

N J T P A

**Regional Job Access &
Reverse Commute
Transportation Plan**



October 1999

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Inc.

**NJTPA
REGIONAL
JOB ACCESS and REVERSE COMMUTE
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

**Prepared by
NJTPA Central Staff**

October 1999

**North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Inc.
One Newark Center, 17th Floor
Newark, NJ 07102
973.639.8400**

The preparation of this document has been financed through funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration Job Access Planning Challenge Grant. The NJTPA is solely responsible for its contents.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	3
2. THE GEOGRAPHY OF POVERTY AND JOB ACCESS BARRIERS IN THE NJTPA REGION	5
2.1 The Geography of TANF and Poverty	5
2.2 Employment Decentralization	11
2.3 Prospective Travel Patterns of the Welfare-to-Work Participant.....	14
3. REGIONAL LINKAGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPANDING INTER-COUNTY JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAMS	16
4. INCLUSION INTO THE NJTPA PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.....	21
4.1 Selection Process	21
4.2 Prioritization Process	22
4.3 Potential Funding Opportunities.....	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY	26
APPENDIX A	28
A. NJTPA Region - Job Access and Reverse Commute Contact List.....	28
 <u>MAPS</u>	
Map 1: <i>NJTPA Region</i>	2
Map 2: <i>Number of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Households in the NJTPA Region</i>	7
Map 3: <i>Municipalities With More Than 1,000 TANF Households</i>	8
Map 4: <i>Percentage of Persons Living Below the Poverty Line</i>	9
Map 5: <i>Private Sector Covered Employment Change, 1982 to 1997</i>	13
Map 6: <i>Regional Transit Index</i>	24
 <u>TABLES</u>	
Table 2: <i>Number of TANF Households as Compared to Total Households by County</i>	6
Table 3: <i>Proportion of Private Sector Covered Employment* in Urban Centers,** 1972 to 1997</i>	12
Table 4: <i>Job Access Sub-committee Scoring Criteria</i>	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Northern New Jersey, received a Job Access Planning Challenge Grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in July of 1998. FTA has established the grant program for MPO's to assist in the planning and coordination of services to help disadvantaged citizens without automobiles access a wider set of job opportunities.

The catalyst for Job Access planning activities was the passage of the federal welfare reform bill, the *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* (PRWORA), which repealed the "open-ended federal entitlement program,"¹ i.e., Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and replaced it with "time-limited cash assistance...mandatory work requirements,"² i.e., Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. This federal initiative is commonly referred to as "welfare-to-work." Much of the responsibility for implementing PRWORA's goals fall on state governments, and the success in reaching these goals will be measured by the numbers of persons fulfilling various work requirements within imposed time limits. New Jersey's welfare-to-work program, entitled Work First New Jersey (WFNJ), limits clients to a five-year lifetime total of benefits, with some exceptions. Simply, welfare recipients must find employment or lose their public assistance in 60 months. WFNJ attempts to coordinate a network of support services linking welfare clients with employment opportunities. One of the most important of these support services, along with job training and child care, is transportation to employment opportunities.

Transportation will be the logistical determinant for the success of welfare reform, or as the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, Rodney Slater, states, "Transportation is the 'to' in welfare-to-work."³ The State of New Jersey has taken the lead in planning these services

¹ Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA), *Transportation and Welfare Reform: States on the Move*, 1997. [<http://www.ctaa.org/welfare/states-move>] Cited Oct. 1997.

² Ibid.

³ CTAA, *Welfare to Work Transportation*, 1997. [<http://www.ctaa.org/welfare>] Cited Oct. 1997.

through the “New Jersey Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project” by coordinating job access issues through the New Jersey Department of Transportation, New Jersey Transit, New Jersey Department of Human Services, the 21 counties of the state, and other social services and employment related organizations. The counties have each developed a program, or Community Transportation Plan, to provide job access services to move Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) forward.

The NJTPA will be providing regional coordination of the Community Transportation Plans of the northern New Jersey counties. It is the purpose of this **Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation Plan** to identify opportunities for cooperative efforts, or linkages, between counties to coordinate county-based services across borders, and to implement a prioritization structure for evaluating future Job Access/Reverse Commute projects in the NJTPA Region. This plan, detailing a regional response for Job Access issues, will not “supersede, but...build upon existing welfare-to-work transportation planning activities,” as per the Job Access and Reverse Commute Competitive Grants Program Notice.⁴

THE GEOGRAPHY OF POVERTY AND JOB ACCESS BARRIERS IN THE NJTPA REGION

A number of prevailing transportation and settlement trends and patterns in the NJTPA Region create obstacles for welfare recipients transitioning to the labor force. Using Census and other data, this plan shows that families on public assistance are heavily concentrated in the region’s urban centers and the municipalities near them (mainly older sub-centers).

However, jobs available to those on public assistance tend to be in the suburbs, as a result of historical trends. In 1951, the suburban counties constituted just 29.6 percent of the region’s private sector covered jobs,⁵ but by 1989 this number increased to 56.8 percent. Conversely, 70.4 percent of the private sector covered jobs in 1951 were concentrated in the urban counties⁶ of the region. By 1989, this percentage dropped to 39.7 percent.⁷

⁴ Federal Register, v63, n215, November 6, 1998.

⁵ Covered employment refers to workers of employers subject to the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Law. Private sector does not include government employees, self-employed, farmers, or persons covered by the Railroad Retirement Act.

⁶ Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union Counties.

⁷ Derived from Table B-8, NJTPA, *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey, Appendix I*, Fall 1995, p. B11.

According to the NJTPA Regional Transportation Plan, “The vast majority of regional job growth is not in areas near high capacity transit systems, such as the cities of Newark, Jersey City, and New Brunswick, but rather in areas that are largely auto dependent.”⁸ For TANF participants, many of whom lack autos and are dependent on public transit, this means severely restricted access to some of the region's largest job centers.

In addition, 90% of adult TANF recipients in New Jersey are single, female heads of households and therefore, have needs for childcare and for flexible transportation. These physical, social, and economic obstacles can appear insurmountable for welfare clients who wish to become independent of public assistance.

REGIONAL LINKAGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPANDING INTER-COUNTY JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAMS

This plan identifies proposed projects in each county's Community Transportation Plan developed during the "New Jersey Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project" that have regional linkages, i.e. inter-county significance.

