

TRANSPORTATION

Scope of the Problem and Indicators of Need

Transportation serves as a vital resource for participation in society. By using one of a number of different transportation modes, people are able to travel to work as well as other activities, such as shopping, recreation, childcare, and medical trips that are essential to maintain a person's well-being. The effectiveness of the transportation system depends on the extent to which it provides all segments of the population the necessary mobility to access the range of activities that make up their daily lives. Developing appropriate transportation policies requires taking into account the complexity of the travel patterns of different population groups, including their need for and ability to access efficient and affordable transportation options. In order to provide a foundation for examining the state's transportation system, the following discussion examines the particular transportation needs of some of the most disadvantaged population groups – people of low-income, the elderly, people with disabilities, and rural populations. The transportation patterns of these groups are considered, as well as information about their particular challenges and needs experienced in relation to accessing needed transportation.

Low-income people often face transportation challenges related to cost and the trade-offs between expense and efficiency. National data suggests that transportation costs can represent a relatively large share of the low-income household budget. A report issued by Bureau of Transportation Statistics, using data from the Census Survey of Income and Program Participation, found that, although the working poor spent a fraction of what other workers spent on commuting expenses, these costs amounted to a significantly higher proportion of their income.¹ In total, they calculated that the working poor spent nearly 10% of their income on commuting expenses in 1999, compared with just over 2% for workers earning \$45,000 or more per year, and 3.9% for all working Americans. The report also found that the working poor who drove their own vehicles spent a higher percentage of their income on commuting (21%) than those who used public transportation (13%). Low-income people are less likely to be able to afford the costs required to own and operate a private car, and while public transportation may provide a more economical option, it does not always provide an effective and efficient means of getting where they need to go. In particular, low-income single mothers often face transportation needs combining travel to work, childcare, and other locations to meet household obligations. These complex travel patterns require transportation options that can allow them to link trips between different locations efficiently.²

The working poor are more likely than higher income workers to use alternative commuting modes such as public transportation, carpooling, biking and walking. Census

¹ Commuting Expenses: Disparity for the Working Poor. Issue Brief Number 1. Bureau of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation. March 2003.

² Evelyn Blumenberg, "Engendering Effective Planning: Spatial Mismatch, Low-Income Women, and Transportation Policy," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Summer 2004, Vol. 70, No. 3, pp. 269-281.

analysis of data on the commuting patterns of New Jersey workers reveals that low-income workers are less likely to drive alone to work and more likely to use other means of transportation than workers earning at or above 150% of the official poverty level. As the table below shows, both for workers below the federal poverty level (100% of the poverty level) and between the federal poverty level and 150% of the official poverty level, just under 50% in each group drove alone to work compared to almost 75% for the group at or above 150% of the poverty level. On the other hand, the share of low-income workers using public transportation was almost double the rate of workers earning 150% or more of the poverty level. Similarly, low-income workers were much more likely to carpool and walk to work than those at or above 150% of the poverty level.

Means of Transportation to Work by Poverty Status for New Jersey Workers (poverty status is identified by place of residence)				
Mode of Transportation*	Total	Below 100 Percent of the Poverty Level	100 to 149 percent of the Poverty Level	At or Above 150 Percent of the Poverty Level
Drove Alone	72.8	49.5	49.5	74.7
Carpooled	9.3	16.2	14.2	8.8
Public Transportation	10.3	18.1	18.7	9.6
Walked	3.1	9.4	10.5	2.5
Total	100	100	100	100
Source: U.S. Census, American Community Survey 2005				

*Note: Taxicab, Motorcycle, & Bicycle and Worked at Home categories have been excluded from the table.

When transportation patterns are examined by dollar income rather than income as a percent of the poverty level, the same contrasting use of private cars versus public transportation is revealed. A little more than 63% of workers 16 years and over who earned less than \$25,000 drove alone to work, compared to 78% of those who earned between \$25,000 and \$50,000 and 77% of those who earned \$50,000 or more. On the other hand, low-income workers were more likely to use public transportation to commute to work than those workers earning between \$25,000 and \$65,000. Workers earning between \$65,000 and \$75,000 were as likely as low-income workers to use public transportation, while workers earning \$75,000 or more were more likely to use public transportation. This is probably a result of the large number of high-income workers who use public transportation to travel to work in New York City.³ For low-income workers relying on public transportation to travel from home to work within New Jersey, particularly those traveling from low-cost urban residential areas to suburban areas of job growth, the relative inflexibility of public transportation compared with private cars can make travel difficult.

³ US Census. American Community Survey 2005. Dollar amounts are 2005 inflation adjusted dollars.

Elderly New Jerseyans are another disadvantaged group that faces unique challenges in terms of reliable and affordable transportation. National research has shown that the elderly are extremely dependent on the private automobile as a means of transportation. A 2003 study from the Brookings Institution identified a trend of “extreme dependence” on private cars, either as passengers or drivers, among most older people, regardless of where they live.⁴ Nationally, almost 90 percent of all trips made by the over-65 population are by private automobile.⁵ Only the 40 to 64 year age group makes a larger share of all their trips by private car, and then by less than one percent more. In terms of commuting to work, almost 74% of older workers drive alone to work, a rate similar to that of the overall working population.⁶ Conversely, the older population is less likely to use public transportation, and only 6% of older workers commute via public transportation, a much lower rate than any other age group or the statewide average.⁷ Most of the public transportation trips the elderly make are by bus.

Despite the trends of dependence on private automobile transportation, more than one-fifth (21%) of the over-65 population do not drive.⁸ Rates of elderly non-drivers are particularly high among the over-65 population living in rural communities and sprawling suburbs, in households with no cars, and for older African-Americans, Latinos and Asian-Americans. While just 16% of the over-65 white population do not drive, 42% of elderly African-Americans, 39% of elderly Latinos, and 45% of elderly Asian-Americans do not drive. The consequence of these combined trends of dependence on automobile transportation and the inability to drive is the reality that more than half of the non-driving over-65 population stays home on any given day because they lack transportation options. Over a third of the total over-65 Latinos, African-Americans and Asian-Americans populations stay home on any given day as compared to just 22 percent of all elderly white people.

