Discussion Points

New Jersey Department of Transportation

1. **The Transportation Trust Fund Authority FY 2006 Financial Plan includes a discussion of revenues of the Authority, including Constitutional and statutory sources. The largest Constitutional source is the Motor Fuels Tax, cited at $405 million. However, Article 8, Section 2, paragraph 4 of the State Constitution dedicates the revenue from "9 cents of" the motor fuels tax (a dynamic, not static amount) to the transportation capital system from the $580 million anticipated in the FY 2006 budget from this source. The statute establishes the amount of $405 million as a minimum.**

The total tax imposed is 10.5 cents per gallon (cpg) for gasoline and 13.5 cpg for diesel, so a reasonable interpretation of the constitutional language encompasses 85.7 percent of the tax from gasoline sales and 66.7 percent of the tax from diesel sales. Gasoline accounts for 80 percent of fuel subject to taxation. In FY 2006, if this interpretation is correct the 9 cpg dedication will generate about $475 million.

- ***Question:*** **How does the Administration interpret the constitutional language as a static amount, that is unaffected by growth in the tax?**

Constitutionally dedicated motor fuel tax revenues above the $405 million appropriated to the Transportation Trust Fund Authority are included in the $278.7 million operating subsidy provided to NJ TRANSIT. NJ Transit's operating budget funds rehabilitation and repair work that meets the constitutional requirement for dedication of motor fuel revenues.

2. **The TTFA Financial Plan for FY 2006 includes $156 million in Federal Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle bonds ("Garvee" bonds), and $1 billion in Revenue bonds.**

- ***Question:*** **Please explain why Garvee bonds are being used?**

Existing four bridges on Route 52 causeway are in poor condition. The two low level bridges included in the first Contract 'A' are in extremely poor condition with Sufficiency Rating below 5 on a scale of 0 to 100.

There are numerous and regular complaints from the public about large pieces of falling concrete from the decks of these bridges. These often result in emergency repairs and closure of lanes on this heavily traveled route.

Historically, the Department spends between $500,000 and $800,000 per year for emergency maintenance on these bridges.

In 1998, the Department spent $5 million to rehabilitate and extend the service life of these bridges. At that time, it was anticipated that the service life of the bridges could be extended another 5 years. This allowed us time to complete the design of the current bridge replacement contract.

Based on recent complaints and falling large chunks of concrete pieces from the deck, we believe that the service life of these bridges is nearly expired and replacement of the bridges is needed immediately. This causeway serves as an emergency evacuation route for Ocean City.
New Jersey's transportation infrastructure continues to deteriorate at an alarming rate

Discussion Points

and needs far outstrip available resources. The Department has a critical need to repair and rehabilitate several very large bridge rehabilitation contracts (over $100 million each) over the next several years. These projects are necessary to preserve safety and relieve congestion for the motoring public and cannot be delayed. They would consume a very large proportion of available Federal apportionments in the year they are ready for contract. If financed in a traditional pay-as-you-go manner, not only would these projects be delayed, but many other critical projects would also have to be delayed. Construction of these major repair projects would not be possible without the use of Garvee Bonds, which allow NJDOT to charge only annual debt service against available Federal apportionments rather than full construction costs. This financing technique will free up Federal funding to advance other projects when they are ready for delivery. This funding mechanism is being used only on a small number of high-cost projects that cannot be delayed.

- **Question: Could the program be funded using only conventional TTFA revenue bonds?**

No. Conventional TTFA "State contract" bonds pledge State revenues for repayment. The Route 52 bridge rehabilitation project is a Federal-aid project and the bonds will be repaid using Federal appropriations.

- ***Question:*** **What are the advantages and disadvantages, if any, to securitizing our federal highway and transit aid?**

The advantage of borrowing against Federal aid for very large projects is that NJDOT can immediately fund critical infrastructure projects that cannot afford to be delayed. These projects will improve safety and relieve congestion in key areas. Given that New Jersey's transportation infrastructure needs far outstrip available resources, these projects would be delayed unless an alternative funding strategy was developed. The disadvantage of any debt related strategy is the additional interest costs that must be repaid over the life of the borrowing. However, NJDOT has a responsibility to the public to keep our roadways safe, to relieve choking congestion, and to preserve a transportation system built by past generations, and this approach is necessary. It should be noted that Garvee bond interest rates are currently at or below 4 percent and it is likely that construction projects delayed for lack of funding will experience cost escalation of at least that amount.