In each county's Community Transportation Plan, planning efforts were undertaken that assessed:

- **Current Transportation Services and Facilities and**
- **Transportation Needs and Service Gaps**

Next, analysis of the gaps in service were utilized to develop services and programs to connect the transit-dependent population to job opportunities. The **Recommended Transportation Strategies** were as follows:

- Modifications to existing bus routes and schedules to increase the frequency of service, add destinations, or provide connections to other services,
- New services, operating on fixed or flexible routes and schedules, to link county residents with regional transit services or employers and other major destinations,
- Increased coordination of paratransit services, including the establishment of transportation brokers,
- Expansion of paratransit systems to offer service to new user groups or during

⁸ NJTPA, *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey, Appendix I*, Fall 1995, p. B12.

- additional hours,
- Programs to assist low-income individuals with the purchase and operation of their own cars,
 - Employer shuttles,
 - Increased distribution of public transportation information to users, including trip planning services,
 - Implementation of NJ transit's WorkPass program and other incentives for the use of transit passes, and
 - Encouragement of carpooling and vanpooling.

Since this plan will not “supersede, but...build upon existing welfare-to-work transportation planning activities,”⁹ programs that embrace development of regionally linked services and promote inter-county synergies were extracted from the county plans. Furthermore, the development of the the NJTPA's 2025 Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan will be enhanced by its ability to draw recommended inter-county strategies derived from the County Community Transportation Plans into the Corridor Planning Process framework. One example is **The Newark Owl Feeder Service** which consists of a flexibly routed van service connecting NJ Transit Route 62 and PATH operating between 1 and 5 AM, 7 days a week. This service would provide access to airport jobs and jobs in Hudson County and New York City (via PATH). This service could also be used as a feeder service in the Newark area ultimately providing late night access to jobs in the Secaucus area. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 3, 6, and 12]

INCLUSION INTO THE NJTPA PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

According to FTA's FY 1999 Job Access and Reverse Commute Competitive Grant Program Notice, it is the MPO's responsibility to implement a structure in which the region's proposed projects can be selected and prioritized. Upon release of the Job Access and Reverse Commute Grant Program Notice, the NJTPA will request a Letter of Intent in order to do a preliminary assessment of the proposed project for general eligibility for that round of funding. Timelines for the application process will be distributed via fax, and further guidance will be administered throughout the process.

⁹ Federal Register, v63, n215, November 6, 1998.

The NJTPA's Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) will appoint a **Job Access Sub-committee** from its members for prioritization purposes. Once eligibility is established, the merit of each application will be evaluated based on the FTA's eligibility criteria and scoring system.

Once the project prioritization process has been finalized, the NJTPA Board of Trustees must approve the prioritized projects. Next, the list of prioritized projects and programs will be forwarded to NJ Transit, and a consolidated application will be submitted to FTA.

1. INTRODUCTION

The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Northern New Jersey (*See Map 1 on page 2*), received a Job Access Planning Challenge Grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in July of 1998. FTA has established the grant program for MPO's to assist in the planning and coordination of services to help disadvantaged citizens without automobiles access a wider set of job opportunities. The State of New Jersey has taken the lead in planning these services through the "New Jersey Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project" by coordinating job access issues through the New Jersey Department of Transportation, New Jersey Transit, New Jersey Department of Human Services, the 21 counties of the state, and other social services and employment related organizations. The counties have each developed a program, or Community Transportation Plan, to provide job access services to move Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) forward.

The NJTPA will be providing regional coordination of the Community Transportation Plans of the northern New Jersey counties. It is the purpose of this **Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation Plan** to identify opportunities for cooperative efforts, or linkages, between counties to coordinate county-based services across borders, and to implement a prioritization structure for evaluating future Job Access/Reverse Commute projects in the NJTPA Region. This plan, detailing a regional response for Job Access issues, will not "supersede, but...build upon existing welfare-to-work transportation planning activities," as per the Job Access and Reverse Commute Competitive Grants Program Notice.¹

This plan will also be used in the development of broader transportation plans for the region. The main element of the NJTPA's 2025 Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), now under development, is the Corridor Planning Process. The Corridor Planning Process is a bottom-up approach to planning long-range federal transportation investment in the region, in which the subregions are intricately involved. The cross-jurisdictional objective-based planning

¹ Federal Register, v63, n215, November 6, 1998.

effort focuses on 18 corridors in the region that are defined by a combination of travel markets (journey-to-work) and road and rail facilities. The Corridor Planning Process identifies each corridor's primary movements, its respective mobility/accessibility issues, and analyzes critical areas that affect mobility within the corridor. The development of the RTP will be enhanced by the ability to draw recommended inter-county strategies derived from the County Community Transportation Plans into the Corridor Planning Process framework.

1.1 Background

The main consequence of the passage of the federal welfare reform bill, the *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* (PRWORA), is the repeal of the "open-ended federal entitlement program,"² i.e., Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and its replacement with "time-limited cash assistance...mandatory work requirements,"³ i.e., Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. This federal initiative is commonly referred to as "welfare-to-work." Much of the responsibility for implementing PRWORA's goals fall on state governments, and the success in reaching these goals will be measured by the numbers of persons fulfilling various work requirements within imposed time limits. New Jersey's welfare-to-work program, entitled Work First New Jersey (WFNJ), limits clients to a five-year lifetime total of benefits, with some exceptions. Simply, welfare recipients must find employment or lose their public assistance in 60 months. Since the goal of welfare reform is not merely a reduction of welfare rolls through stringent federal guideline adherence, but an effort to provide current welfare recipients with the skills and opportunities to gain economic independence, WFNJ will attempt to coordinate a network of support services linking welfare clients with employment opportunities. One of the most important of these support services, along with job training and child care, is transportation to employment opportunities.

Transportation will be the logistical determinant for the success of welfare reform, or as the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, Rodney Slater, states, "Transportation is the 'to' in welfare-to-work."⁴ Transportation planners will be faced with the challenge of integrating and coordinating the existing transportation system that supports the region with individual

² Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA), *Transportation and Welfare Reform: States on the Move*, 1997. [<http://www.ctaa.org/welfare/states-move>] Cited Oct. 1997.

³ Ibid.

⁴ CTAA, *Welfare to Work Transportation*, 1997. [<http://www.ctaa.org/welfare>] Cited Oct. 1997.

nontraditional transportation programs. The standard "systematic" approach to meeting public transportation needs provides fixed-route, peak-hour, peak-direction transit service that most efficiently serves dense urban areas as an employment destination. The nontraditional programmatic approach to public transportation generally caters to segments of the population with mobility limitations, such as the elderly and disabled, whereby parallel service is implemented to meet the needs of the population. Thus, the hope is

*If public transportation systems and programs cannot work efficiently on their own, the answer may lie in combining them. Integrating programmatic and systematic service may give a community its best chance for stable, efficient mobility.*⁵

To facilitate the implementation of such welfare-to-work strategies, the *Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century* (TEA-21) includes a Job Access and Reverse Commute Competitive Grant Program, a five-year, \$750 million competitive grant program of which \$500 million is guaranteed.

