

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
The intersection needs to be addressed. I also feel that the current ramp to Route 24 East from Eastbound Columbia Turnpike is easy to miss based on where it is place. This plan addresses that issue.			
			Thanks for asking for feedback
i think the changes will provide a safer way of turning left onto Park Avenue after exiting Rt 24			
The video mentioned a tough merge off of 24 south to park south via columbia. The proposal is going to create the same tough merge from columbia east to park south in order to get onto the new 24 entrance. The proposal is also going to cause unnecessary traffic through two residential streets off of park as cut throughs (being Prescott and Punch Bowl.) This project also would require eminent domain use and wasted tax money to repair a minimal delay in traffic flow.			
Cut through traffic will be further reviewed and any property acquisitions will be determined during the design phase. The municipalities in the study area have identified this interchange as being problematic and a safety concern.			
	What is projected wait time at new park ave off ramp	le will cars still be backing up on to 24	
	The estimated wait time for traffic at the Park Avenue off-ramp is 142.2 seconds (2 minutes 22 seconds) during the AM peak hour, and 121.4 seconds 2 minutes 1 second during the PM peak hour). This information is in Appendix J Traffic Volumes.	Traffic is not expected to back up onto NJ 24 eastbound from the Park Avenue off-ramp during the AM peak hour. The off-ramp would be long enough and have the capacity for the traffic exiting NJ 24.	
	Is there any way to minimize the island on Park Avenue Southbound to extend what looks like a 3rd lane leading to the turn lanes of the proposed new ramp to Rt 24 Eastbound. If there are too many cars turning left, the 2 lanes at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Ave Southbound might get clogged and not allow cars going past the proposed ramp to get through.	Since all this work is being done on this intersection, any thought on fixing the long wait times to turn left from Park Ave Southbound onto Columbia Turnpike Westbound? Sometimes you need to wait through 2-3 cycles of red/green lights before being able to make that left turn, especially during rush hour, primarily because the existing turn lane is very short. If this lane was lengthened, where cars could get into that lane sooner, that would help alleviate the wait time.	
	Yes, extending the lane is something that will be reviewed during design.	The signal timing and turning lane length will be reviewed during the design.	
			Beneficial to Madison residents
It doesn't go far enough. While we need assistance on Park/Columbia, the approval of the Marriott Hotel with a left turn off Park is thoughtless. Somehow that should be tied together w/ the roads planned around the Sherman/Wells office building. A left off Park with all the traffic will continue existing problems. There should be a light at minimum.	Why is there no light provided for access to the Marriott?	Can't you get access to the Marriott arranged through "the back"?	Will the light at Punchbowl and Park be tied into the light schedule at Park and Columbia?
	The AC Hotel (Mariott) is not expected to be built.	NJDOT does not allow driveway connections to highway ramps.	The signals are currently tied together and will remain coordinated with the proposed improvements.

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>Addresses the problem of southbound on park ave, but eliminates a highly efficient entrance (eastbound Columbia to eastbound 24). Would be better to add an intersection further south on park ave.</p> <p>The Campus Drive connection to NJ 24 was reviewed as part of this study. See Alternative 4 on Page 19 of the Report. There are several significant disadvantages to this alternative and it was not supported by NJDOT.</p>			
<p>Very dangerous intersection, I have many times had close calls from drivers exiting from Rt 24 and trying to get in the left turn lanes on Columbia Tpk to get onto Park Ave</p>	<p>What is the timeframe for the project?</p> <p>The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.</p>	<p>Will my taxes go up?</p> <p>The funding source for design and construction is not known at this time.</p>	
			<p>Please at least give an estimate of the timeline, costs, and tax impact</p> <p>The estimated cost is \$12 million. The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.</p>
<p>I use this intersection often in two directions: Take CR 510 through the intersection from Morristown to Florham Park and back - this seems to be not being affected much by the redesign. Take CR 510 and continue to South bound Rt 24 - this seems to be a major impact to possibly heaviest traveled direction of this intersection through entire day, not only rush hours - instead of one traffic light with straight intersection crossing, people traveling East CR 510 to South Rt 24 will have to pass two traffic lights with one right turn and one left turn. This severely impacts all local residents traveling back and forth from South-East Rt 24 to Morristown.</p>	<p>I watched a video and there is absolutely no consideration given for traffic going CR 520 to/from Rt 24 - why is that not being discussed?</p> <p>The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between NJ 24 eastbound Exit 2A to Columbia Turnpike (510) westbound and the Columbia Turnpike (510) intersection with Park Avenue, along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection.</p>		
			<p>This proposal has major impact on local residents in favor of people traveling only during rash hours, which is wrong.</p>
<p>Too much traffic will be pushed off columbia to get to 24 by and through an existing neighborhood. The current east bound on ramp should stay. Alternatively, why isnt traffic being pushed to the business complexes via campus drive - where the cars are heading anyway.</p> <p>The Campus Drive connection to NJ 24 was reviewed as part of this study. See Alternative 4 on Page 19 of the Report. There are several significant disadvantages to this alternative and it was not supported by NJDOT.</p>			