- ***Question:*** **Will the issuance of Garvee bonds entail a premium over the cost of a like-sized issuance of revenue bonds? If so, what is the expected amount of that premium in each year of debt retirement? What is the total amount of the premium (expressed as a present value)?**

Again, Garvee bonds will be issued for a small number of high-cost projects that are in immediate need of repair and rehabilitation. Given the alarming rate at which this infrastructure is deteriorating and considering the need for safety improvements and congestion relief, these projects cannot be delayed, necessitating this financing mechanism. The Authority's underwriter for the planned Garvee bond sale is expecting a better interest on Garvee bonds than conventional TTFA State-contract bonds. This expectation is based on interest rates secured by other state transportation agencies that have issued Garvee bonds. However, as noted, it would not be appropriate to issue conventional TTFA State-contract bonds for a Federal-aid project in any case.

Discussion Points

3. **The Maritime Industry Fund, established pursuant to P.L. 2001, c.429, has accumulated just under $4 million since its enactment, from increased Boat Registration Fees. The fund's revenue is dedicated to projects and initiatives supporting the maritime industry.**

- ***Question:*** **Does the Office of Maritime Resources have a multi-year spending plan for the Maritime Industry Fund? If so, what are its components? What specific projects are proposed? Does it appear that the fund will accumulate sufficient revenue to accomplish dredging tasks, given the high cost of dredging activity and environmental remediation?**

The Office of Maritime Resources' Program has developed the "I BOAT NJ" program to promote, improve, and enhance the maritime industry and boating public by providing grants financed through the Maritime Industry Fund. The Office of Maritime Resources has developed this program as a multi-year spending program; grant funding is financed by the boater registration fee increases pursuant to P.L. 2002, c. 34 (N.J.S.A. 12:7-34.47). The guidelines for the program are set forth in NJAC 16:63. Under the program, a selection committee comprised of government and industry representatives review project proposals and recommend approval as appropriate. There are two grant cycles each year. Expressions of interest are accepted throughout the year with proposals reviewed twice a year in February and August.

The "I BOAT NJ" program is an extremely effective complement to State funding for the Maritime Transportation System. Funding provided for the Maritime Transportation System through the State Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) is used to coordinate and fund essential State Channel Dredging Projects with the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Coastal Engineering. The Office of Maritime Resources has structured the "I BOAT NJ" program to directly complement this TTF funding and the initial round of grants includes a number of proposals for the treatment of dredged material.

The Office of Maritime Resources continues to closely coordinate the funding from these two sources to most effectively benefit the maritime and boating communities. At this time it appears that the boat registration fees will continue to be sufficient to fund the "I BOAT NJ" grant program.

The first grant cycle was recently completed with a total of $2,565,335.00 in grants awarded to 18 projects. The selectees were announced at the annual Marine Trades Association of NJ conference on April 1, 2005. As of April 8, 2005, Maritime Resources has received 2 proposals for the next grant review in August. The following is a listing of the selectees:

BIRDSALL ENGINEERING, INC./NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP—Shark River Bay Sediment & Dredged Material Management Planning

BLUE WATER MARINA—Marina Reconstruction & Development

DAVID BEATON & SONS MARINA—Bathroom Construction with ADA Accessibility

Discussion Points

FRIENDS OF BELMAR HARBOR—Community Based Sailing Program

LAWLER, MATUSKY & SKELLY ENGINEERS, LLP—Characterization of Dredged Material in Specific Confined Disposal Facilities for Use in Federal Shore Protection & Flood Control Projects

LINCOLN HARBOR YACHT CLUB—Wake Mitigation Strategies & Dock Repair

MARINE TRADES ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY—Bring A Buddy Boating 2005

MARINE TRADES ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY—Economic Analysis of New Jersey's Marine Trades Industry

NEW JERSEY MARINE SCIENCES CONSORTIUM/SEAGRANT—Boat Ramp Condition Analysis & Guide

NEW JERSEY MARINE SCIENCES CONSORTIUM—Boater Outreach at New Jersey Marinas (Display Cases)

NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE MARINE SERVICES BUREAU—Boater Safety Programs

NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE MARINE SERVICES BUREAU—Boater Education Programs.