⁵ Rae, p. 1.

2. THE GEOGRAPHY OF POVERTY AND JOB ACCESS BARRIERS IN THE NJTPA REGION

A number of prevailing transportation and settlement trends and patterns in the NJTPA Region create obstacles for welfare recipients transitioning to the labor force. These physical barriers, in concert with social and economic obstacles, can appear insurmountable for welfare clients who wish to become independent of public assistance. In fact, “contrary to popular myth, the majority of welfare mothers are not long-term recipients but rather ‘cycle’ back and forth between low paid-work and welfare.”⁶ This “‘cycle’ back and forth” shows that welfare mothers do attempt to transition to the workforce only to find that existing support service—transportation being a “key” service—are not meeting their needs.

2.1 The Geography of TANF and Poverty

The total number of households receiving TANF in the NJTPA region is 64,941.⁷ Essex County contains almost 40 percent of the region’s TANF households, 286 percent greater than its share of total households. (See *Table 1 on page 6.*) Hudson County more than doubles its total household share, while Passaic and Union Counties surpass and approach their shares, respectively. Altogether, these four counties account for more than 77 percent of the region’s TANF recipient households. Diverging from these heavy concentrations, Hunterdon County’s TANF share is one-twentieth of its total household share, while the remaining eight counties are no larger than 56 percent of their total household shares.

By municipality, the participants are heavily concentrated in what the New Jersey State Plan calls urban centers.⁸ The five urban centers in the NJTPA Region are Newark, Jersey City, Paterson, Elizabeth, and New Brunswick, and contain over 49 percent (31,883) of the TANF clients in the region. Newark alone accounts for 25 percent (16,217) of the regional client share, while comprising less than 4.5 percent of the region’s total household share. If one includes municipalities adjacent to the urban centers, 70 percent (45,423) of the region’s

⁶ Lacombe, p. 2.

⁷ According to a DHS database geocoded by address dated March 1997.

⁸ “A city of Statewide importance, designated...by the State Planning Commission...a large settlement that has a high intensity of population and mixed land uses...the historical foci for growth in the major urban areas of New Jersey.” NJSPC, p.332.

Table 1: Number of TANF Households as Compared to Total Households by County

COUNTY	1997 TANF Households*	Pct. of Region	1990 Total Households**	Pct of Region	Ratio Pct. Clients: Pct Households
BERGEN	2,363	3.6%	308,795	14.8%	0.25
ESSEX	24,689	38.0	277,667	13.3	2.86
HUDSON	14,153	21.8	208,574	10.0	2.18
HUNTERDON	69	0.1	38,152	1.8	0.06
MIDDLESEX	4,184	6.4	238,974	11.4	0.56
MONMOUTH	3,456	5.3	197,325	9.4	0.56
MORRIS	585	0.9	148,627	7.1	0.13
OCEAN	2,538	3.9	168,312	8.1	0.49
PASSAIC	6,193	9.5	155,450	7.4	1.28
SOMERSET	730	1.1	88,819	4.3	0.26
SUSSEX	186	0.3	44,492	2.1	0.13
UNION	5,392	8.3	179,966	8.6	0.96
WARREN	403	0.6	33,876	1.6	0.38
NJTPA REGION	64,941	100%***	2,089,029	100%***	1.00

*Database from N.J. Department of Human Services, Office of Policy and Planning, geocoded by address and dated March 1997. The discrete locations were then geo-referenced to its county level in MapInfo.

**1990 U.S. Census Bureau, STF3A.

***Percentages may not add up due to rounding, however, the ratio was computed using actual percentages.

participants are encompassed. Further, of the 385 municipalities in the region, only 35 have 250 or more participants. These 35 municipalities comprise 85 percent of the participants, while accounting for only 8 percent of the total land area and 9 percent of the number of municipalities. (See Map 2 on page 7.) Additionally, thirty of the 35 municipalities are within six miles of an urban center.

Aside from the above-mentioned urban centers, there are eight other municipalities⁹ with more than 1,000 TANF participants. (See Map 3 on page 8.) Combined with the urban centers, these municipalities contain 71 percent of the TANF recipients in the region. The number of families on public assistance in both the region's urban centers and the municipalities near them (mainly older sub-centers), underscores the heavy concentration of poverty in these Northern New Jersey areas.

The U.S. Census confirms that poverty has been heavily concentrated in the region's urban centers. (See Map 4 on page 9.) According to the 1990 U.S. Census, 417,460 persons,

⁹ In addition to the five designated urban centers; Passaic city, West New York, Union City, East Orange, Orange, Irvington, Plainfield, and Perth Amboy have more than 1,000 TANF participants.

or 7.4 percent, live below the poverty line¹⁰ in the 13-county region; about one-third are children. The disproportion of poverty between the urban centers and outlying areas is quite notable: The poverty rate for the five urban centers is 19.5 percent, while only 4.8 percent of the residents in the rest of the region fall below the poverty line. The concentration of poverty is quite severe as the urban centers contain more than 35 percent of the region's poor residents, while only consuming 1.5 percent of the land area and 14 percent of the regional population. Likewise, the 1990 U.S. Census found the unemployment rate in the urban centers to be 13.5 percent while the rate in the rest of the region was 5.2 percent. In both cases, the unemployment rate for women was higher.¹¹

Compounding the economic difficulties facing TANF participants in the NJTPA region is their low educational attainment. Of the heads of households whose educational attainment is known, 52 percent have not graduated high school, 40 percent are high school graduates, and less than 9 percent have had any post-high school education.¹² The low educational attainment will have direct implications on the types of jobs that welfare clients can get, generally limiting them to unskilled or low-skilled jobs, which will directly affect their transportation needs based on where such jobs are located.

Studies have found that the spatial correlation and dynamic of poverty and minority concentrations creates overwhelming obstacles to overcome poverty. As summarized by John Accordino in "The Consequences of Welfare Reform for Central City Economies," the entrenchment of structural poverty is bolstered by¹³:

- A mismatch in job skills between the job seeker and the employer's needs, and a spatial mismatch between residences of the poor and job locations.
- The occupation structure of an "hourglass" economy, whereby low-wage, low-benefit or high-wage, high-benefit jobs are being generated with no thickening of middle income employment.
- A lack of formal information on job openings and informal "word-of-mouth" job networks.
- Discrimination towards race, ethnicity, and gender, as well as the employer's stigmatization

¹⁰ The poverty threshold for 1990 for the 48 contiguous states was \$6,280 for the first person and \$2,140 for each additional person (\$12,700 for a four-person family). Comparatively, the poverty threshold for 1997 was \$7,890 for the first person and \$2,720 each additional person (\$16,050 for a four-person family).