The large numbers of elderly who cannot drive means that they have a decreased ability to participate in the community and the economy. Compared with older drivers, older non-drivers make 15 percent fewer trips to the doctor, 59 percent fewer shopping trips and visits to restaurants, and 65 percent fewer trips for social, family and religious activities.⁹

People with disabilities experience the same transportation needs as the general population, but the accessibility limitations of the transportation system may restrict the transportation options of people with disabilities and, in turn, their ability to conduct their

⁴ Sandra Rosenbloom. *The Mobility Needs of Older Americans: Implications for Transportation Authorization*. The Brookings Institution Series on Transportation Reform. Washington D.C. July 2003.

⁵ John Pucher and John L. Renne. *Socioeconomics of Urban Travel: Evidence from the 2001 NHTS*. *Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 49-77. Summer 2003.

⁶ U.S. Census, *American Community Survey 2005*.

⁷ U.S. Census, *American Community Survey 2005*.

⁸ Linda Bailey. *Aging Americans: Stranded Without Options*. Surface Transportation Policy Project. April 2004.

⁹ Linda Bailey. *Aging Americans: Stranded Without Options*. Surface Transportation Policy Project. April 2004.

work and social lives. A national survey conducted by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics in 2002 examined the impact of transportation on the work and social lives of the disabled and the extent to which such impact is unique to the disabled population.¹⁰ Among the pertinent findings, the study reported that more than half of the 3.5 million homebound population (1.9 million) were people with disabilities. About 23% of the disabled population needed some sort of assistance or equipment to travel outside the home, such as a cane, crutches, a walker, assistance from another person or manual wheelchair. In addition, the study reported that 12% of the disabled had difficulty getting the transportation they needed, compared to just 3% of the non-disabled population. Findings on the use of personal motor vehicles showed considerable differences between the disabled and non-disabled populations, with lower rates of access to household vehicles among people with disabilities; and variance between the transportation experiences of people with and without disabilities spanned various types of transportation.

As among the elderly, the barriers to effective transportation experiences by people with disabilities have a significant impact on access to social resources and involvement. A survey of the transportation patterns and challenges of 800 people living in a homecare program in Contra Costa County, California, confirmed that seniors and the disabled abandon social, religious, and recreational trips first when they have to rely on rides from others.¹¹ Asked to identify locations to which they could not go in the previous month because they lacked transportation, about 28% answered that they could not get to a family member's or friend's home because they had no way to get there, 26% said they had no way to get to a grocery store, 23% to a doctor or hospital, 20% to a drugstore, 19% to a place of worship, and 15% to a social or community center.

While no New Jersey-specific data is available to examine the particular challenges of people with disabilities in our state, the preceding information from national studies and other states illustrates the transportation needs experienced by people with disabilities and the importance of a public transportation system that can accommodate the access needs of people with limited mobility.

A final disadvantaged population that must be considered in reviewing transportation problems and needs is people living in rural areas. Rural populations, because there are fewer people and they are more widely spread out, face many transportation difficulties not encountered by people living in more dense urban environments. These problems are especially acute for the rural poor and the rural elderly and disabled.

Research for the U.S. as a whole in 2005 shows that, although the rural population made slightly fewer trips per day than the urban population, they traveled considerably

¹⁰ Freedom To Travel. US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics. BTS03-08. Washington D.C. 2003.

¹¹ Annie Decker. To Drive Or Not To Drive: For Some Disabled and Elderly, That's Not Exactly the Question. The Next American City. May 2006.

longer distances each day.¹² The differences are especially apparent for low-income people (earning less than \$20,000), who traveled 59% more miles per day than their urban counterparts. Similarly, rural households in every age category traveled longer distances each day than the same urban household age groups, with the most pronounced differences between the rural and urban elderly populations.

Given the lack of public transportation options in rural areas and the need to travel long distances, rural households are more likely to own a car than their urban counterparts and, thus, to travel by car. Only 11% of rural households with less than \$20,000 in earnings did not own a car compared with almost 27% of urban households. Even rural households with no cars still make 64% of their trips by car, with two-thirds of these either as driver or passenger in vehicles with two or more passengers. Where one or more cars are available, rural households made almost 91% of their trips by car, including rural households with less than \$20,000 in earnings who make almost 90% of their trips by car. A similar percentage of the rural elderly (92%) use cars as their mode of travel.

The lack of access to good public transportation in New Jersey's rural areas is particularly challenging for people with disabilities. A recent study by the Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center at Rutgers University, which examined the relationship between where people with disabilities live relative to available transportation options, found that "transit services are far more accessible to residents living in the state's urbanized counties than for those living in rural counties."¹³ The study showed that, among disabled residents who go outside the home, more than 90% in the urban counties of Bergen, Camden, Essex, Hudson, Passaic and Union live within the Access Link service boundary, while this is true for less than 50% of these residents in the more rural Hunterdon, Salem, Somerset, Sussex, and Warren counties.¹⁴ The lack of accessible Access Link options disproportionately affects the rural disabled. For a disabled person who lives in a rural community and cannot use a standard automobile, it is more than likely that s/he will not be able to share rides with neighbors or relatives with private cars, take taxis, ride bikes or use the regular public transportation system. This person will probably require a special accessible vehicle, which is likely to be expensive.

In order to adequately address the need for adequate, efficient and affordable transportation, New Jersey's transportation programs and policies must address the scope of transportation challenges and needs experienced by people of low income, the elderly, people with disabilities and rural populations. While transportation patterns of these groups vary, the importance of accessible and efficient public transportation to meet their transportation needs is consistent and such a system must respond to the particular needs and challenges of these groups.

¹² John Pucher and John L. Renne. Rural Mobility and Mode Choice: Evidence from the 2001 NHTS. Transportation. Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 165-186. March 2005.

¹³ Meeting the Employment Transportation Needs of People with Disabilities in New Jersey. Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. January 2005.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

Transportation Programs

Table of Contents

New Jersey Transit	7
Department of Human Services Transportation Programs.....	17
Vanpools.....	19
Transportation Trust Fund Capital Development Programs.....	20

Note: Some services related to Transportation are also related to other need areas and are addressed under other sections of this report, including Disabilities, Health, Housing, and Community and Economic Development.