OCEAN AND COASTAL CONSULTANTS, INC./STONE HARBOR BOROUGH—Dredged Material Separation Technology on Nummy Island

RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY—Regional Dredged Material Management, Characterization, & Data Analysis in Coordination with NJDOT/OMR

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF MARINE & COASTAL SCIENCES—Winter Flounder Study

SHELTERED COVE MARINA—Boat Ramp Reconstruction with ADA Accessibility

Currently, funds in the Maritime Industry Fund are not being utilized for dredging although Dredged Material Management proposals were selected. Instead Maritime Resources relies on its allocation from the Capital Program Transportation Trust Fund to coordinate and fund State Channel Dredging Projects with the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Coastal Engineering.

4. **P.L. 2003, c.131 established the Safe Corridor program, under which sections of highways with high traffic volume or accident rates would be designated "Safe Corridors" and given greater focus for safety improvements. Fines for certain traffic violations in these corridors were doubled, with the additional revenue directed to the Highway Safety Fund. The act required an annual evaluation of the program's effectiveness and report of the projects funded by the Highway Safety Fund.**

Discussion Points

- *Question:* **What increased activities of local law enforcement agencies, reimbursable through this fund, have occurred since the law's implementation? Does the evaluation indicate that the program has been successful in providing revenue for transportation projects and programs? Given that the purpose of doubling fines in safe corridor areas was to influence driver behavior, has this policy been successful? If driver behavior is successfully influenced, would not the fund's revenues then decline and become less effective in supporting corridor safety measures?**

  New Jersey is the most densely populated state in the nation. It has 36,000 miles of roadway and is a crucial transportation corridor between the New York and Philadelphia metropolitan regions. NJDOT's Safety First Initiative, now beginning its third full year, is a comprehensive strategy of engineering, education and enforcement measures designed to reduce the number and severity of accidents and improve safety on New Jersey roads. As a component of Safety First, the Legislature in 2003 passed the Landmark Safe Corridors Legislation.

  Funds collected through fines issued for vehicle violations such as speeding, careless and reckless driving in Safe Corridors began being deposited in the Highway Safety Fund in February 2004. As of April 2005, $1,626,588 has been deposited in this account.

  Though not intended to be a revenue source to fund transportation projects and programs, the Department will make the funds collected from the citations issued within designated Safe Corridors available to local law enforcement agencies for special enforcement efforts associated with this program. Examples of eligible uses will include procurement of enforcement equipment such as radar units, crash data collection systems hardware and software, salaries and overtime attributed to enforcement activities of Safe Corridor locations, equipment and publications related to community safety education programs. The Department is currently finalizing an informational package that outlines the criteria for requesting reimbursement for these and other activities associated with this enforcement effort along with other details of this grant program. This information will be distributed to municipalities with designated Safe Corridors under their jurisdiction before the end of April.

  The Department's evaluation of the success of the Highway Safety program will rely heavily on accurate crash and violation citation data, which is collected by local and State law enforcement agencies. To ensure a thorough and accurate analysis of the effectiveness of the Safe Corridors program, data must be collected from these law enforcement agencies for a sufficient time period. In order to ensure that all relevant data is analyzed, NJDOT will continue to collect data through Spring 2005 and then begin a thorough analysis. Initial indications are that during the one-year period, February 2004 to February 2005, 14,244 citations were issued within a safe corridor. This effort will establish a baseline of information against which to make future determinations as to the effectiveness of this program.

  A decrease in revenues coming to the Highway Safety Fund would likely correlate to a decrease in the number of citations being issued by law enforcement officials. NJDOT would likely attribute this development to increased driver awareness through the

Discussion Points

designated Safe Corridor and a demonstration of the success of the Safe Corridors program. NJDOT expects that this would result in a decline in the number and severity of accidents in designated Safe Corridors.

NJ TRANSIT

5. Recent press reports cited remarks by state transportation officials that the lack of any funding for Trust Fund projects after FY 2006 has resulted in a different approach to capital project funding, with certain projects being delayed and more emphasis being placed on the completion of different project phases than would ordinarily be the case.

- ***Question: How has the lack of funding impacted the types and phases of rail capital projects proposed for FY 2006? What are the ramifications of the funding situation for the State's transportation capital program?***

  NJ TRANSIT's capital program is first focused on maintaining the state-of-good-repair of the State's transit system. We are not in a position to commit to construction of major expansion projects now because of the lack of committed multi-year capital funding. We are, however, advancing the planning and design effort on expansion projects in a manner that allows for segmentation so as to position NJ TRANSIT to advance expansion projects once funding is authorized.