¹¹ According to the 1990 U.S. Census, the regional unemployment rate was 6.0% for men and 6.4% for women. In the urban centers, the rate was 13.2% for men and 13.8% for women.

¹² Derived from NJDHS, Division of Family Development, Bureau of Research Statistics, "Monthly Report," p. 6.

¹³ Accordino, pp. 11-12.

of welfare recipients.

2.2 Employment Decentralization

As residences have dispersed into the suburbs and exurbs of New Jersey, employment has followed. From 1980 to 1992, office space has grown more than 400 percent in the suburban counties¹⁴ of the region as 67 million square feet has been built.¹⁵ Private-sector-driven employment shifts,¹⁶ have shown similar suburban growth trends. For example, in 1951 the suburban counties constituted just 29.6 percent of the region's private sector covered jobs,¹⁷ but by 1989 this number increased to 56.8 percent. Conversely, 70.4 percent of the private sector covered jobs in 1951 were concentrated in the urban counties¹⁸ of the region. By 1989, this percentage dropped to 39.7 percent.¹⁹

In the region's urban centers, over one-quarter (102,504) of the private sector covered jobs from 1972 to 1997 were lost. (See *Table 2 on page 12.*) The urban centers contained more than 21 percent of the region's private sector employment in 1972, but less than 12 percent in 1997. Conversely, private sector covered jobs outside of the region's urban centers increased by 682,351 from 1972 to 1997 for an employment growth rate of 50 percent.

There are many suburban municipalities that rival or surpass some of the urban centers in total private sector covered jobs for 1997. For example, private sector covered jobs in Edison, Piscataway, Woodbridge, and Franklin Township (Somerset County) each exceed that of the urban center New Brunswick, while East Brunswick, South Brunswick, and Bridgewater rival it. Although Newark and Jersey City rank first and second, respectively, in the number of private covered jobs in the region and state, Edison is a close third. Moreover, Edison gained a greater number of private sector jobs and had a higher percentage growth rate than Jersey City

¹⁴ Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Bergen, and Somerset Counties.

¹⁵ J. Hughes, Seneca, and Lang, Dec. 1995, p. 16.

¹⁶ Private firms are at liberty to locate wherever they choose (e.g. near consumers, employees, areas with lower land costs). Government employment is more likely to be located based on public policy goals (e.g. support of urban centers) or near social services clients in population centers. NJTPA, *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey, Appendix I*, Fall 1995, p. B10.

¹⁷ Covered employment refers to workers of employers subject to the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Law. Private sector does not include government employees, self-employed, farmers, or persons covered by the Railroad Retirement Act.

¹⁸ Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union Counties.

¹⁹ Derived from Table B-8, NJTPA, *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey, Appendix I*, Fall 1995, p. B11.

Table 2: Proportion of Private Sector Covered Employment* in Urban Centers, 1972 to 1997**

	1972	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	1997
Urban Centers	372,300						
% NJTPA Region	21.29%						
% State	16.59%						
Urban Centers		315,753					
% NJTPA Region		18.33%					
% State		14.24%					
Urban Centers			297,498				
% NJTPA Region			15.42%				
% State			11.76%				
Urban Centers				275,987			
% NJTPA Region				12.75%			
% State				9.62%			
Urban Centers					277,224		
% NJTPA Region					12.28%		
% State					9.13%		
Urban Centers						273,561	
% NJTPA Region						12.17%	
% State						9.07%	
Urban Centers							269,796
% NJTPA Region							11.59%
% State							8.62%
Total, NJTPA Region	1,748,510	1,722,151	1,929,190	2,165,208	2,258,085	2,247,217	2,328,357
Total, State	2,243,598	2,217,132	2,530,556	2,869,631	3,036,932	3,017,640	3,131,476

*Covered employment refers to workers of employers subject to the N.J. Unemployment Compensation Law. Private sector does not include government employees, self-employed, farmers, or persons covered by the Railroad Retirement Act.

**NJSPC designated urban centers in the NJTPA Region: Newark, New Brunswick, Paterson, Jersey City, and Elizabeth.

from 1982 to 1997. (See Map 5 on page 13.) A more drastic example exists in Passaic County where Wayne contains twice the number of private covered jobs as the urban center of Paterson. Parsippany-Troy Hills is also a suburban community where robust employment growth has occurred.

These employment patterns have implications for job access. According to the NJTPA RTP, "The vast majority of regional job growth is not in areas near high capacity transit systems, such as the cities of Newark, Jersey City, and New Brunswick, but rather in areas that are largely auto dependent."²⁰ For TANF participants, many of whom lack autos and are dependent on public transit, this means severely restricted access to some of the region's largest job centers.

²⁰ NJTPA, *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey, Appendix I*, Fall 1995, p. B12.

2.3 Prospective Travel Patterns of the Welfare-to-Work Participant

Nationwide, more than 90 percent of welfare parents are single mothers.²¹ This gender specific trend holds true in New Jersey, where approximately 90 percent of all adult TANF recipients are female.²² In the NJTPA region specifically, a single parent—most likely a single mother—heads over 96 percent of TANF families.²³ There are distinguishing characteristics of a single mother's travel patterns that portray greater transportation needs, and for the poor working mother, even greater obstacles.

The working mother's home responsibilities complicate her trip to work regardless of the mode taken. Poor working mothers who need to utilize public transportation find it even more difficult, due to the likelihood that they must follow a *trip chain* to fulfill their responsibilities. Trip chaining is the linking of trip purposes, or "the increased tendency for commuters to make a work trip part of a trip chain— i.e., taking children to school, picking up necessities, and running household errands in an effort to more efficiently use time."²⁴ An increase in double income households and single parents in the work force has augmented the phenomenon of the trip chain. For the poor working mother, trip chaining is not only a way to "more efficiently use time," but is also an economic necessity. Low-wage working mothers spend almost 210 percent more on transportation per month than welfare-reliant mothers (\$62:\$129).²⁵ According to the 1990 NPTS, employed women in urban areas take 3.8 trips per day—12 percent more than urban employed men and 31 percent more than urban women who are not employed. Also, the number of person miles more than doubled for working-age women while this number increased 46 percent for working-age men.²⁶ However, the problem for the welfare mother is that few own automobiles to effectively and efficiently complete their trip chain.²⁷ This dependence on the automobile is explained:

...working women with children are particularly dependent on the car because it is the best³/₄ and perhaps only³/₄ way to balance the child care and domestic responsibilities they retain when they enter the paid labor force given societal

²¹ Lacombe, p. 1.