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>I think the new design will help solve a serious problem at Columbia Turnpike West bound and Park Ave. However, I am concerned about traffic traveling west on Columbia Turnpike and trying to enter 24 East. The merge lane between vehicles entering 24 east and vehicles exiting 24 east to get on Columbia Turnpike East is not good and the new design will increase traffic. I think the entrance from Columbia Turnpike East to 24 East should be closed. Vehicles should be directed to make a left at Park Ave and then make a left at the new T intersection to join 24 East. Will add a few minutes to travel time, but will be much safer. With this change, I would be very supportive of the project.</p>	<p>Please see my comment</p>		
<p>Consideration to be taken during Preliminary/Final Design</p>			
			<p>See my comment above. I believe the current design solves a problem on Columbia Turnpike, but creates a serious safety issue on 24 East</p>
<p>I am concerned about traffic that exits 24 East onto Columbia Tpk that meets existing traffic on Columbia Tpk. that wants to make a right turn onto Park Ave. Will there be a Yield sign posted and how will the lanes be marked?</p>	<p>Will there be a Yield sign posted for traffic that exits Rt. 24 East at Columbia Tpk?</p>	<p>Will a right turn only lane for Park Ave. exist on westbound Columbia Tpk ?</p>	
<p>Yes, the ramp will be controlled by a Yield.</p>		<p>Yes, the lane will remain.</p>	
<p>There is way too much traffic on the on and off ramps on Rt 24 Florham Park. Every morning people have to wait an hour or more (when there wasn't covid issues) to get past Florham Park. Insane amount of waiting every day. Makes people let for airport, etc.</p>			
<p>The improvements identified in this report would help reduce the delay on the ramps.</p>			
			<p>There is way too much traffic on the on and off ramps on Rt 24 Florham Park. Every morning people have to wait an hour or more (when there wasn't covid issues) to get past Florham Park. Insane amount of waiting every day. Makes people let for airport, etc.</p>
<p>It's a good idea as crossing 3 lanes of heavy traffic to make a left turn on Park Avenue from Columbia Turnpike after exiting Route 24 is very difficult.</p>			

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>Agree on the reasons to construct a new ramp but the video is very confusing. Be human and stop talking like a robot. Know your audience is New Jerseyans and we understand Exit numbers. Talk to us in simple terms as if you are giving new directions to someone driving from Rt 24 or someone driving from Morristown on Columbia Tpk. Focus on change management principles - what is changing and NOT changing for the driver? If I am driving from NYC on Rt 78 and then 24 west, do I still have exits 2A Towards Morristown and 2B towards Florham Park? If driving from 24 East, Which exit number is being eliminated and what's the new one? Is there going to be a new Exit 2C? If driving from Morristown on Columbia tpk, we pass Bayer Pharma on left, then how do I get on Rt 24 East with new ramp.. do I have to turn on Park ave and then take the new ramp? If so, this will be a total disaster and inconvenient. If I'm driving from Florham park on Columbia tpk, can I still make the left on Park ave?</p>	<p>Why is the video confusing?</p>	<p>What is changing for the driver?</p>	<p>Which exit numbers from 24 East or west are being eliminated?</p>
		<p>There will no longer be access to Route 24 eastbound from Columbia Turnpike eastbound. Access will be relocated to the proposed Park Avenue ramp. Access to Columbia Turnpike from Route 24 eastbound remains with added direct connection to both Columbia eastbound and Park Avenue.</p>	<p>There will be no change to the exit numbers on Route 24 eastbound or westbound. However, traffic using Exit 2A to Columbia Turnpike westbound will no longer be able make a left on to Park Avenue south. Instead, drivers will use Exit 2B to access Park Avenue south of Columbia Turnpike. The on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike eastbound to Route 24 eastbound would be eliminated; drivers would access Route 24 eastbound from the new on-ramp on Park Avenue.</p>
	<p>What is the new proposed exit number and where will it take us?</p>	<p>What is changing and not changing from Columbia turnpike (not rt 24)?</p>	<p>Great job but it needs work.</p>
	<p>There are no new exits from NJ 24. Exit 2A will remain, but vehicles will no longer be able to turn left (south) onto Park Avenue after using Exit 2A. Drivers will have to use Exit 2B to reach Park Avenue south of Columbia Turnpike. Exit 2B will be modified to connect to Park Avenue. Exit 2B's connection to Columbia Turnpike eastbound will remain.</p>	<p>The entrance from Columbia Turnpike eastbound to NJ 24 eastbound will be eliminated. Drivers on Columbia Turnpike eastbound will instead have to turn right onto Park Avenue to access the NJ 24 eastbound on-ramp. There are no changes to NJ 24 access from Columbia Turnpike westbound.</p>	
<p>With concerns Columbia Park residents need to be able to make a left turn out of the main Entrance at Columbia Rd. as well as a left turn out of the other entrance on Prescott</p>	<p>Are there any plans to alter the inflow and out flow of traffic for Columbia Park Townhomes from either current established entrances?</p>		
<p>The improvements would have little effect on the Columbia Road entrance. Left turns in and out of the Prescott Road entrance will continue to not be allowed.</p>	<p>The driveway to the Columbia Park Townhomes was designed with this project in mind. There are no plans to alter the driveway or the movement of traffic in or out of the Townhomes property.</p>		
<p>looks great esp w all the corporate traffic there</p>	<p>looks good except for 1 thing.. if I'm coming from lets say Trader joe in florham park headed past the airport to park ave and need to make a left .. either to go to the hotel there or even to head toward punchbowl road area... how would i do it if there will NOTbe a left turn at the park ave and columbia tpke intersection???</p>		