- ***Question:*** **What amount does NJ transit expect to receive from the transit fare increase and what amount from the TTF, for operating purposes and for capital purposes, respectively? Is NJ Transit's TTF total operating subsidy increasing or decreasing compared to last year's budget?**

  At NJ TRANSIT's January 2005 Board Meeting, the agency presented it's preliminary FY 2006 Operating Budget that included a proposed $60.6 million fare increase necessary to close a projected budget gap. However, in response to the direction of Acting Governor Codey and the Board, the agency is working to identify internal efficiencies and revenue enhancements that would reduce the size of the fare increase and will present a revised proposal at its April Board Meeting.

  The agency is anticipating total TTF funding in FY 2006 of $534 million, of which $157.8 million is programmed for eligible operating budget expenses and $376.2 million for capital needs. It should be noted that TTF funding allocated to operating budget costs has been increasing annually. For FY 2006, the $157.8 million will remain flat at the FY 2005 level.

  Consistent with the Governor's Budget Message recommendation, NJ TRANSIT is assuming that FY 2006 State operating assistance will remain at the FY 2005 level of $278.7 million.

6. The President and CEO of Amtrak, David Gunn, recently informed Congress and the Amtrak Board of Directors that "... Should something happen that impacts our budget, the possibility of Amtrak facing a cash crisis in FY 2005 could quickly become very real. Any significant reduction in the infrastructure investment program will likely force Amtrak to suspend high-speed operations on the Northeast Corridor." (letter to Congress and Amtrak Board of Directors, 2/15/05). Currently, Congress has not authorized restoration

Discussion Points

of federal funding to an extent that would continue Amtrak's capital investment capability.

- ***Question: Does NJ Transit have a contingency plan in place to maintain service on the Northeast Corridor lines, in the event of a service interruption for Amtrak? If so, please describe the plan's major components and their fiscal impact. Please also provide a copy of the plan for the committee's review. If no contingency plan exists, does NJT plan to prepare one in light of the impact the current federal budget might have on Amtrak?***

  The Administration's proposed FY 2006 budget, while zeroing out funding for Amtrak, does provide $360 million to the Surface Transportation Board (STB) for the continuation of commuter rail services throughout the United States under a provision called a "directed service order." These funds are to be used by the STB to contract with third parties (including Amtrak itself) to ensure that all existing Amtrak services continue to be provided for the operation of NJ TRANSIT's commuter rail services on the Northeast Corridor. This provision also applies to commuter rail services of SEPTA, New York's LIRR, etc.

  In spite of this provision, NJ TRANSIT is concerned that the Administration budget proposal will have a substantial impact on rail services in New Jersey. For instance in the absence of Amtrak's long distance train service operating between Boston, New York and Washington, thousands of New Jerseyans will have to drive or use limited airline services for their travel needs. In addition, there is no precedent for the use of a "directed service order" to continue operations at the extensive scale of operations as that on the Northeast Corridor. It is critical that trained Amtrak employees be available to perform the work to ensure safe and reliable train operations. NJ TRANSIT is concerned on a smooth transition to Amtrak services under a "directed service order" as STB has previously used "directed service orders" only for the continuation of limited freight service during service disruptions.

  NJ TRANSIT does have contingency plans in the event of temporary service disruptions on its rail system. However, since this is not a short-term service disruption but a major change in Amtrak responsibilities, it is not an event which can be handled by a service contingency plan. More than 156,000 daily trips are taken on NJ TRANSIT trains operating on the Northeast Corridor.

  Given the difficulty of developing a contingency plan to provide equivalent service for these riders in the event of an Amtrak stoppage, NJ TRANSIT is working with our Congressional delegation and the Administration to ensure that Amtrak receives adequate Federal funds to avoid any service disruption.

<u>**Motor Vehicle Commission**</u>

7. H.R.418, the "Real ID Act of 2005" specifies driver's license standards, data systems for maintaining and sharing information, and verification systems that states would be required to establish. Some estimates indicate that the fiscal impact on states to implement and maintain the changes required in H.R.418 would total as much as $100 million each year,. The provisions of the bill have been incorporated into a pending federal FY 2005 supplemental appropriations bill, greatly increasing its chance for

Discussion Points

passage into federal law.