Detailed Program Information

New Jersey Transit

Program Purpose and Description:

New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) operates public transportation services in hundreds of municipalities statewide, and is the nation's third largest provider of bus, rail, and light rail transit.¹⁵ As of 2005, it operated or contracted to operate 238 bus routes, 11 commuter rail lines, and 3 light rail lines, connecting 20,000 bus stops, 162 rail stations and 52 light rail stations.¹⁶ In FY05, almost two-thirds (66.1%) of passenger trips were on buses, although the highest percentage (66.2%) of passenger miles were by rail.¹⁷ Ten percent of New Jersey workers, twice the national average, use public transportation to go to work. New Jersey is home to five of the nation's top twenty highest transit use cities. Overall, the state is second only to New York in transit use.¹⁸

Fares charged to riders vary by the type of transportation, the distance of travel, and the age and disability status of the rider. Bus fares are determined based on the number of zones through which a trip passes. One-way adult bus fares generally¹⁹ start at \$1.25 for travel in 1 zone, with fares for children, seniors (age 62+), and individuals with disabilities starting at \$0.60. Fares for rail and light rail vary, but are generally higher than bus fares while also offering discounted fares for children, seniors, and individuals with disabilities. In order to obtain reduced fares for all three forms of transportation, seniors and individuals with disabilities who do not have a Medicare card must apply for a Reduced Fare ID/Card. Reduced fares provide discounts for one-way and round-trip tickets, but no additional discounts are available on 10-trip discount packages or monthly passes. NJ Transit offers a variety of other discounts to commuters,²⁰ students, and families, as well as collaborating with DHS to provide transportation assistance to WFNJ and post-WFNJ recipients.²¹

NJ Transit also offers some programs and services designed to accommodate the specific needs of some vulnerable populations, including people with disabilities and senior citizens, but these programs are limited. Currently, only 41% of NJ Transit rail stations (66 out of 162) are wheelchair accessible. While 99% of local bus routes have lift-equipped buses on every trip, some commuter buses and routes served by private

¹⁵ *NJ Transit Annual Report 2004*, p. 4.

¹⁶ *NJ Transit Facts at a Glance for FY05*, p. 1.

¹⁷ *NJ Transit Facts at a Glance for FY05*, p. 1.

¹⁸ *Blue Ribbon Commission Report: Recommendations for Ensuring a Strong Transportation Network for the 21st Century, a Report to Governor James E. McGreevy and the New Jersey Legislature*, November 2003, p. 20.

¹⁹ The Southern-Interstate Fare Chart starts at \$1.30 for adult one-way fares in 1 zone and the Northern Intra-Commuter Fare Chart does not include travel restricted to 1 zone.

²⁰ BusinessPass allows commuters who work for participating employers to deduct a portion of their monthly pass costs from their pre-tax wages and PatronPass allows businesses to purchase one-way bus and train tickets in bulk (at no discount) for employees.

²¹ See the program description for DHS Transportation Programs following in this chapter.

carriers require an advance reservation for accessible service.²² As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), NJ Transit also operates a paratransit service known as Access Link for people whose disabilities prevent them from getting on and off of buses unassisted, or in other situations where disabilities prevent use of ordinary bus services.²³ Access Link requires reservations 1-14 days in advance of a ride. Coverage area is determined by local bus routes. No train lines and only about 61% of the state's bus lines are shadowed by Access Link.²⁴ There is Access Link service to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, but no Access Link or similar service from any point in New Jersey to any point in New York City.²⁵

Additionally, NJ Transit is involved with the state's county paratransit system, which provides community-based transportation services to people with disabilities, seniors, and in some cases other populations, including WFNJ recipients.²⁶ These services are administered by counties or municipalities and have varying policies regarding hours of operation, acceptable trip purposes, and fares. Many counties provide rides free of charge. Hours of operation are generally limited, and most counties do not provide inter-county service.²⁷

Budget and Performance Trends:

New Jersey Transit provides publicly available reports with a great deal of detailed information regarding service numbers and funding levels in addition to the information provided in the state budget materials. While the funding information in these sources primarily matches the information in the state materials, there are some significant variations due to differences in what is being counted in the two sources. Specific differences are discussed in notes following the appropriate tables on the following pages.

The state budget materials provide detailed information regarding service numbers and various cost measures for bus and rail operations, and well as appropriation lines for state funds and federal funds. The departmental budget also indicates total cost offsets from farebox revenues and from other revenue sources that subsidize the operational budget for public transportation. In addition to this information regarding NJ Transit's operational budget, the state budget materials also provide information regarding funding for capital projects. Both state and federal funding distributed through the Transportation Trust Fund for public transportation is reported in the appendix to the Budget Book. The Appropriations Bill also delineates all capital projects funded through the FY07 appropriation from the Transportation Trust Fund.

²² http://www.njtransit.com/as_rail_access.shtml; http://www.njtransit.com/as_bus_access.shtml.

²³ http://www.njtransit.com/as_al.shtml.

²⁴ Figure was estimated by comparing the number of routes (144) in *Bus Routes Shadowed by Access Link* (NJ Transit website), with the number of bus routes (240) operated or contracted by NJ Transit as of June, 2004. *NJ Transit At A Glance Fiscal Year 2004 (p.1)*.

²⁵ Conversation with NJ Transit representative, November 8, 2004.

²⁶ http://www.njtransit.com/as_paratransit.shtml.

²⁷ <http://www.njcost.com/schedule.htm>.

In addition to the information on bus and rail operations and funding, NJ Transit documents provide some evaluation data for the Access Link ADA Paratransit Program, although no separate published budget data is available for this program. The NJ Transit documents also provide a capital budget for FY05 and FY06.

Department of Transportation - Public Transportation Evaluation Data				
	Actual FY04	Actual FY05	Revised FY06	Estimated FY07
Bus operations (including subsidized carriers) ²⁸				
Average daily ridership	250,075	259,475	256,600	273,700
Total cost/trip/rider	\$3.72	\$3.99	\$3.97	\$4.06
Total revenue/trip/rider	\$1.84	\$1.73	\$1.87	\$1.90
Total cost/mile	\$7.43	\$8.14	\$7.83	\$8.52
Total revenue/mile	\$3.68	\$3.52	\$3.69	\$3.98
Revenue/cost ratio	49.6%	43.3%	47.2%	46.7%
Buses operated by NJ Transit	2,158	2,038	2,049	2,122
Buses leased to private carriers	1,010	968	968	968
Rail operations				
Average daily ridership	113,625	118,450	119,000	126,300
Total cost/trip/rider	\$9.49	\$9.51	\$9.40	\$9.53
Total revenue/trip/rider	\$5.05	\$5.66	\$5.28	\$6.04
Total cost/mile	\$10.89	\$10.77	\$10.56	\$11.28
Total revenue/mile	\$6.49	\$6.05	\$6.65	\$7.09
Revenue/cost ratio	59.6%	56.2%	63.0%	62.8%
Rail passenger cars	867	944	961	934
NJ Transit System (average of bus and rail)				
Average daily ridership	382,025	400,450	402,500	434,700
Total cost/trip/rider	\$5.49	\$5.64	\$5.62	\$5.66
Total revenue/trip/rider	\$2.89	\$2.69	\$2.94	\$2.94
Total cost/mile	\$8.76	\$9.07	\$8.86	\$9.52
Total revenue/mile	\$4.60	\$4.33	\$4.64	\$4.95
Revenue/cost ratio (including overhead costs)	52.6%	47.8%	52.3%	52.0%
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-395, D-396)				

Note – The ridership numbers in this table are significantly lower than the ridership indicated in the NJ Transit materials because the above data indicates average weekday round trips (or people using the system), while NJ Facts At A Glance reflects average weekday one-way passenger trips. The bus and light rail data are also combined, while these data are broken out in the NJ Facts At A Glance data.