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	<p>The left onto Park Aveune is still permitted when traveling Columbia Turnpike westbound from Florham Park. The modifications will only make the turn inaccessible for vehicles exiting Route 24 Eastbound at exit 2A.</p>		
<p>Long overdue. Columbia has been hazardous for years and years as I drive Columbia westbound daily and face the hazard from the weaving traffic. I wonder why you wouldn't just eliminate that exit from 24 East have have the cars take the new exit ramp onto Park.</p> <p>Exit 2A is useful and more direct for drivers heading west on Columbia Turnpike towards Morristown, or heading north on Park Avenue. If Exit 2A was closed, it would unnecessarily concentrate traffic on one off-ramp and at the new Park Avenue intersection.</p>	<p>I wonder why you wouldn't just eliminate that old exit from 24 East have have the cars take the new exit ramp onto Park. They can do right and proceed to the Columbia traffic light and go left or straight.</p> <p>Exit 2A is useful and more direct for drivers heading west on Columbia Turnpike towards Morristown, or heading north on Park Avenue. If Exit 2A was closed, it would unnecessarily concentrate traffic on one off-ramp and at the new Park Avenue intersection.</p>		
<p>A very sensible idea, the risk of collision is so high, I rarely use the exit on R24, because invariably I have to turn left.</p>			
			<p>The obvious questions are timeline, ecology etc.</p> <p>The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction. The environmental screening report provides an overview of the environmental conditons. It is presented in Appendix L and summarized on pages 14-16 of the Concept Development Report. The environmental impact and any needed mitigations would be studied in detail in the design phase.</p>
<p>The concept is correct but I am concerned about the extra traffic flow that will be crossing in the combined acell/decell lane on Rte 24 EB. That is already very dangerous. Also, the division of Columbia Tpke WB with a concrete island will only add to the confusion of an already tricky intersection. I foresee many intentional and unintentional illegal dangerous turns from confused or impatient motorists.</p> <p>These concerns will be reviewed during the design phase and discussed with all agencies involved to ensure the changes are safe when implemented.</p>			
	<p>What is the environmental impact?</p>	<p>How long is the estimate that this redesign will be sufficient. In order words, will this be sufficient for many years and should handle increased demand for at least 10 years, etc.</p>	<p>Were other designs considered? Traffic Circle, Diverging Diamond, etc.</p>

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	The environmental screening report provides an overview of the environmental conditions. It is presented in Appendix L and summarized on pages 14-16 of the Concept Development Report. The environmental impact and any needed mitigations would be studied in detail in the design phase.	The demand will be projected out 20 years during design, and it was projected out 20 years during concept development.	Many alternative designs were considered and vetted through meetings with municipal officials from the project area before they were studied in detail. See Page 16 of the report and Appendices M and S.
	Will signals include detection for emergency vehicles (Florham Park First Aid frequents this intersection en route to hospital).		please include emergency vehicle detection
	It would be the municipality's decision to have the signal pre-emption installed as part of this project.		
			Excellent presentation.
Since most of the traffic associated with entering/exiting Columbia Tpk is for people who work at Campus Drive, NY Jets and locations towards the Madison side of Park Ave, why isn't there a consideration for creating an exit off of 24 directly into the back of the Campus Drive street/location? The exit off of 24 to Campus Drive would eliminate traffic both on Park Ave and Columbia Tpk and make it simpler for people to get to and from the offices. It would also be way safer and would help alleviate a lot of the wear and tear that Columbia and Park Ave receive.			
	The Campus Drive connection to NJ 24 was reviewed as part of this study. See Alternative 4 on Page 19 of the Report. There are several significant disadvantages to this alternative and it was not supported by NJDOT.		Please see above.
For the most part I believe but am not so sure that I agree with removing the current ramp to Rt. 24 EB.			
	The proposed NJ 24 eastbound off-ramp connection to Park Avenue would cut-off the current NJ 24 eastbound on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike eastbound. Therefore the ramp must be moved to Park Avenue for this configuration to function.		
Still unclear as to the time frame and the effected traffic congestion. I do feel that it is a dangerous intersection and it would be an improvement.	How long will the streets be closed?	Will all the traffic have to be diverted to neighborhoods ?	Will the other ramp to Florham Park still be open?
The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction. Page 21, Alternative 3 of the Report provides a summary of the impact the changes would have on traffic.	Traffic impacts and any detours will be identified and carefully planned for during the design phase.	Traffic impacts and any detours will be identified and carefully planned for during the design phase.	Exit 2B to Columbia Turnpike eastbound will not be changed.
There are workers on bicycles and on foot; there soon will be many more residents and workers. How does anyone NOT driving navigate safely?	Pedestrians	People on bicycles	Responsive technology based on presence of VRU