***Question:* To what extent and in what ways would New Jersey's driver licensing system be impacted by this proposal?**

Since September 11, 2001, New Jersey has undertaken many important and successful steps to increase the security and integrity of the driver's licenses and ID cards issued by the State. In fact, were the REAL ID Act to be enacted, New Jersey would find itself well positioned to meet many of the Act's minimum driver's license and ID issuance standards.

Enactment of the REAL ID Act will impact New Jersey's driver licensing system in several ways. The REAL ID Act would require that before issuing a driver's license or identification card to an individual, the State verify, with the issuing agency, the issuance, validity and completeness of each document presented by an applicant for identification purposes. This would require a process of communication and/or a method for verification to be implemented between the Motor Vehicle Commission and, not only all other New Jersey entities issuing identification documents, such as the Bureau of Vital Statistics, but it would require a similar communication process or verification method for similar entities in other states and with Federal agencies. It should also be noted that the Act does not specify whether "verification" of source documents is to be accomplished by electronic means, which could result in additional technological changes or enhancements to the existing Motor Vehicle Commission system.

- **Question: What is the estimated fiscal impact of compliance?**

Since major requirements of the law still need to be clarified, it is not currently possible to estimate the cost of compliance.

- **Question: Is the Commission aware of any federal funding that would be available to assist New Jersey with this mandate, if it becomes federal law?**

It has been indicated that Federal funds would be made available, but neither the amount of funding nor the requirements to qualify has been announced. MVC plans to aggressively pursue all Federal funds associated with the Act.

8. Financial information included in the Motor Vehicle Commission's (MVC) 2004 annual report shows actual and projected capital outlays for FY 2004-2006 totaling $107.7 million that have been or will be charged to the Trust Fund for MVC capital purposes established by the sale of bonds by the New Jersey Economic Development Authority. The bond sale produced $147.5 million for MVC capital needs (plus $10 million for the Judiciary for automated traffic system purposes). Based on these projections, the Trust Fund will have about $40 million remaining for MVC capital needs in FY 2007 and beyond.

The MVC received in October 2004 a study completed by Standard and Poor's on current and future facility siting and development issues.

- ***Question:* Please summarize the recommendations of this siting study.**

Discussion Points

The Siting Study recommendations are summarized in the attached Executive Summary Page of the Siting Study as presented to the Motor Vehicle Commission (MVC) in December 2004. The study provides a series of 28 recommendations for new leases to replace month-to-month leases, building and expanding Motor Vehicle Agencies on existing owned sites, adding agencies, such as Paterson, and consolidating functions where appropriate. The recommendations are designed to specify a zip code where service to the public is most needed. The software tool provided to the Commission by the consultant is a software program which we can use to evaluate a property and its value over time in a lease vs. buy or lease vs. lease cost comparison. This Property Selection Tool will guide and inform choices among specific properties available to the MVC in a given area.

- ***Question:*** **What is the projected fiscal impact on MVC revenues, operating costs and capital outlays of implementing the plan?**

The total fiscal impact in FY 2006 related to the Siting Study is \$23.7 million, \$23.3 million in capital outlays and \$400,000 in operating costs. There is no projected fiscal impact on MVC revenues from the Siting Study implementation.

Operating costs related to the Siting Study are lease payments and are projected to increase by \$400,000 in FY 2006. This is the result of a decision to replace existing month-to-month leases, to allow better access to mass transit and major throughways and to increase square footage in the Motor Vehicle agencies to accommodate more services such as the digitized driver license and more driver testing facilities.

The FY 2006 budget reflects the following capital projects which total \$23.3 million: \$6.1 million for development and construction of five new agencies on State owned land; \$5.0 million for lease fit-outs of eight agencies; \$11.7 million for improvements on six state-owned sites; and \$.5 million for the cost to fit-out a new motor vehicle agency in Paterson.

MVC Commission members accepted the Siting Study in December 2004 with the understanding that these recommendations were a guide and that further study and analysis would be needed. The total fiscal impact cannot be determined at this time because it is not clear that all of the Siting Study recommendations will be implemented. For example, the State-owned Livingston property is a site recommended for building a motor vehicle agency, however an engineering study found that the site has some wetland issues that will require further analysis and may affect the square footage of the building that the MVC hoped to construct. Standard and Poor's states in the report that: "A key issue for MVC will be the total budget available for facility acquisitions, improvements, staffing, and moving costs in the next five years and the actual costs required to implement the recommended actions that comprise the optimal portfolio." MVC will take a cost benefit approach with the most critical projects and those with the highest cost to benefits ratio being the priorities.