²⁸ Note – The State Budget Book data for bus operations include light rail operations data.

NJ Transit Ridership Evaluation Data		
Service Data	FY04	FY05
Bus – total annual trips	148,054,700	153,448,300
<i>Avg. weekday trips</i>	<i>500,150</i>	<i>518,950</i>
<i>Avg. Saturday trips</i>	<i>264,700</i>	<i>268,850</i>
<i>Avg. Sunday trips</i>	<i>158,800</i>	<i>167,300</i>
Rail – total annual trips	62,185,400	64,933,600
<i>Avg. weekday trips</i>	<i>227,250</i>	<i>236,900</i>
<i>Avg. Saturday trips</i>	<i>76,550</i>	<i>79,700</i>
<i>Avg. Sunday trips</i>	<i>58,250</i>	<i>62,400</i>
Light Rail – total annual trips	9,895,200	13,701,800
<i>Avg. weekday trips</i>	<i>36,550</i>	<i>45,050</i>
<i>Avg. Saturday trips</i>	<i>19,100</i>	<i>24,700</i>
<i>Avg. Sunday trips</i>	<i>13,800</i>	<i>18,000</i>
Total annual passenger trips	220,100,000	232,100,000
Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04 and FY05		

NJ Transit FY05 Operating Cost Recovery					
	Revenues			Expenses	Recovery Ratio
	Passenger Revenues	Other Revenues	Total Revenues		
Bus	\$245,100,000	\$8,400,000	\$253,500,000	\$471,800,000	53.7%
Rail	\$297,700,000	\$40,000,000	\$337,700,000	\$549,900,000	61.4%
Light Rail	\$11,700,000	\$1,400,000	\$13,100,000	\$47,800,000	27.4%
System-wide (including administrative costs)	\$558,100,000	\$68,200,000	\$626,300,000	\$1,436,400,000	43.6%
Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04					

Note – The expenses and recovery ratios reported in this table differ from the revenue/cost ratio reported in the State Budget Book evaluation data because the two sources deal differently with certain reimbursable costs and administrative expenses. The State Budget Book excludes certain reimbursable costs that are paid directly out of specific state and federal grants, since these reimbursable costs are generally unrelated to the delivery of services, while the Facts At A Glance data include all agency expenses to conform with accounting principles. The State Budget Book

also allocates certain administrative costs to each mode of transportation (Bus²⁹ and Rail), while the Facts At A Glance data includes administrative expenses only in the system-wide data.

NJ Transit FY04 Operating Cost Recovery					
	Revenues			Expenses	Recovery Ratio
	Passenger Revenues	Other Revenues	Total Revenues		
Bus	\$237,100,000	\$8,200,000	\$245,300,000	\$437,600,000	56.1%
Rail	\$287,800,000	\$34,800,000	\$322,600,000	\$527,400,000	61.2%
Light Rail	\$8,900,000	\$1,100,000	\$10,000,000	\$40,700,000	24.6%
System-wide (including administrative costs)	\$537,200,000	\$99,500,000	\$636,700,000	\$1,326,600,000	48.0%

Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04

Note – This historical operating costs data is provided for comparison purposes.

Access Link ADA Paratransit Program Evaluation Data		
Service Data	FY04	FY05
Annual passenger trips	470,997	537,455
Avg. weekday passenger trips	1,591	1,817
Avg. Saturday passenger trips	626	748
Avg. Sunday passenger trips	445	494
Annual passenger miles	3,600,000	4,100,000
Annual vehicle revenue miles	6,300,000	7,100,000

Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04 & FY05

²⁹ The data reported for the bus transportation mode includes light rail.

Department of Transportation - Public Transportation Operations Appropriations Data						
	Orig. & -- Supple. FY05	Total FY05 Available	Expended FY05	FY06 Adj. Approp.	Req./Recomm. FY07	Actual Approp. FY07
Railroad and Bus Operations (grants-in-aid)	\$1,436,387,000	\$1,436,387,000	\$1,436,387,000	\$1,413,200,000	\$1,531,000,000	\$1,531,000,000
<i>Farebox Revenue</i>	<i>(\$558,059,000)</i>	<i>(\$558,059,000)</i>	<i>(\$558,059,000)</i>	<i>(\$623,100,000)</i>	<i>(\$666,200,000)</i>	<i>(\$666,200,000)</i>
<i>Other Resources</i>	<i>(\$599,628,000)</i>	<i>(\$599,628,000)</i>	<i>(\$599,628,000)</i>	<i>(\$516,200,000)</i>	<i>(\$564,100,000)</i>	<i>(\$564,100,000)</i>
<i>Total Grants-In-Aid (State)</i>	<i>\$278,700,000</i>	<i>\$278,700,000</i>	<i>\$278,700,000</i>	<i>\$273,700,000</i>	<i>\$300,700,000</i>	<i>\$300,700,000</i>
Railroad and Bus Operations (state aid)	\$25,287,000	\$25,287,000	\$25,287,000	\$34,352,000	\$34,930,000	\$34,930,000
<i>State Aid – CRF³⁰</i>	<i>\$25,287,000</i>	<i>\$25,287,000</i>	<i>\$25,287,000</i>	<i>\$34,352,000</i>	<i>\$34,930,000</i>	<i>\$34,930,000</i>
Total State Funding for Railroad and Bus Operations	\$303,987,000	\$303,987,000	\$303,987,000	\$308,052,000	\$335,630,000	\$335,630,000*

Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-396-D-397) & FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 187. 188)

* Note – While this table includes information provided in the state budget materials regarding all revenues that fund operating costs, the state total reflects only the total for the two appropriations derived from state revenues: Grants-in-aid and State Aid – Casino Revenue Funds (CRF). Increases in both of these funding lines are discussed in the following additional analysis section. *The Appropriations Bill does not include a calculated sum of appropriated state aid and grants-in-aid line-items; the indicated sum is calculated by the author.