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>This was not part of NJDOT's scope of work for this study. The purpose of this concept development project is to develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the NJ 24 eastbound Exit 2A ramp and the Columbia Turnpike intersection with Park Avenue, along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection.</p>			<p>The inclusion of responsive technology will be considered in the design phase.</p> <p>This whole area should work for people.</p>
<p>I am inconvenienced if I have to make a right turn onto park avenue to go eastbound onto route 24.</p>			
<p>My concern is only that when I exit Rt 24 WB onto Columbia Turnpike WB on my way to Park Ave SB (to come home), I will now potentially get stopped at two traffic lights (one more than currently): one at the Columbia Turnpike/Park Ave intersection and then again on Park Ave and the new ramp to 24. What effect will this have on traffic and the time stopped?</p>	<p>See comment above.</p>		
<p>The current intersection is very hard to negotiate.</p>			
<p>I strongly disagree with the idea of removing the existing Columbia Turnpike 24 Eastbound on-ramp. I don't understand why removing this particular on-ramp will help divert traffic when it is the off-ramp that is causing weaving and traffic and accidents. I personally think that the decision to remove the 24 Eastbound on-ramp from Columbia turnpike and moving it to Park Ave is a poor decision that probably will result in more weaving on Park Avenue and new traffic delays as people trying to get onto the 24 will now cause back-up (and lines in the left-turn lanes, which I am assuming are not that long). For instance, if I am using the proposed, new Columbia Turnpike 24 Eastbound on-ramp, I will have to use the right turn lanes from Columbia Turnpike to get onto Park Avenue. However, I now must go across 2 other lanes to get to the two left turn lanes, which I am sure will get backed up during rush-hour traffic, to get onto the 24 - therefore, causing me to weave on Park Ave. More people will now be competing to get into the left turn lanes in the morning to get to the 24 eastbound on-ramp. Please consider how these proposed ideas for reducing delays from the off-ramp would now affect those who are trying to use the on-ramp. I kind of worry that you will now move the problem with this intersection to Park Ave, where residents and commuters are going to have to be weaving/competing to get to the left turn lanes of the 24 eastbound on-ramp. I don't see</p>	<p>Will residents and commuters have to weave from the proposed two right turn lanes from Columbia Turnpike to get to the 24 eastbound on-ramp?</p> <p>The Columbia Turnpike eastbound approach to the intersection would include 2 signalized right turn lanes. Drivers would no longer be permitted to turn right on red onto Park Avenue southbound.</p>	<p>Do you predict that there will be delays/back-up caused by residents and commuters trying to get into the new left-turn lanes to get onto the new eastbound 24 on-ramp?</p> <p>The study reports that the intersection design and signal timing would be sufficient so that backups are not expected.</p>	<p>Would it be possible to merge the existing 24 eastbound on-ramp with the proposed new 24 eastbound on-ramp from Park Ave?</p> <p>The proposed NJ 24 eastbound off-ramp connection to Park Avenue would cut-off the current NJ 24 eastbound on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike eastbound. The two movements of traffic would conflict, therefore the existing on-ramp has to be moved to Park Avenue.</p>

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>have to be weaving/competing to get to the left turn lanes of the 24 eastbound on-ramp. I don't see how this is any different than the current problem we have now with the off-ramp. I think this may even cause more problems. Why can't we keep the Eastbound 24 on-ramp and merge it with this new proposed on-ramp instead of getting rid of the Eastbound 24 on-ramp all together, which I have never observed to EVER get back up during rush-hour times and I have lived here for 22 years. It is one of the most effective on-ramps I've ever been on, and I've lived in Los Angeles, California where traffic is awful and on-ramps and merging is awful. That Columbia turnpike on-ramp for the 24 (east-bound) is a totally fine on-ramp. Why is there a need to get rid of that on-ramp when it is not even causing traffic delays? I totally understand the need to prevent weaving on the off-ramp because that I have seen over the course of 22 years always cause problems. But the on-ramp, however, - I have never seen such problems. I hope you seriously consider my comments here as I know many other neighbors in this area would also feel the same way as I do. I think you will be creating more problems moving that on-ramp to Park Ave. If you decide to move forward with the new Park Ave on-ramp - why not have it merge together with the existing on-ramp on Columbia Turnpike? I truly worry that this is going to create delays. Based on the graphics/data shown in the Youtube video, I did not see much evidence to support the need for a new 24 eastbound on-ramp. Are there really delays that require a new structure? I would feel better about this new on-ramp if there was more discussion about why there needs to be a new on-ramp. I totally get why there needs to be a new off-ramp, but the new on-ramp for 24 east bound is my main concern as a commuter and resident who uses this on-ramp multiple times a day.</p>	<p>Why is it necessary to move the entrance of the existing 24 eastbound on-ramp when your proposed data shows no observed delays for entering the eastbound on-ramp? I worry that this is going to create a whole other traffic problem at this new Park Ave intersection..</p>		<p>Is it also possible to just have an exit from the 24 in the new proposed plan onto Park Ave and not have a new entrance onto the 24 east bound from Park Ave? That way we do not create more problems/traffic/accidents/delays for those trying to enter the 24 east-bound on-ramp.</p>
	<p>The proposed NJ 24 eastbound off-ramp connection to Park Avenue would cut-off the current NJ 24 eastbound on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike eastbound. The two movements of traffic would conflict, therefore the existing on-ramp has to be moved to Park Avenue.</p>		<p>The proposed NJ 24 eastbound off-ramp connection to Park Avenue would cut-off the current NJ 24 eastbound on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike eastbound. The two movements of traffic would conflict, therefore the existing on-ramp has to be moved to Park Avenue.</p>
<p>I will fight it to the end</p>	<p>Why is there no proposal for an exit ramp off of 24 DIRECTLY into the Florham Park Green complex (Jets facility, Summit medical building)?</p>	<p>Hasn't anyone considered that if an exit was formed off of 24 directly into the Florham Park Green that it would virtually eliminate ALL of the current traffic issues on Columbia and Park Ave</p>	<p>Does anyone realize that if a ramp was built off of 24 directly into the Florham Park Green complex the construction would be less debilitating because it is all marsh land where nobody lives RATHER than the current proposal which will disrupt traffic patterns for years until it's completion? Creating even more traffic jams and accidents</p>
	<p>NJDOT does not allow highway ramp connections into private property, therefore this is not a viable option.</p>	<p>NJDOT does not allow highway ramp connections into private property, therefore this is not a viable option.</p>	<p>NJDOT does not allow highway ramp connections into private property, therefore this is not a viable option.</p>
	<p>WHY IS THERE NO RAMP OFF OF 24 directly into THE FLORHAM PARK GREEN COMPLEX?????</p>		