Discussion Points

- *Question:* **Has the MVC developed a plan to implement the study's recommendations?**

  MVC is in the beginning stages of developing an implementation plan. Approval of the plan's recommendations was obtained by the MVC Commission members in December 2004. The plan is still under analysis and review. The Siting Study provides for a five-year timeframe for implementation of all the recommendations. The MVC is also developing a five-year capital plan that will include the development of property and the maintenance of existing properties. This plan should be completed before the end of the fiscal year. The Siting Study is a working document that provides assistance and guidance but not absolutes.

- *Question:* **If so, what are the fiscal impacts of that plan, and to what extent are they reflected in the FY 2006 proposed MVC budget?**

  At this time it is difficult to assess the total fiscal impact of the Siting Study because MVC is in the initial stages of developing a five-year implementation plan. The Siting Study will require further analysis to determine if the recommendations are feasible. The total fiscal impact in FY 2006 related to the Siting Study is $23.7 million, $23.3 million in capital outlays and a $400,000 increase in operating costs. The increase in operating costs reflects changes in the lease payments. The FY 2006 budget reflects the capital outlays as follows: $6.1 million for development and construction of five new agencies on State owned land; $5.0 million for lease fit-outs of eight agencies; $11.7 million for improvements on six State-owned sites; and $.5 million for the cost to fit-out a new motor vehicle agency in Paterson.

- *Question:* **Does the Trust Fund have adequate resources for facilities costs resulting from this study? If not, how does the MVC propose to obtain additional resources?**

  At this time, MVC believes that there are sufficient resources for implementing the major objectives of the Siting Study within a fiscally responsible budgetary framework. Funding for implementing the Siting Study recommendations will be a combination of Trust Fund and operating dollars, as not all recommendations of the Study are Trust Fund eligible (i.e., leasing facilities).

Discussion Points

ATTACHMENT
Siting Study Recommendations
Executive Summary

New Leases For Month-to-Month Sites Requirements: 6,000 Square Feet

With Increased Staffing:

- Elizabeth MVA
- Springfield MVA
- South Plainfield MVA
- Morristown MVA
- Englewood MVA
- Matawan MVA
- Somerville MVA
- Newton MVA

With Current Staffing:

- Salem MVA
- Bayonne MVA

Build MVA At Existing Owned VIS

- East Brunswick MVA built at South Brunswick VIS
- Lakewood MVA built at Lakewood VIS
- Freehold MVA built at Freehold VIS
- Randolph MVA built at Randolph VIS
- Flemington MVA built at Flemington VIS but with current staffing

Additional MVAs

- Additional MVA in Riverton
- Additional MVA in Paterson
- Additional small MVA in Somerset

Site Modifications/Expansions

- Expansion of Newark MVA-VIS-DTC to offer Regional Service Center services on second floor and a parking garage
- Mini-Regional added on to expanded Cardiff MVA

Other Moves or Consolidations of Existing Sites

- Hawthorne RSC-MVA to replace Wayne RSC-MVA with increased space
- Oakland and Wyckoff MVAs consolidated into one larger MVA in Oakland and a new MVA in Little Ferry

Build a New VIS
(And in some cases move or add an MVA)

- Owned Scotch Plains VIS (6 Lanes) to replace both leased Plainfield VIS and 2 lane Westfield VIS
- Vineland 5 lane MVA-VIS on owned land to replace Vineland MVA, Bridgeton VIS and Millville VIS (MVA at 6,000 square feet but current staffing)
- Bloomfield MVA to replace Irvington & East Orange MVAs; Livingston MVA-VIS (6 lanes) to replace Montclair VIS and maintain Title 39 in Essex County
- Owned 4 lane Ridgewood VIS to replace the current leased two lane Ridgewood VIS
- Cape May owned MVA-VIS (3 lanes) to replace leased Rio Grande MVA and one lane Cape May VIS
- Port Murray MVA-VIS on owned land to replace Washington MVA and Washington VIS in Warren County.