Special Transportation Trust Fund (Capital Projects)³¹ Appropriations Data					
Orig. & -- Supple. FY05	Total FY05 Available	Expended FY05	FY06 Adj. Approp.	Req./Recomm. FY07	Actual Approp. FY07
\$606,597,000	\$608,897,000	\$599,631,000	\$534,000,000	\$675,000,000	\$675,000,000

Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-397) & FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 185)

³⁰ This appropriation funds the Transportation Assistance for Senior Citizens and Disabled Residents.

³¹ Note – The budget line item is referred to as “Trust Fund Authority – Revenues and other funds available for new projects.”

Note – This funding is also reflected in the Transportation Trust Fund table as “State Transportation Fund Authority.”

Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) Public Transportation Projects				
	FY05 Expended	FY06 Adjusted Appropriation	FY07 Request / Recommended	FY07 Appropriated
State Transportation Funding Authority	\$599,631,000	\$534,000,000	\$675,000,000	\$675,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	\$416,390,000	\$492,792,000	\$635,344,000	\$579,604,000
Total Public Transportation Funding - TTF³²	\$1,016,021,000	\$1,026,792,000	\$1,310,344,000	\$1,254,604,000
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. H-67) & FY06 Appropriations Bill S3000 (p.185, p.269)				

NJ Transit Board Approved Operating Budget		
Expense/Revenue	FY05 Approved Budget	FY06 Approved Budget
Labor & fringes	(\$807,500,000)	(\$856,100,000)
Fuel, power & materials	(\$166,600,000)	(\$190,100,000)
Purchased transportation	(\$151,200,000)	(\$155,100,000)
Other	(\$216,900,000)	(\$211,700,000)
Total Expenses	(\$1,342,200,000)	(\$1,413,000,000)
Passenger fares	\$558,900,000	\$623,100,000
Other revenue	\$59,800,000	\$64,500,000
State operating assistance	\$278,700,000	\$278,700,000
Capital transfer – operating/maintenance	\$356,000,000	\$356,000,000
Other state/federal reimbursements	\$88,800,000	\$90,700,000
Total Revenues	\$1,342,200,000	\$1,413,000,000
Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04 and FY05		

Note – The total revenues for operations reflect the total in the state budget materials, with the exception of the State Aid funding from the Casino Revenue funds, which funds transportation services for the elderly and disabled.

³² Totals calculated by author.

NJ Transit Board Approved FY05 Capital Program		
Expense/Revenue	FY05 Approved Budget	FY06 Approved Budget
Operating/maintenance	(\$356,000,000)	(\$356,400,000)
Debt service	(\$300,900,000)	(\$311,100,000)
Pass-through	(\$114,500,000)	(\$66,300,000)
Rail infrastructure improvements	(\$252,900,000)	(\$177,300,000)
Rail station improvements	(\$76,500,000)	(\$87,600,000)
Park & Ride improvements	(\$7,500,000)	(\$15,600,000)
Bus/light rail state of good repair	(\$18,000,000)	(\$28,200,000)
System Expansion	---	(\$26,000,000)
Systemwide improvements	(\$62,100,000)	(\$78,700,000)
Total Expenditures	(\$1,188,000,000)	(\$1,147,000,000)
Federal Transit Administration	\$518,000,000	\$492,000,000
NJ Transportation Trust Fund	\$606,600,000	\$534,000,000
Port Authority of NY and NJ	\$43,000,000	\$10,000,000
Local match/other	\$20,000,000	\$111,000,000
Total Resources	\$1,188,000,000	\$1,147,000,000
Source: NJ Transit Facts at a Glance FY04 and FY05		

Note – The line item for “operating/maintenance” is also reflected in the preceding Operating Budget table as “capital transfer - operating/maintenance,” indicating that a significant portion of the operations funding reported in the state budget materials as “other resources” derives from a transfer of capital projects funding to cover operating and maintenance costs. The NJ Transit Capital Projects budget includes relatively small resource provided by the Port Authority and local match/other sources, in addition to the Federal Transit Administration and NJ Transportation Trust Fund (State Transportation Funding Authority) capital funding reported in the Trust Fund Authority budget in the state budget materials.

Additional Analysis:

State investment in transportation increased significantly in FY07, due primarily to two increases. The grant-in-aid operating subsidy for NJ Transit was increased by \$27 million. The expressed purpose for this increase, as described in budget materials, is to expand the availability of mass transit, including the addition and expansion of bus, rail, and light rail service. The additional \$90 million increase in capital appropriation for the Transportation Trust Fund is discussed in the discussion of TTF Capital Development Programs later in this chapter.³³

³³ The use of increased funds is discussed in language in the State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-385).

A smaller, but still significant funding increase is the \$600,000 increase in Casino Revenue Fund state aid to NJ Transit. The Casino Revenue Fund appropriations for Public Transportation go to fund services for elderly passengers and passengers with disabilities. Fifteen percent of this casino revenue fund money is retained by NJ Transit to contribute towards services for passengers with disabilities, while the remaining 85% is distributed by NJ Transit to counties for community-based transportation services, including county paratransit. Access Link services cost \$23.2 million in FY04, of which \$1.0 million was collected in passenger fares.³⁴

³⁴ Telephone and e-mail communication with NJ Transit employee in March 2004. No more recent information could be obtained by the time of publication.

Department of Human Services Transportation Programs

Program Purpose and Description:

The Department of Human Services (DHS) operates three programs in cooperation with NJ Transit to assist welfare recipients in obtaining transportation to and from work. Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) participants can receive free monthly commuter passes and tickets on NJ Transit buses and trains through the WorkPass program. WorkPass enables participants to commute to job-related activities such as job training and education, employment opportunities, and childcare, as well as medical visits and shopping, through provision of monthly unlimited ride passes. Discounted tickets are also available for children ages 5-11 years, while children under 4 years ride free when accompanied by a fare-paying adult. Any government-sponsored program can provide these benefits to their participants by enrolling in the WorkPass program.