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	NJDOT does not allow highway ramp connections into private property, therefore this is not a viable option.		
Yes however why is the other proposal from years ago not being considered? Traffic will still be highly congested. The other proposal placed the traffic in the old Exxon complex (BASF & Jets complex). Too much traffic will still be on Park Avenue. Lights will back up the highway causing accidents.	Why not further down near Old Exxon property/Jets area?	Potential Traffic backup on Rt 24 would cause accidents and lights on Park Ave will still be terrible, what will the traffic light flow be?	
	NJDOT does not allow highway ramp connections into private property, therefore this is not a viable option.	The length of the proposed NJ 24 Eastbound off ramp is adequate for vehicle stacking, and traffic is not expected to back up on to NJ 24.	
			Definitely needed but should be down further to At least minimize traffic on Park Ave
			The study found that there are no other viable locations to connect to Park Avenue.
It should of been done along time ago			
No need for the island. Too complex	Cost	What are alternative plans	Timeframe
The island is needed to prevent the lane crossover traffic that this project is intended to address.	The estimated cost is \$12 million.	Many alternative designs were considered and vetted through meetings with municipal officials from the project area before they were studied in detail. See Page 16 of the report and Appendicies M and S.	The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.
	Time of project		Need to consider other options
	Alt text: The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.		Many alternative designs were considered and vetted through meetings with municipal officials from the project area before they were studied in detail. See Page 16 of the report and Appendicies M and S.
I appreciate that you are addressing the suicide-merge from southbound 24, but I am very concerned about the lack of the ability to turn left from Columbia Turnpike to southbound Park Avenue. How are folks coming off Hwy 24 northbound and folks coming over from Florham Park supposed to turn left? Since the cloverleaf works for all the other directions, why not just make a new exit for southbound 24 onto Park Ave just northwest of the cloverleaf? Or do the exit in your proposal in but don't close the left-turn lane on Columbia to southbound Park?	How do folks from Florham Park or NB Hwy 24 turn southbound to Park Ave?		
There would be no change for drivers coming from Florham Park (on Columbia Tpke westbound) or drivers on NJ 24 westbound.	There would be no change for drivers coming from Florham Park (on Columbia Tpke westbound) or drivers on NJ 24 westbound.		
I also think it is critical that an exchange from 24 be built somewhere in Madison so that there isn't over 5 miles of road without an ability to get off or on. It would alleviate traffic in either end of 24.			

