**Comment 12:** Mantua and other towns along the rail line are refusing to allow train stops in their towns. (Rhodes)

**Response:** Comment noted. As described in the 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study, a series of Station Area Planning meetings were hosted by the GCL Project Team and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA)/Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) agency staff at each of the municipalities in which a proposed station was planned. During these meetings, the GCL Project Team engaged the public and local government officials to refine station locations for each municipality.

Refer to Section 2.3.2.2, "Station Areas," for additional information on station locations. The full 2009 Southern New Jersey to Philadelphia Mass Transit Expansion Alternative Analysis Study is available on the project website at: <http://glassborocamdenline.com/>. All future project updates, information, and documents will be published on the project website as it becomes available.

**Comment 13:** Why does Wenonah have the option to decline a station? (Westville Env. Comm.)

**Response:** The proposed GCL includes a station at Wenonah. The DEIS includes an analysis of the 13 New Stations Alternative, which comprises the proposed GCL without the Wenonah Station; this alternative would only partially meet the purpose and need of the proposed GCL.

**Comment 14:** The Rowan University and Glassboro Stations do not serve Rowan University well. The proposed GCL should utilize Whitney Avenue to better serve Rowan University. (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Beginning in 2009, a series of Station Area Planning meetings were hosted by the GCL Project Team and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA)/Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) agency staff at each of the municipalities in which a proposed station was planned. During these meetings, the GCL Project Team engaged the public and local government officials to refine station locations for each municipality. Major stakeholders in the region, including Rowan University, have been engaged in the refinement of the GCL design and station locations. In refining the proposed GCL, the GCL Project Team also looked at alternative alignments through Glassboro and determined that the current alignment would best serve Rowan University and its surrounding community. Refer to Section 1.4.3, "Stations" for a description of the stations proposed.

**Comment 15:** The location of the proposed Sewell Station is not a good place to have a train station. (Krimmel)

**Response:** The GCL Project Team reviewed development potential within the vicinity of the proposed Sewell Station using Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) projections (forecast year 2045) and transit-oriented development estimates developed through a review of existing vacant or underutilized properties. For Mantua Township, DVRPC municipal-wide projections indicate 57.4 percent growth in employment and 44.3 percent growth in population. Further, transit-oriented development estimates completed as part of this effort indicated several transit-oriented development eligible properties located near the Sewell Station. See Section 3.3.2.2, "Station Areas," for a description of Sewell Station.



### 3.2.11 Property Values

**Comment 1:** The proposed GCL would decrease property values. How will residents be compensated for a drop in property value? (Alicia) (Ancona) (Andrews) (Bauer) (Bechta) (Beck) (Bennett) (Biedron) (Boddy) (Campbell, L) (Campbell, R) (Carlin, L & M) (Carlin, M) (Cooper, D) (Daneker) (DeMasi) (Dobbins) (Duffy, J) (Ferrelli, L) (Ferrelli, W) (Hamilton, L) (Hamilton, M) (Hanstein) (Janda) (Johnson, D) (Josh) (Kinmonth) (Krumanocker) (Lahey, B) (Lahey, M) (Lawton) (Ludwig, A) (Machulsky) (Macris) (Meil) (Midgett) (Miller, A) (Milward) (Noverati, R) (Phelan, A) (Pomilio) (Reebenaker) (Rizzo) (Robinson, K) (Rodriguez, O) (Salvatore) (Speak) (Snow) (Taylor, L) (Toal) (Whiteway) (A11) (A12) (A19)

**Response:** The proposed GCL includes provisions for the acquisition of properties which would be directly impacted by the implementation of the project. Indirect impacts to properties beyond those directly affected by the GCL (beyond the proposed Limit of Disturbance) are not considered, and are beyond the scope of the DEIS. For further details on properties that would be acquired as part of the GCL, refer to Attachment 12, "Acquisitions and Displacements Report."

**Comment 2:** In general, property values tend to rise with the introduction of new transit services. The GCL Project Team should analyze the effect of the River LINE on property values. (Schwartz, B)

**Response:** Comment noted. A comprehensive property value analysis is beyond the scope of the proposed project.

### 3.2.12 Resilience

**Comment 1:** I am concerned about flooding being exacerbated by the proposed GCL. Is flooding at rail crossings considered? The grade-separated crossing over US 130 at Brooklawn Circles should be raised in order to avoid frequent flooding. (Ilisco) (Lucci) (Storms) (Taylor, J)

**Response:** Comment noted. The proposed GCL would be designed to avoid or minimize flood risk to the proposed GCL infrastructure and so as not to exacerbate existing flood conditions in the vicinity of the proposed GCL. The GCL would primarily utilize the existing rail corridor, minimizing land disturbance and the amount of impervious surfaces.

**Comment 2:** Permeable paving should be used in the construction of the parking lot in Westville. (Storms)

**Response:** Comment noted. The proposed GCL would be designed to avoid or minimize flood risk. The GCL would primarily utilize the existing rail corridor, minimizing land disturbance and the amount of impervious surfaces. Construction materials and further design refinements will be finalized in the preliminary engineering phase of the project.

**3.2.13 Miscellaneous**

**Comment 1:** New Jersey's political players consistently invest money in projects that do not see a return and do not face consequences for their illegal actions. (Rhodes)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 2:** I would like the proposed GCL to guarantee job opportunities for people of color. (Harvey Jr.)

**Response:** The construction phase of the proposed GCL is projected to support full-time equivalent construction and ancillary employment of approximately 15,560 jobs. The operation and maintenance expenditures are projected to support total annual employment of approximately 651 jobs related to the operations of the GCL. Refer to Section 3.4.3.3, "Economic Output, Job Creation, and Income" for additional information pertaining to the total economic effect of the GCL with regard to construction, operation, and maintenance. Both New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA), the current project sponsor, are equal opportunity employers.

**Comment 3:** I would like to see engineering drawings for the proposed project. (Lahey, B)

**Response:** Project designs and drawings will be developed and published as appropriate during the preliminary engineering phase of the proposed project. Refer to Section 1.4, "GCL Project Description," for further information and conceptual graphics depicting the proposed GCL.

**Comment 4:** Please advertise the proposed GCL project on Philly News. (Offner)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 5:** This needs to be presented on a voting ballot; the public is not informed about the project. (DeGirolamo) (Dobbins) (Giberson) (Glassmire) (Lucci) (Nicky G) (Phelan, A) (Snow) (Streater)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 6:** New Jersey has the worst business climate, and people want to leave. DRPA and NJ TRANSIT are both poorly run, corrupt agencies supported by New Jersey politicians. Many businesses are either leaving the cities along the proposed line or are transitioning to remote work. (Rhodes)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 7:** I do not like the name "Glassboro-Camden Line." (Tinkham)

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 8:** Property owners may be impacted by the incidents (e.g., train fire) on the Camden-Trenton Light Rail. I am concerned about the safety record of New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit). (Lacina)

**Response:** Comment noted.