As part of the WorkPass program, NJ Transit offers WFNJ caseworkers a transit-training program that trains caseworkers in helping clients determine the best NJ Transit routes to travel, based on the participants' needs. The training includes classroom instruction, an instruction video on public transit, extensive commuter travel information, a transit-training manual, and resource materials such as posters, timetables and route maps. Caseworkers can use these resources to educate WFNJ participants on how to use public transportation most effectively.

NJ Transit, in cooperation with DHS, also offers transitional transportation benefits for former WFNJ clients who are employed at least 20 hours per week. This program, titled Get a Job! Get a Ride!, provides free bus or rail passes for one month to WFNJ recipients leaving welfare for work. This pass is restricted to 2 travel zones, rather than the 9 zones in the WorkPass programs. Applications for the pass must be submitted within 1 to 3 months of closing a WFNJ case. To be eligible, an applicant can not have received a free Get a Job! Get a Ride! pass within the previous 12 months.³⁵

The Extended WorkPass program is available to post-Temporary Assistance to Needy Families/Work First New Jersey (TANF/WFNJ) participants who need transportation assistance to be able to continue employment.³⁶ The Extended WorkPass can be used with the same zones and modes of transportation as a regular WorkPass and is available for up to 6 months. To be eligible, former TANF/WFNJ clients must have left the TANF program within the last 24 months and be employed at least 20 hours per week.³⁷

³⁵ <http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/WORKPASS.HTM>; Division of Family Development Program Instruction No. 03-6-3, Division of Family Development, New Jersey Department of Human Services.

³⁶ <http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/WORKPASS.HTM>.

³⁷ Division of Family Development Program Instruction No. 03-6-3, Division of Family Development, New Jersey Department of Human Services.

Budget and Performance Trends:

The state budget materials do not include service information for the DHS transportation programs. Information provided by NJ Transit staff indicates that, on average, the WorkPass program issues approximately 5,000 transit passes a month, while the Get A Job! Get A Ride! program issues approximately 100 passes a month.³⁸ Funding information in the state budget materials is limited to a single line item for the transportation expenses of current WFNJ participants (the Work Pass program).

WFNJ Training Related Expenses (TREs)					
Orig. & --Supple. FY05	Total FY05 Available	Expended FY05	FY06 Adjusted Approp.	Request/ Recommend FY07	Actual Approp. FY07
\$12,905,000	\$13,121,000	\$7,276,000	\$14,013,000	\$14,013,000	\$14,013,000
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-239) & FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 126)					

Note – This information is duplicated under the discussion of WFNJ-TANF in the Income Security chapter of this report.

³⁸ Information provided by NJ Transit staff via e-mail communication, November 9, 2006.

Vanpools

Program Purpose and Description:

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (DOT) encourages and facilitates the operation of commuter vanpools, which provide transportation to and from work for up to 15 people. Vanpools generally involve fees for participants. These fees usually approximate the amount a solo driver would pay for gas and have the advantage of reducing other car-related costs such as vehicle maintenance and depreciation. Examples of independently operated vanpools include: third-party vanpools, operated by for-profit vendors; employer-sponsored vanpools, that may or may not be employer-subsidized and are operated by employers; and owner-operated vanpools, owned by one or more of the group's members. Vanpools are available to any interested commuter and are encouraged for commuters who live 15 or more miles from their place of employment.

Vanpools are not a means-tested program. New Jersey Transit does offer a sponsorship program in areas where the agency has determined that public transportation is either unavailable or not feasible. Eligible vanpool groups may receive up to \$175 per month by applying through local Transportation Management Associations (TMA's), and this sponsorship may be used to reduce the fees charged to participants. TMA's are nonprofit organizations comprising employers and government entities in given regions that are organized to solve local transportation issues. Vanpool groups that use the high occupancy vehicle lane (HOV) during peak commuting hours can qualify for an additional \$325 a month sponsorship. Sponsored groups must provide some documentation to demonstrate eligibility. In addition to this direct aid, DOT also provides assistance in locating vanpools through a ridesharing application available on the DOT website.³⁹

Budget and Performance Trends:

The majority of costs for vanpools are born by participants and/or private employers. There is no line-item allocation for the Vanpool Sponsorship Program in the State FY07 Budget Book, Senate Appropriations Bill, or Appropriations Handbook, and no evaluation data on the numbers of vanpools or commuters served. Information provided by NJ Transit staff indicates that the Vanpool Sponsorship Program included approximately 150 participating vanpools as of September 2005.⁴⁰

³⁹ http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/commuter/rideshare/vanpool.shtm#njtransit;http://www.njtransit.com/cs_sales_vanpool.shtm.

⁴⁰ Information provided by NJ Transit staff via e-mail communication, October 3, 2005. No more recent data was available at the time of printing.

Transportation Trust Fund Capital Development Programs

Program Purpose and Description:

The New Jersey Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) provides funding to counties and local areas for transportation projects through a variety of programs, in addition to providing state and federal capital funding for public transportation projects.⁴¹ While not targeted to low-income areas or projects serving specific needs of low-income people, these projects provide the capital investment in state transportation infrastructure that is necessary to maintain that infrastructure. Such investment can be very important for the working poor, who frequently have to commute long distances between places of job growth and limited available affordable housing.

TTF, also known as the Special Transportation Trust Fund, is divided into three types of funding streams, in addition to the funding for public transit discussed earlier in this chapter. State Highway Funds provide state funding for transportation improvements to the state highway system and represent the largest investment of state TTF funding, other than investment in public transportation. Local Highway Funds⁴² provide state funding for improvements to municipal and county roads. The majority of this funding is equally divided between county aid and municipal aid, with a smaller discretionary aid portion reserved for emergent or regional needs. County aid is distributed to the state's 21 counties according to a formula involving population and road mileage. Counties are also required to develop an Annual Transportation Program (ATP), identifying projects and costs. The distribution of municipal aid is primarily through a competitive application process, although smaller portions of this funding are available for municipalities qualifying for urban aid,⁴³ and designated funding is allotted to Jersey City and Newark.⁴⁴ Finally, federal funding administered through the TTF provides funding for projects meeting the criteria of categories described in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). A variety of projects are authorized under this act, including improvements to limited access highways, rehabilitation or replacement of bridges, improvement in Federal Aid Route System roads, and projects to improve air quality or relieve congestion. A small portion of this funding is provided through Transportation Enhancement Program grants, which may be used for non-traditional transportation projects, provided they have a direct transportation relationship and enhance quality of life.