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>NJDOT explored many options and the preferred alternative was the only viable option. Many alternative designs were considered and vetted through meetings with municipal officials from the project area before they were studied in detail. See Page 16 of the report and Appendices M and S.</p>			
<p>Backups resulting from an additional light cycle on park avenue will impact PM traffic flow. The ramp from Columbia Tpke to 24E should continue to exist as having traffic turn right to make a left onto 24 makes no sense.</p>	<p>Was a traffic study conducted for PM traffic flow- both for cars coming down Columbia Tpke and turning to 24E, which will now need to turn into Park Ave?</p>	<p>Was a traffic study conducted for PM traffic on Park Ave westbound which already backs up to Punch Bowl Rd?</p>	
<p>The drivers heading to Park Avenue via 24 eastbound will use Exit 2B instead of 2A in the new design.</p>	<p>Yes, the entire intersection was studied including traffic coming from all directions.</p>	<p>Yes, Park Avenue was included in the study.</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">It looks like a great plan.</p>			
<p>I am in support of this however I have some concerns. The shift of traffic on Route 24 East is going to affect the current on-ramp from Columbia Turnpike West to Route 24 East. It is already difficult to merge into 24 East traffic as you have to navigate people exiting to the ramp from Route 24 East to Columbia Turnpike East. There is only a 200 foot, at best, entrance/exit lane. It basically spans the bridge for Columbia Turnpike. You will be moving an accident prone intersection from one area to another. This probably being more hazardous as tractor trailers and other large vehicles are traveling at a higher rate of speed than on Columbia Turnpike. Additionally, the ramp from Columbia Turnpike West to Route 24 East constantly has water draining from the marsh area onto the ramp creating an icing condition everyday from mid-November until March. Drainage needs to be added on the west side of the ramp where the ramp starts to alleviate this icing condition.</p>	<p>This plan will greatly impact traffic from Columbia Turnpike West onto Route 24 East. What will be done to alleviate an already hard merge during high traffic times. The new design will make this even more difficult.</p>	<p>Is this a NJDOT or Morris County initiated project? If a NJDOT project why is the funding falling on local and county government?</p>	<p>What ramp closure impact will this construction have and for how long? Specifically Columbia Turnpike East to Route 24 East and to Columbia Turnpike West to Route 24 East.</p>
<p>This would be reviewed during design.</p>	<p>There is no change to this movement. Any issues that currently exist will be vetted during design.</p>		<p>This will be determined during preliminary and final design.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Please feel free to contact me to discuss this further. Thank you</p>			
<p>I think I am supportive however i have concerns as listed above. I feel Prescott rd and Delaware rd may need a light or revisited.</p>	<p>I wonder how necessary this will be if covid work place changes continue long term. Are the companies around here going to be returning to full volume? Was this study take pre covid?</p>		
<p>This would be reviewed during design.</p>	<p>The traffic data was recorded before the pandemic. New traffic counts would be taken during the design phase.</p>		
<p>I think the having to make a left on Park avenue will further delay traffic on Park Ave, which is already a nightmare.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">What needs to be fixed is the rt 24 west to rt 287 north exit, That backs up a mile. Talk about dangerous!!!</p>		

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
			This was not part of the scope of work for this concept development study.
Is Morris County paying for this?			
There is no reason to change it. Spend that money somewhere else.			
Removing the 24E ramp that currently exists will lengthen my commute time since I will now have to drive straight through Columbia turnpike and sit at an additional light to get onto the new ramp. The change to 24W and ramp and including the barrier on Columbia turnpike sound like a needed change for safety and decrease in traffic.			
Looks like a good fix to me. You can't fix stupid and the drivers today will prove that statement true. Good luck!			
			I am very glad to be retired. Try it. You'll love it.
I am concerned about the timeline and the inconvenience and traffic it will cause while being built.	What effect is this going to have on the traffic in Madison?		
The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.	The preferred alternative does not include changes to roads in Madison and no traffic impact to Madison is anticipated.		
			It doesn't matter. It will be done no matter what.
In no way shape or form are we addressing the issue of trying to enter into 24 east where we will now have more traffic pushing against the already dangerous/tight merge. And that is just one of many issues to address, including what type of traffic this will push to local back roads with the closure of the ramp directly into Columbia. Local residents are going to use these roads to avoid the extra time it would take to exit and sit at 2 lights where they used to encounter none to get onto Columbia. Oh and curb will do nothing to prevent people from driving over it, I've seen it.			
			See previous comments
I'm concerned about the cost and the addition of yet another traffic light on Park Ave when this intersection has been like this since they completed Route 24.	Before deciding, how much will it cost?		
	The estimated cost is \$12 million.		
			It's irresponsible to present this with no budget to show.

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
			The budget in the report shows Alternative 3's construction cost at \$6.3 million. We are estimating that with permits, right-of-way acquisition, and design that the project will cost \$12 million.
<p>This intersection has always been a problem, but lately getting worse, with the local development going on. I'm glad something is being done to address it.</p> <p>The existing ramp to get onto Route 24 should not be removed. It may cause too much traffic turning onto Park Ave south, then waiting at a light and then making a left hand turn behind the hotel to get onto route 24</p>			
<p>I works.</p>	<p>if moves smoothly what is the initiation date of construction?</p>	<p>how long will the intersection be disrupted?</p>	<p>will there be suggested alternate routes?</p>
	<p>The earliest the project could be ready for construction is 2025, however funding is not in place for design and construction.</p>	<p>Traffic impacts and their duration will be identified and carefully planned for during the design phase.</p>	<p>Traffic impacts and any detours will be identified and carefully planned for during the design phase.</p>
	<p>who is paying the bill for the land acquisition and build?</p>		
	<p>The funding source is not yet identified.</p>		
	<p>What will be the effect on traffic on Park Ave. NB arriving at Columbia Turnpike?</p>		
	<p>The project will reduce the amount of vehicles traveling through the Columbia Turnpike / Park Avenue intersection. Park Avenue northbound vehicles going to NJ 24 eastbound will not go through the intersection to access the on-ramp.</p>		
<p>As far as I can understand it. I have often reflected on the fact that leaving Route 24 to get to Columbia and then over to the left so I can make the left onto Park Avenue is very dangerous and very stressful. I marvel at the fact that I have never had an accident nor have I seen others in accidents. It to me was a crash just waiting to happen. Your new plan seems to take away this dangerous situation.</p>			<p>Thanks for explaining this with a video and the courtesy of asking the opinions of drivers who use this critical area.</p>
			<p>Looks like a good idea.</p>
<p>It seems to be overly complicating exiting from Columbia turnpike to 24 E adding time to that commute and overly increasing traffic on Park Ave</p>			