²² Rudy Myers, NJDHS, Division of Family and Development, Bureau of Research Statistics, March 20, 1998.

²³ Derived from *Current Program Statistics*, NJDHS, Division of Family and Development, Dec. 1997, p. 4.

²⁴ Pisarski, 1996, p. 4.

²⁵ Edin and Lein, p. 91 cited in Lacombe, p. 2.

²⁶ Lacombe, p. 2.

²⁷ "Nationally, less than 6 percent of welfare families reported a car as a household asset in 1995; the average value was just \$620. This ownership figure is probably low, because previous welfare eligibility rules limiting the value of assets may have led some recipients to 'hide' ownership by having a family member or friend hold the title. However, Edin and Lein's 1997 study of welfare mothers in selected cities found that car ownership among recipients ranged no higher than 20 to 40 percent." Lacombe, p. 2.

constraints^{3/4}inadequate child and eldercare, limited housing options, segregated labor markets, poor transportation options for children, inaccessible services in the suburban areas in which over 70 percent of all jobs are located, and unsafe alternative methods.²⁸

*Recent studies also suggest that single mothers take both **more trips** and **longer trips** than married mothers.²⁹*

The fact that the vast majority of the clients are single mothers will also have direct impact on travel needs. These characteristics in tandem—the likelihood of following a trip chain due to being single parenting mother and where/how they will get to a limited choice of work locations—will substantially complicate not only getting to the job, but ultimately keeping the job in order to remain independent of public assistance.

²⁸ Rosenbloom, p. 48 cited in Lacombe,, p. 3.

²⁹ Lacombe, p. 3.

3. REGIONAL LINKAGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPANDING INTER-COUNTY JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAMS

The purpose of this section is to identify the proposed projects in each county's Community Transportation Plan developed during the "New Jersey Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project" that have regional linkages, i.e. inter-county significance.

In each county's Community Transportation Plan, planning efforts were undertaken that assessed:

- **Current Transportation Services and Facilities and**
- **Transportation Needs and Service Gaps**

Next, analysis of the gaps in service were utilized to develop services and programs to connect the transit-dependent population to job opportunities. The **Recommended Transportation Strategies** were as follows:

- Modifications to existing bus routes and schedules to increase the frequency of service, add destinations, or provide connections to other services,
- New services, operating on fixed or flexible routes and schedules, to link county residents with regional transit services or employers and other major destinations,
- Increased coordination of paratransit services, including the establishment of transportation brokers,
- Expansion of paratransit systems to offer service to new user groups or during additional hours,
- Programs to assist low-income individuals with the purchase and operation of their own cars,
- Employer shuttles,
- Increased distribution of public transportation information to users, including trip planning services,
- Implementation of NJ Transit's WorkPass program and other incentives for the use of transit passes, and
- Encouragement of carpooling and vanpooling.

Since this plan will not "supersede, but...build upon existing welfare-to-work

transportation planning activities,”³⁰ programs that embrace development of regionally linked services and promote inter-county synergies were extracted from the county plans. Furthermore, the development of the the NJTPA's 2025 Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan will be enhanced by its ability to draw recommended inter-county strategies derived from the County Community Transportation Plans into the Corridor Planning Process framework. The following listing is not in rank order.

A. Community Transportation System to be comprised of the following components has been proposed to link the 450,000+ jobs within Bergen County and the urban areas bordering the county. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 8 and 9]

1. Local bus service (B-Lines)
2. Special Transportation Service
3. Community Commuter
4. Ridematching
5. Enhanced bus service

Adding or augmenting these services as required would serve the WFNJ clients within Bergen, Essex, Hudson, and Passaic counties.

B. The Newark Owl Feeder Service would consist of a flexibly routed van service connecting NJTransit Route 62 and PATH operating between 1 and 5 AM, 7 days a week. This service would provide access to airport jobs and jobs in Hudson County and New York City (via PATH). This service could also be used as a feeder service in the Newark area ultimately providing late night access to jobs in the Secaucus area. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 3, 6, and 12]

C. The Fairfield/West Caldwell Job Access Program could be linked with Morris County services. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 6 and 7] It would entail:

- Develop a database of all employers in the target area.
- Invite employers to a local Transportation Summit.
- Survey or interview the target employers to determine the number and type of jobs, shift times, and transits access conditions and needs.
- Develop appropriate cost-effective transportation solutions for access to the most promising underserved employers and shifts.

³⁰ Federal Register, v63, n215, November 6, 1998.

- Establish an ongoing relationship between employers, the County, and transportation providers.

D. The Meadowlands Job Access Program would involve area employers, Essex and Hudson Counties, Meadowlink TMA, and NJTransit and entail: [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 12 and 13]

- Develop a database of all employers in the target area.
- Survey or interview the target employers to determine the number and type of jobs, shift times, and transit's access conditions and needs.
- Develop appropriate cost-effective transportation solutions for access to the most promising underserved employers and shifts.

E. Connections among Hunterdon, Warren and Morris Counties are perceived as inadequate. Dialogue among the Hunterdon County LINK office and appropriate Morris and Warren County offices is considered a possible solution. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 4 and 16]

F. A recent **LINK** option in Hunterdon County has been implemented for Merck employees that guarantees them a ride home if they miss the last train. This service will deliver any such passenger to a Wheels service and ultimately to the Somerville Station from where the commute to Newark in Essex County may resume. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 4 and 16]

G. In Middlesex County- **expansion of the DASH** (Davidson Avenue Shuttle) in participation with Somerset County would provide New Brunswick residents increased access to employers in New Brunswick. Also suggested was that planning and securing of funding sources be conducted jointly between Middlesex and Somerset Counties. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 2]

H. Middlesex County- Investigate the possibility of a joint effort with Mercer County to increase access to the jobs in southern Middlesex County as well as the Hightstown and Trenton areas in Mercer County. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 2]

- A new **East-West bus route** running between Hamilton Township and a point in East Windsor/Hightstown area.
- **Extension of NJ transit Route 600** from Trenton along Route 1 beyond its current terminus at Princeton Forrestal Village and an increase in evening service along the

route.