New Jersey is home to three Metropolitan Planning Organizations, which are central to the planning efforts of the Department of Transportation. The North Jersey

⁴¹ See the discussion and budget information presented under the NJ Transit description earlier in this chapter.

⁴² Note - The state budget materials refer to this portion of TTF funding as local highways funds, but the NJ Transportation Fact Book 2005 describes these funds as the "state aid program."

⁴³ The qualifications for designation for urban aid are laid out in N.J.S.A. 52:27D-178 et seq.

⁴⁴ "This allocation is ensured at a level not less than their combined total of 1984 apportioned Federal Aid Urban System Funds and state match, including their portion of any non-attributable funds made available to Small Urban Areas." NJ Transportation Fact Book 2005, available at <http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/publicat/Facts/finance.shtm>.

Transportation Planning Authority covers 13 counties, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission covers four New Jersey counties, as well as five Pennsylvania counties, surrounding Philadelphia, and the Southern New Jersey Metropolitan Planning Organization covers four counties. These agencies are provided for by federal law and are ultimately responsible for transportation-related federal funding within their regions. As part of their duties, these agencies conduct long-term transportation planning.⁴⁵

There are a number of other small local aid programs funded through DOT. Such programs include local aid targeting bikeways and the safe streets to schools project. Other DOT projects are more directly funneled through the three regional metropolitan planning organizations, including federal funding for local scoping and local lead programs. DOT also provides limited funding for two programs administered by the Department of Community Affairs that have special relevance for community and economic development concerns. Local aid for centers of place provides funding for communities that qualify as approved Centers of Place through the State Office of Smart Growth.⁴⁶ Local aid for transit villages funds projects that encourage mixed use development near passenger transportation facilities in communities selected for the Transit Village Program.

Budget and Performance Trends:

Annually the Special Transportation Trust Fund combines federal highway administration funds with state transportation trust fund revenue drawn primarily from the constitutionally dedicated state gas tax to provide capital funding for the state's infrastructure of state, county, and local roads. The annual appropriation to the Transportation Trust Fund from these dedicated revenues is \$895 million in FY07. This appropriation represents a \$90 million increase over the historic annual funding level of \$805 million, making the total commitment of state funding to the transportation capital program (including funding to public transportation) a record high for New Jersey of \$1.6 billion.⁴⁷ The state uses funding from bond revenues and other non-dedicated sources to support the Transportation Trust Fund, in addition to the dedicated gas tax revenue, which accounts for the difference between the \$895 million appropriation and the projected expenditures for local highway funds, state highway funds, and federal funds, discussed below.

No evaluation data is provided in the state budget materials regarding the capital projects funded by these revenues, but the Transportation Trust Fund budget in the appendix of the State FY07 Budget Book indicates the total state and federal funding by project type.

⁴⁵ *Access & Mobility 2025 Regional Transportation Plan*, <http://njtpa.njit.edu/planning/RTP2002/rtp2002.htm>.

⁴⁶ See the discussion of the Office of Smart Growth in the Community and Economic Development chapter of this report.

⁴⁷ This \$90 million increase is indicated on p. D-385 of the FY07 State Budget Book, and the actual appropriation is listed on p. D-393 of the budget book and p. 179 of the FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007.

The Special Transportation Trust Fund expenditures appear in two ways in the state budget materials. First, the revenue and departmental budget sections of the State Budget Book both include line items for local highway funds, state highway funds, and federal funds, while the Appropriations Bill includes a line-item appropriation of the federal funding and includes in language the total sum for both forms of state funding. The Appropriations Bill also lists each state-funded project with the allocated funding for each project, and indicates a total appropriation \$30 million higher (\$925 million) than the requested appropriation in the budget book.⁴⁸ An additional appropriation of \$175 million for the Route 52 Causeway Replacement Contract⁴⁹ is also included in language in the Appropriations Bill. Second, the Appendix of the Budget Book includes a budget for the Transportation Trust Fund which includes state and federal funding for state highway projects and local aid projects, as well as the public transportation projects discussed earlier in this chapter.

Information available from materials published on the Department of Transportation website provide some additional detail regarding grantees and funding levels for a variety of programs, but the level of detail available is inconsistent. In addition to county and municipal aid awards for FY07, these materials include the FY05 and FY06 grant awards for three of the small state-funded grant programs (bicycle program, safe streets program, and centers of place program). The FY06 recipients of federal transportation enhancement funding are also listed.

⁴⁸ FY07 Appropriation Bill S2007 (pp.180-185).

⁴⁹ The language indicates that this appropriation is from the Transportation Trust Fund Authority's Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles (GARVEE) bond proceeds. State FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 187).

New Jersey Transportation Trust Fund FY07 Grant Recipients Division of Local Aid and Economic Development - State Funded Programs Evaluation Data		
	Total Number of Grants FY07	Total Number of Counties Covered by FY07 Grants
County aid program*	23	21 (+ two municipalities) ⁵⁰
Municipal aid program*	431	21
Bicycle program	28	13
Safe Streets program (FY06)	60	19
Local Aid for Centers of Place (FY06)	8	8
Source: Recent Grant Recipients for Funding Program – State Funded Programs; DOT website		

Note – The DOT website does not provide parallel evaluation data for a number of other state-funded programs, including the discretionary portion of the Local Highway Funds, the State Highway Funds, or a number of other small grant programs.

*Note - County aid and municipal aid make up the majority of the funding reported in the state budget materials as “Transportation Trust Fund – Local Highway Funds.”

Transportation Enhancement Program Grant Recipients FY06 Division of Local Aid and Economic Development – Federally Funded Program Evaluation Data	
Total Number of Grants FY06	Total Number of Counties Covered by FY06 Grants
14	10
Source: Recent Grant Recipients for Funding Program – Federally Funded Programs; DOT website	

Note – Transportation Enhancement Program grants represent only a small portion of federal TTF funded projects.

⁵⁰ Jersey City and Newark each received grants through the County Aid program, in addition to the grants allotted to their respective counties.

Special Transportation Fund Schedule 2 (denotes other revenues)				
	Actual FY05	Estimate FY06	Estimate FY07	Actual FY07
State General Fund				
County and other shared projects ⁵¹	\$2,527,000	---	---	---
TTF – local highways fund	\$196,654,000	\$145,000,000	\$175,000,000	\$175,000,000*
TTF – state highway funds	\$573,101,000	\$534,000,000	\$675,000,000	\$750,000,000*
Federal				
Federal Highway Administration	\$624,022,000	\$889,923,000	\$977,509,000	\$933,880,690
Total Special Transportation Fund⁵²	\$1,381,501,000	\$1,560,923,000	\$1,827,509,000	\$1,858,880,690*
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. C-32) & FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 180-185, 261)				

*Local *versus* state highway fund totals are calculated from detailed information regarding individual grant awards for TTF Authority projects on pages 180-185 of the FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007. Total funding is calculated by author.