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
			<p>Please address the traffic and safety issues on rt 24 west where it ends at 287. There are accidents daily there.</p> <p>This is not part of the the scope of this project. NJ 24 and I-287 are within the NJDOT's jurisdiction.</p>
<p>This should also eliminate the traffic in the evening for people trying to get to RT 24 east from Park Ave.</p>			
<p>What a shame that poor planning by the state when constructing Rt 24 now results in taking land from owners. I say close down the exits from Rt 24 because nothing but crime comes from that roadway into our area.</p>			
<p>My support is based on this option or status quo. I am more supportive of the flyover concept that was also proposed. While that option is more costly it avoids forcing westbound Columbia Tpk traffic to use Park Ave to access RT 24 E. It just seems like creating a new problem while solving another. My yes vote is base on this being much better for those in Madison and along the Florham Park Park Ave. corridor. This certainly eliminates the crazy crossing of 3 lanes of traffic in 600' and eases the backup at Park Ave north and Columbia</p>			
<p>As long as there is a long campaign of information. And clear signs for routing.</p> <p>There would be a large public awareness campaign in advance of any construction, if this project advances.</p>			
<p>I support minimizing the current danger. However, even though I watched the video, I'm not certain of the true potential.</p>			
<p>What studies have been done as to how this will affect traffic northbound on Park Ave towards Columbia Tpk? Not during Covid, it can take over 30 minutes at times to go from Punchbowl to Columbia Tpk (about half a mile). This proposal looks like it will only make that worse.</p> <p>The data used in the traffic analysis is based on pre-covid traffic volumes and are presented in this report. Further traffic analysis will be conducted in the design phase.</p>	<p>What studies have been done during non-covid times for traffic on all affected streets in all directions?</p> <p>The data used in the traffic analysis is based on pre-covid traffic volumes and are presented in this report. Further traffic analysis will be conducted in the design phase.</p>		
<p>I commute to work from Hanover township to Florham Park through the various intersections and I think this will be an improvement.</p>			
<p>Changes seem reasonable</p>	<p>What is the environmental impact of proeject (e.g. the loss of the permeable ground, additional light, etc)?</p>	<p>What is the impact of a new light on Park ave?</p>	<p>Will the new light on Park ave be in sync with the main light intersection?</p>

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	The environmental screening report provides an overview of the environmental conditions. It is presented in Appendix L and summarized on pages 14-16 of the Report. The environmental impact and any needed mitigations would be studied in detail in the design phase.	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design.	The signal timing and synchronization will be reviewed during the design phase.
	How long is construction expected to take?	What is the expected impact to traffic while this is underway?	It was a good presentation, but important that enough relevant residents know about it.
	The length of construction will be estimated during the design.	Traffic impacts and any detours will be identified and carefully planned for during the design phase.	
As a resident of the Delaware/Arrowhead neighborhood, I strongly disagree with the current ramp design. We already deal with a large number of cars using our neighborhood as a cut through to Punch Bowl road, both directions. With the proposed ramp just outside our intersection it would greatly increase the traffic into our neighborhood. Another issue is that the design eliminates our ability to turn left from our neighborhood, onto Park Avenue.	What is your plan to reduce cut through traffic entering Delaware from Rt. 24 ramp?	What kind of barrier will be installed on Park Avenue.	How do I access Delaware from Park Avenue? Current plan only allows access heading Eastbound on Park, Entry to Delaware heading West has a proposed barrier in the way.
	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.	It will be determined during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.
	This proposal really reduces access to the Delaware/Arrowhead neighborhood, I hope some input will be requested from those residents.		This plan, in its current state, really looks to increase traffic drastically in the Delaware/Arrowhead neighborhood. I hope the input from residents can assist making these plans work for all.
	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.		
I'd like to get answers to my concerns about the residents in my neighborhood.....as described this seems to create multiple issues and challenges from our otherwise peaceful neighborhood with kids on bikes/walking/playing.	looks like new barrier plus light at intersection will mean it's not feasible to make a left turn out of Delaware onto Park or the new Route 24 entrance--- something we do frequently.	looks like there won't be the ability to make a left hand turn from Park Ave onto Delaware when heading westbound.	there may be increased challenges of making a safe right turn onto Park Ave since the traffic light will either be oncoming Park Ave traffic or oncoming 24 exit to Park Ave East..... When will it be safe for us to pull out on a non-signalized road?
	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.	It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.
	looks like a HIGH RISK of traffic increasing with people exiting 24 to use Delaware as a cut through to Punch Bowl (to avoid the light at intersection of Park and Punch Bowl)	Has anyone considered the impact to the 1 Delaware Road/Arrowhead neighborhood residents less than 20 yards from our road?	
		It will be reviewed during preliminary and final design. Public meetings will be held.	