F. Investigate a possible joint effort between **Middlesex County and Union County** for better access to jobs in the Rahway, Linden, and Elizabeth area. Specifically, companies located within that area such as IKEA could attract employees from Carteret, Perth Amboy, and Woodbridge if transportation services were available. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 2 and 12]

G. Monmouth County would work to facilitate **transfers between Monmouth County's paratransit service and Middlesex County's Area Wide Transportation Service**. Monmouth county has expressed interest is linking the two systems to enable the customers of both services better access to both counties. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 1 and 2]

H. **Connecting NJ Transit Route 989 with NJ Transit route 605** would aid WFNJ clients in **Somerset County** by providing direct access to potential jobs in Princeton and the Quaker Bridge Mall in **Mercer County**. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 2]

I. **WHEELS 884** currently operates between Hunterdon and Somerset Counties. Additional service has been requested to service the increased development along Route 22. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 4]

J. Improve level of service to mitigate gaps in transit between **New Brunswick** (Middlesex County) and **Somerville** (Somerset County). [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 14]

K. Increased linkage to employment clusters such as Newark International Airport, New Jersey Gardens retail/ commercial center, and Woodbridge Mall area in Middlesex County. Some gaps in service have been identified as territorial and others as time of service. Middlesex County, Union County, and Essex County would be the primary participants. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 2 and 12]

L. **Extension of the Morris Avenue (Route 82) Corridor** service into Essex County would permit WFNJ clients to access potential employment centers such as Short Hills Mall and Livingston Mall which are both located in Essex County as well as Overlook Regional Medical Center in Summit. Essex County and Union County would be the participants in this linkage. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 3 and 6]

M. A need to connect **Plainfield in Union County to Somerset and Middlesex Counties** exists. Employment centers in Somerset County such as AT&T Worldwide Headquarters and several Fortune 100 companies are presently inaccessible to WFNJ clients. [Located in NJTPA Corridor(s): 3]

N. **Expansion of NJ Transit's WHEELS** program has been suggested to link Muhlenberg Regional Medical Center to Middlesex County, Middlesex Mall and other major employment centers. This project would benefit WFNJ clients within Union and Middlesex Counties by increasing connectivity among readily accessible locations.

O. A **Passaic County Transit Map** should be developed that outlines the fixed route services available within the county as well as those of neighboring counties. This effort should involve all neighboring counties and include both public and private transportation service providers. Sussex County, Bergen County, Hudson County, Morris County, and Essex County should be involved.

4. INCLUSION INTO THE NJTPA PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

4.1 Selection Process

According to FTA's FY 1999 Job Access and Reverse Commute Competitive Grant Program Notice, in the NJTPA region it is the MPO's responsibility to implement a structure in which the region's proposed projects can be selected and prioritized. Upon release of the Job Access and Reverse Commute Grant Program Notice, the NJTPA will request a Letter of Intent in order to do a preliminary assessment of the proposed project for general eligibility for that round of funding. The Letter of Intent should be no more than two pages, and should include:

- Key Contact Person – Address, telephone, fax number...
- Organizational Description - What does your organization do?
- Proposed Project Description – What type of project is it? Where is it located? Is it an Access to Jobs or Reverse Commute project?
- Plan Consistency – How does your proposed project relate to the effected county's Community Transportation Plan (as a segment of the Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project)? How does your project relate to the Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation Plan? Does your project cross county boundaries?
- Evidence of Coordination (or Continued Coordination) – Have you discussed your proposal with the agencies impacted by it?
- Funding – What is your total cost? How much would be from the FTA grant? What is the source(s) of your proposed match?

Timelines for the application process will be distributed via fax, and further guidance will be administered throughout the process.

4.2 Prioritization Process

The NJTPA's Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) will appoint a **Job Access Sub-committee** from its members for prioritization purposes. Once eligibility is established, the merit of each application will be evaluated based on the FTA's eligibility criteria and scoring system. The number of points in parentheses indicates the maximum level of points for a given factor. The criteria are as follows:

Table 3: Job Access Sub-committee Scoring Criteria

1. Coordinated human services/transportation planning process and Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation plan (25 Points)
Evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant:
 - (A) Demonstrates a collaborative planning process, including:
 - (1) coordination with, and the financial commitment of, existing transportation service providers;
 - (2) coordination with the state or local agencies that administer the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (TANF and WtW grant programs);
 - (3) coordination with public housing agencies (including Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities as defined by the Secretary of HUD) if any, who intend to apply for Welfare to Work Housing Vouchers from the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
 - (4) consultation with the community to be served; and
 - (5) consultation with other area stakeholders.
 - (B) Presents a Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation Plan addressing the transportation needs of welfare recipients and low-income individuals.
 2. Demonstrated need for additional transportation services (30 Points)
Evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant demonstrates:
 - (A) in the case of an applicant seeking assistance to finance a Job Access project, the relative need for additional services in the area to be served to transport welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from specified jobs, training and other employment support services; and
 - (B) in the case of an applicant seeking assistance to finance a Reverse Commute project, the need for additional services to transport individuals to suburban employment opportunities.
 3. Extent to which proposed services will meet the need for services (35 Points)
Evaluated based on the extent to which:
 - (A) the proposed service will meet the need
 - (B) to which the applicant demonstrates the maximum use of existing transportation service providers and expands transit networks or hours of service, or both.
 4. Financial commitments (10 Points)
Evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant:
 - (A) identifies long-term financing strategies to support proposed services
 - (B) identifies financial commitments by human service providers
 - (C) identifies financial commitments by existing transportation providers
- Also under consideration: the extent to which the applicant addresses the following variable factors: (10 Bonus Points Total)
1. Innovative approaches that are responsive to identified service needs;
 2. Use of employer-based strategies;
 3. Linkages to other employment-related support services; and
 4. Other strategies that are effective in meeting program goals.

Additionally, a Regional Transit Index (RTI) and the prioritized list of transportation strategies contained in each county's Community Transportation Plan will also be utilized for advisory purposes. (See *Map 6 on page 24.*) RTI takes into account 8 factors at the US Census block group level in order to analyze transit need on a regional scale. The 8 factors are:

Resident Characteristics- Origin Based Data

- Population Density (US Census, 1990)
- Density of Population with a Mobility Impairment (US Census, 1990)
- Density of Households with No Vehicle Available (US Census, 1990)
- Density of Households Earning Less Than \$15,000 Per Year (US Census, 1990)
- Density of Resident Labor Force (US Census, 1990)
- Density of Unemployed Persons (US Census, 1990)
- Density of TANF Households (NJ Dept. of Human Services, 1997)

Employment- Destination Based Data

- Density of Employees (Equifax Employer Data, 1993)

Each of the 8 factors is disaggregated into quintiles (frequency of block groups in the NJTPA Region disaggregated into five ranges with equal class intervals- i.e., 20% of the frequency in each class interval). The quintiles are then given a score for each factor, 1 through 5 (lowest to highest density). The scores then get accumulated for the overall RTI. For example, a block group receiving a cumulative RTI score of 10 (8 factors X a score of 1 for each factor-- two factors, employee density and density of persons with a mobility impairment, are weighted twice.) will show low transit need. Conversely, a block group receiving a cumulative RTI score of 50 (8 factors X a score of 5 for each factor--two factors are weighted twice) will show high transit need. To reiterate, this will be utilized for advisory purposes only.

Once the project prioritization process has been finalized, the NJTPA Board of Trustees must approve the prioritized projects. Next, the list of prioritized projects and programs will be forwarded to NJ Transit, and a consolidated application will be submitted to FTA.

4.3 Potential Funding Opportunities

Each County Community Transportation Plan provides substantial guidance for potential funding sources for Job Access and Reverse Commute activities. They are summarized as follows:

- New Jersey Department of Transportation – *Transportation Innovation Fund*
- New Jersey Department of Human Services – *TANF/Transportation Block Grants*
- US Department of Labor, Employment and training Administration – *Welfare-to-Work Grants*
- US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families – *TANF Social Services Block Grant*
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration – *Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accordino, John. "The Consequences of Welfare Reform for Central City Economies," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, v 64, n 1, pp. 11-15.

Brail, Richard K. et al. *Assessment of Public Transportation Opportunities for WorkFirst New Jersey Participants*, Rutgers University, Bloustein School of Policy and Planning, July 1997.

Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA). "People JOBS & Transportation: The First National Conference on Employment and Transportation," October, 1996. [<http://www.ctaa.org/joblinks/pjt-contents.htm>]

----- . *Transportation and Welfare Reform: States on the Move*, 1997. [<http://www.ctaa.org/welfare/states-move>] Cited Oct. 1997.

----- . "Bringing the Transportation Perspective to Welfare Reform," *Community Transportation Magazine*. May/June 1997.

----- . "Mobility: Key to Welfare Reform," *Community Solutions Newsletter*. Winter 1995, 8 pp.

Edin, Kathryn and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.

Federal Register, v63, n215, November 6, 1998.

Federal Register, v63, n65, November 6, 1998.

Hughes, James W, Joseph J. Seneca, and Robert E. Lang. *Commercial Office Space Overhangs: 21st Century Regional Economic Geographies*, Rutgers Regional Report, Issue Paper No. 9, December 1995.

Lacombe, Annalynn. U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, *Welfare Reform and Access to Jobs in Boston*, BTS98-A-02, prepared by, Washington, D.C., 1998.

New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Family and Development, Bureau of Research Statistics. "Monthly Report," March 1998, p. 6.

New Jersey State Planning Commission (NJSPC). *Communities of Place, The New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan (NJSDRP): Reexamination Report and Preliminary Plan*, Presentation Version, June 25, 1997.

New Jersey Department of Transportation, New Jersey Department of Human Services, and NJ Transit Corporation (Consultant: Multisystems, Inc.) Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project. *Initial County Coordination Planning Efforts*, Deliverable No. 1, September 24, 1997.

----- . *Profile and Inventory of Services and Facilities*, Deliverable No. 2, January 2, 1998.

----- . *Transportation Needs and Service Gaps*, Deliverable No. 3, May 8, 1998.

----- . County Work First New Jersey Transportation Task Force, *County Community Transportation Plan*, Fall 98-Winter 99. (For all counties in the NJTPA Region)

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA). *Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey*, August 1995,

----- . *Appendix I: Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey*, Fall 1995.

Pisarski, Alan. *Commuting in America*, Eno Foundation for Transportation, Inc., 1987.

----- . *Commuting in America II*, Eno Foundation for Transportation, Inc., 1996.

Rae, Karen. "A Blending of Approaches," *Passenger Transport*, v 50, n 50, Dec. 22, 1997, pp. 1, 6.

Rosenbloom, Sandra. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "Travel by Women" *1990 NPTS: Demographic Special Reports*, FHWA-PL-95-032, Feb. 1995, Chapter 2.

Transportation Summit II: New Jersey Statewide County and Community Transportation Planning Project, Trenton, Jan. 29, 1998.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. *Our Nation's Travel: 1995 National Personal Transportation Survey (NPTS) Early Results Report*, September 1997.

APPENDIX A

A. NJTPA Region - Job Access and Reverse Commute Contact List

Subregion	Contact	Agency	Phone	Fax
Bergen	Terry Dunn Egan	Bergen County Economic Development Corporation	201.646.3072	752.4180
Bergen	Edward Testa	Director, Bergen County Board of Social Services	201.368.4200	368.8710
Bergen	Peter Kendall	Exec. Director, Bergen County WIB	201.752.4003	646.3584
Bergen/Passaic	Krishna Murthy	Meadowlink TMA	201.939.4242	939.2630
Bergen	Daniel Quinonez	Asst. to Bergen County Exec. Committee Coordinator	201.646.3630	752.4180
Bergen	Margaret Cook	Director, Bergen County Division of Special Transportation	201.646.3227	343.2512
Bergen	Arline Simpson	Private Industry- Simpson Assoc./Work Force Investment Board/ Meadowlands Chamber of Commerce	201.843.1414	843.6483
Bergen	Tina Alexander	Bergen County Executive, Constituent Realties	201.646.3690	646.3101
Bergen	Richard Preissler	Deputy Director, Bergen County Board of Social Services	201.368.4218	368.8721
Bergen	Noreen Best	Bergen County Division of Community Development Human Services Advisory Council CEAS	201.646.2559	487.0945
Bergen	Margery Runyon	NJ Dept. Of Human Services Representative	201.977.4011	977.8942
Bergen	Thomas W. Casey	Bergen County, Dir. Of Transit Planning and Mgmt.	201.646.2892	342.7412
Bergen	John Marchioni	Commerce and Industry	201.368.2100	368.3438
Bergen	Chet Mattson/ Donna Orbach	Bergen County Dept. of Planning and Economic Development	201.646.2896	342.7412
Bergen/Hudson	Ken Ochab	HMDC	201.460.1700 x227	460.1722
Essex	Robin Guarino	Dept of Economic Development, Training and Employment	973.395.8747	395.8478
Essex	Jeffry L. Bertrand	Dept of Economic Development, Training and Employment		395.8478
Essex	Geri Durso	Essex County WIB		395.8478
Essex	James Williams	Director, Essex County Department of Citizens Services	973.733.3000	643.3985
Essex	Arlene Steinbacher	Essex County Department of Citizens Services	973.733.3313	643.3985
Essex/Union	Lou Capadona	Director, Transit Plus	973.491.7109	491.8881
Essex	Paula Stein	Program Dev. Officer, First Occupational Center of NJ	973.672.5800	672.0065
Essex	Janet Treamont	Supervising Planner, Dept. of Planning and Economic Development	973.509.8200	509.8524
Essex	Jim Bartell	Dept. of Planning and Economic Development	973.509.8200	509.8524
Essex	Samuel Papa	Essex County Dept. of Planning and Economic Development	973.509.8200	509.8524
Hudson	Carol Wilson	Director, Hudson County Health and Human Services	201.271.4311	271.4357
Hudson	Angelica Harrison	Director, Hudson County Division of Social Services	201.420.3000	420.0343
Hudson	Anthony J. Corsi	Exec. Director, Hudson County WIB	201.451.1511	451.1515
Hudson	Suzanne Mack	Exec. Director, Hudson TMA	201.432.2200	946.9390
Hudson	John Lane	Hudson County Dept. of Engineering and Planning	201.915.1067	915.1256
Hunterdon	Tara Braddish	Exec. Dir., Hunterdon Area Rural Transit	908.788.5553	788.8583
Hunterdon	John F. Callahan	Director, Hunterdon County Div. of Social Services	908.788.1300	806.4588
Hunterdon	Angelo Di Orio	Administrator, Hunterdon County Dept. of Human Services	908.788.1368	806.4204
Hunterdon	Les Varga	Hunterdon County Planning Board	908.788.1490	788.1662
Jersey City	Cheryl Allen-Munley	Jersey City, Div. Of Engineering	201.547.6986	547.4729
Middlesex	Patricia Roman	Central Jersey United Way	745.4116	247.9855
Middlesex	Jay McMurren	Central Jersey United Way	732.247.3727	247.9855
Middlesex	Angela Mackaronis	Middlesex County Board of Social Services	732.745.3500	745.4558
Middlesex/Somerset/Hunterdon	Howard Cooper	Exec. Dir., Greater Raritan WIB	732.524.3578	524.5253
Middlesex	Peter Cantu	Exec. Dir., Keep Middlesex Moving	732.745.4485	745.7482