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
<p>This proposal is completely inadequate to address the root causes of traffic congestion on Park Ave. All you are doing is pushing a major traffic volume issue a quarter of a mile farther south on Park Ave from Columbia Road intersection to a new poorly conceived T-intersection. There are two problems causing the traffic issues at the Columbia Rd/Park Ave intersection: the irresponsible growth Florham Park pursued along Park Ave that has contributed a massive volume of morning/evening commuters and the lack of interchanges on Rte 24 between Hanover Twp and Millburn. These problems affect traffic negatively all along 124 and Park Ave. A real solution to these problems would be for NJDOT to build a new traffic interchange in Florham Park next to the Jets training facility which would allow commuters to empty to an access road running parallel to 24 which connects the major corporate headquarters in that area as well as connecting to Florham Rd intersection with Park Ave (this intersection is in a commercial district unlike the current proposal which is predominantly residential). Furthermore, the NJDOT should finish Triborough Rd interchange or build another interchange near Spring Brook in Madison to allow the large volume of drivers traveling to Madison to exit 24 without clogging Park Ave or 124. Madison and Park Ave have successfully fought off traffic improvements along the Rte 24 corridor in the past (using racially charged rhetoric) while both towns developed in ways that predominantly spread negative traffic impacts to surrounding towns (particularly Hanover Twp, Morris Twp, and Chatham). It is time for NJDOT to recognize the real issues here and come back with a proposal that adequately smooths out traffic volume to Florham Park and Madison.</p>	<p>Why is NJDOT not looking at Rte 24 corridor traffic issues holistically to come up with solutions that will improve conditions along all of Park Ave and 124?</p>	<p>Why is a major intersection in a mixed residential/light commercial area preferable to a solution in a full commercial area?</p>	<p>Has NJDOT studied the locations that travelers using the Columbia Rd/Park Ave intersection are actually going?</p>
<p>Regardless of whether NJDOT supports or has the funds for constructing a new interchange, NJDOT will not make infrastructure changes in a municipality unless the municipality supports it. Zoning is controlled by municipalities.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of this study.</p>		<p>The overall destination was not required for the report.</p>
	<p>What influence has Madison and Florham Park had in the planning process and generally within the NJDOT that solution that involve traffic increases in these towns are consistently squashed?</p>		
<p>Currently, the proposal has the entire neighborhood of Delaware Road and Arrowhead Road only being able to make a right turn, out of the development, onto Park Ave. Therefore, anyone needing to go left, would need to exit through the back end of the development and make a left onto Punchbowl and then a left onto Park Ave. Which would not only be a longer drive, but now we would be stuck in all the traffic coming down Park Ave, needing to go onto Route 24. Our development should either be incorporated into the plans, so that we can still make a left turn, or you should move the ramp further down. This is ruining the atmosphere of the area.</p>	<p>Why is the Delaware Road development being negatively impacted by this and only forced to make a right turn onto Park Ave?</p>		

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	<p>The turn restriction will be reviewed further during the design phase.</p>		
	<p>What happens to Rt. 24 Westbound traffic exiting onto Columbia Tpke? If you want to make a left to Park Ave, how does that work?</p>		<p>The preferred alternative does not include any changes to the NJ 24 westbound off-ramps. Traffic from NJ 24 westbound will continue to be able to turn left onto Park Avenue from westbound Columbia Turnpike.</p>
	<p>My neighborhood currently exits Delaware rd onto park Ave by making a left to head towards the columbia/park ave light. If the ramp is placed in it's proposed location, there will be a teaffcnlight 50 ft from the Delaware rd intersection. When the light is green on park Ave it will be difficult to make a left due to regular park Ave traffic, and when it is green the other way the traffic from 24 will be exiting and make it again impossible to make a left. How are all 30 of us neighbors supposed to exit our development safely and in a reasonable timeframe?</p>		<p>The turn restriction will be reviewed futher during the design phase. Drivers on Delaware Avenue will continue to be able to acess Punch Bowl Road to turn left onto Park Avenue northbound.</p>
<p>widen columbia turnpike to park ave north turn as well</p>			<p>Environmental constraints prevent the widening of Columbia Turnpike.</p>
<p>In general, it is a nice video presentation. Looking at Google Maps, I was wondering if leaving the Columbia/Rt 24 intersection alone (except for the westbound barrier and the two right turn eastbound lanes onto Park Ave South) and instead extending Campus Drive (two separate 1 way lanes) to provide an on/off ramp to Rt 24 East? This might simplify construction and be less confusing to motorists on Rt 24 East.</p>			<p>The Campus Drive connection to NJ 24 was reviewed as part of this study. See Alternative 4 on Page 19 of the Report. There are several significant disadvantages to this alternative and it was not supported by NJDOT.</p>
	<p>How will westbound traffic on Columbia Turnpike be separated at tho new island. Seems like a safety issue for drivers unfamiliar with the area.</p>		

Comments:	Q1/Q4:	Q2/Q5:	Q3/Comments:
Responses	Responses	Responses	Responses
	<p>The lane divider prevents vehicles exiting NJ 24 eastbound from accessing the left turn lanes on Columbia Turnpike westbound. Signs will guide Columbia Turnpike westbound vehicles from Florham Park to the turn lanes or to the through lanes in advance of the island divider.</p>		
<p>The current merge lane on 24 East should be extended. There's not a lot of time to merge.</p>			
<p>The merge lane is under NJDOT jurisdiction and was not within the scope of this NJDOT study.</p>			