Middlesex	Bridget Stillwell Kennedy	Middlesex County Dept. of Human Services	732.745.4228	296.7971
Middlesex	George Ververides	Director, Middlesex County Dept. of Planning	732.745.3013	745.3201
Monmouth	Henry Nicholson	Director, Monmouth County Division of Transportation	732.577.6731	845.2028
Monmouth	Kathleen Brady	Director, Monmouth County Division of Social Services	732.431.6000	431.6267
Monmouth	William Wood	Exec. Director, Monmouth County Workforce Investment Board	732.747.2282	747.7202
Monmouth	Jeff Vernick	Monmouth County Dept. of Planning	732.431.7460	409.7540
Morris	Amy Wexler	Director, Special Services Transportation	973.829.8101	326.9025
Morris	Elizabeth Lehmann	Morris County Board of Social Services	973.326.7800	326.7251
Morris/Passaic/ Warren/Sussex	Judith Scleicher	MC Rides	973.267.7600	267.6209
Morris/Sussex/ Warren	Kathy Fitzgibbons	Morris/Sussex/ Warren WIB	973.285.6880	984.0132
Morris	Frank Reilly	Morris County Board of Transportation	973.829.8101	326.9025
Morris	John Bonanni/Gary Barnett	Morris County Dept. of Human Services	973.285.6868	285.6713
Morris	Walter Krich	Director of Transportation Planning, County of Morris Dept. of Planning and Development	973.829.8101	326.9205
Newark	Fernando Rubio	City of Newark, Dept of Engineering	973.733.8417	733.4772
Newark	Daniel Akwei	Director, Mayor's Office Of Employment and Training (MOET)	733.4821	733.3690
Newark	Alfred Faiella	Deputy Mayor and Director, Dept. of Economic and Housing Development	733.6575	733.6965
Newark	Joel Freiser	Deputy Dir. Newark Economic Development Corporation	643.2790	643.8753
Newark	Spencer Ferdinand	Director, Economic Development	733.6284	733.5758
Ocean	Dave Fitzgerald	Ocean County Transportation and Vehicle Services	732.736.2082 x233	505.6963
Ocean	Kathleen Edmond	Ocean County Transportation and Vehicle Services	732.736.2082 x229	505.6963
Ocean	Rae Valentine	Ocean County Workforce Investment Board	732.240.3113	349.5627
Ocean	Beverly J. Bearmore	Director, Ocean County Board of Social Services	732.349.1500	473.0669
Ocean	Pieter Waldenmaier	Ocean County Planning Board	732.929.2054	244.8396
Passaic	Ed Lipiner	Passaic County Planning	973.881.4497	881.4484
Passaic	Gary Altman	Passaic County WIB	973.640.3400	343.7214
Passaic	Mark Schiffer	Passaic County Board of Social Services	973.881.0100	881.3232
Passaic	Bob Guarasci	NJ Community Development Corporation	973.225.0555	225.0556
Somerset	Yvonne Manfra	Somerset County Division of Transportation	732.231.7116	271.4657
Somerset	Mildred Gaupp	Director, Somerset County Board of Social Services	908.526.8800	231.9010
Somerset	Anita Perez	Ridewise of Raritan Valley	908.704.1011	704.1494
Somerset	Bob Bzik	Somerset County Planning Board	908.231.7021	707.1749
Sussex	Karen Bevans	Director, Sussex County Transit	973.579.0480	383.1124
Sussex	Samuel Seamans	Sussex County Div. of Social Services	973.383.3600	383.3627
Sussex	Tom Drabic	Sussex County Planning Board	973.579.0500	579.0513
Union	Frank Guzzo	Director, Union County Dept. of Human Services	908.527.4808	558.2562
Union	Betty Sebring	Union County Dept. of Human Services	908.527.4890	558.2562
Union	Carol Ford	WIB Admin, Union County Dept. of Human Services	908.527.2567	558.2562
Union	Charles J. Gillon	Union County Div. of Social Services	908.965.2758	965.2752
Union	Ron Weening	Union County	908.654.9409	789.1553
Warren	Jan McDyer	Warren Co. Dept. of Human Services	908.475.6332	475.6333
Warren	Henry Dinger	Warren County Welfare Board	908.475.4744	475.1533
Warren	David Dech	Warren County Planning Board	908.475.6530	475.6537
Statewide	Valerie Powers	NJ Protection and Advocacy, Inc.	609.292.9742	777.0187
Statewide	Therese Langer	RELC	973.353.5695	353.5537
Statewide	Bob Koska	NJ Transit	973.491.7376	491.7367
Statewide	Jim Lewis	NJDOT	609.530.2853	530.8044
Regional	Geneva Graham	Port Authority of NY & NJ	212.435.4069	435-5060