⁵¹ While the budget materials indicate no anticipated revenue from “county of other shared projects.” this may not reflect an actual elimination of this revenue source. Revenue information is consistently missing in this table of the State Budget Book for the current and coming fiscal years at the time the budget is published each year, but then is reported under “actual” in following Budget Books.

⁵² Total indicated is the total from the state budget materials, minus the TTF – Public Transportation Projects line, which is reported earlier in this chapter

Special Transportation Trust Fund Appropriation Data						
	Orig. & -- Supple. FY05	Total FY05 Available	Expended FY05	FY06 Adj. Approp.	Requested/ Recommended FY07	Actual Approp. FY07
TTF – Local Highway Funds	\$145,000,000	\$145,858,000	\$145,823,000	\$145,000,000	\$175,000,000	\$175,000,000*
TTF – Federal	\$716,391,000	\$1,004,267,000	\$750,966,000	\$889,923,000	\$977,509,000	\$933,880,690
TTF – State Highway Funds	\$541,000,000	\$601,442,000	\$585,017,000	\$526,000,000	\$750,000,000	\$750,000,000*
Total Special Transportation Trust Fund⁵³	\$1,402,391,000	\$1,751,567,000	\$1,481,806,000	\$1,560,923,000	\$1,902,509,000	\$1858,880,690
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. D-394) & FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007 (p. 180-185, 261)						

*Local versus state highway fund totals are calculated from detailed information regarding individual grant awards for TTF Authority projects on pages 180-185 of the FY07 Appropriations Bill S2007.

Transportation Trust Fund Budget			
	FY05 Expended	FY06 Adjusted Appropriation	FY07 Requested / Recommended
<i>State Highway Projects (State)</i>	\$585,126,000	\$526,000,000	\$750,000,000
<i>Local Aid Highway Projects (State)</i>	\$145,823,000	\$145,000,000	\$175,000,000
State Transportation Funds - subtotal	\$730,949,000	\$671,000,000	\$925,000,000
<i>State Highway Projects</i>	\$704,322,000	\$836,528,000	\$773,118,000
<i>Local Aid Highway Projects</i>	\$46,535,000	\$53,395,000	\$204,393,000
Federal Highway Funds - subtotal	\$750,857,000	\$889,923,000	\$977,511,000
Total	\$1,481,806,000	\$1,560,923,000	\$1,902,511,000
Source: State FY07 Budget Book (p. H-67)			

Note – The Public Transportation Projects funding in the TTF is included under NJ Transit earlier in this chapter.

⁵³ Actual FY07 Appropriation for Total Special Transportation Trust Fund for DOT capital projects calculated by author.

**New Jersey Transportation Trust Fund FY07 Grant Recipients
State Programs – Division of Local Aid and Economic Development
Grant Awards**

Program	Total FY07 Approved Funding
County aid program	\$70,021,000
Municipal aid program	\$76,091,000
Bicycle program (FY05)	\$4,140,000
Safe Streets program (FY06)	\$5,232,000
Local Aid for Centers of Place (FY06)	\$899,500

Source: Recent Grant Recipients for Funding Program – State Funded Programs; DOT website

Note – The DOT website does not provide parallel funding data for a number of other state-funded programs, including the discretionary portion of the Local Highway Funds, the State Highway Funds, or a number of other small grant programs.

**Transportation Enhancement Program (TEA-21 Program)
Total Grant Funding**

FY04	FY05	FY06
\$11,524,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,450,000

**Source: FY04 and FY06 Transportation Enhancement Recipients – DOT website; NJ
Transportation Fact Book 2005.**

Note – Transportation Enhancement Program grants represent only a small portion of federal TTF/TEA-21 funding.

Additional Analysis:

The long-term viability of the Transportation Trust Fund has been called into question in a report by the Regional Plan Association.⁵⁴ The report argues that dramatic increases in capital costs have not been systematically matched by increased revenue or by changes in spending. Instead, revenues have been obtained by borrowing against money diverted from the General Fund. The deficit between costs and revenues has been accelerated by increased debt service costs. Outstanding Trust Fund Bonds have increased from a bit more than \$1 billion in 1995 to over \$7 billion in 2006. Since operating costs cannot be funded with borrowed money, deficits in these costs have been made up by transferring capital funds to operations, further accelerating the need for borrowing. The Report estimates that the Transportation Trust Fund will need an additional \$2.7 billion to pay for Department of Transportation and NJ transit capital improvements, maintenance, and operations. The need for additional new revenues will continue at least at this level through 2016. New transportation taxes and/or NJ Transit

⁵⁴ *Putting the Trust Back in the New Jersey Transportation Trust Fund*, Regional Plan Association, July 2005.

fares will probably need to be considered in order to raise money for the TTF. Since either of these steps would tend to have a disproportional impact on low-income people, New Jersey must take special measures to ensure that these vulnerable populations are protected.

Recommendations

Planning

- The state should establish a comprehensive Workforce Transportation Plan to improve existing programs and policies, and develop new initiatives, designed to get all workers to and from their jobs in a reasonable amount of time.

With varying economic, housing, socioeconomic, and transportation conditions statewide, the plan should adopt a multimodal strategy to facilitate workforce transportation. Such a plan should combine the use of private automobiles, NJ Transit-provided public transportation, and other multi-user services operated by employers, nonprofits, livery companies, local governments, or groups of commuters.

- Improvements in the bus network that would reduce trip time and make schedules more reliable should be prioritized in upgrading the public transportation system.

Buses represent a particularly cost-effective form of public transportation, and are most heavily used by people unable to afford their own cars. In the state's most densely populated and traveled areas, the development of modern Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) should be emphasized over the construction of new rail facilities.

Work and Family Transportation

- The public transportation budget should include money to fund nonprofit organizations or other entities that help get low-income people to and from work in regions where traditional public transportation cannot operate in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Reduced price or free taxi vouchers should also be made available to help people get to or from work or childcare.
- Transportation policies must address the particular burdens of working parents traveling between their homes, workplaces, and childcare locations.

Unfortunately, public transportation schedules make chained-trips (where trips to several locations immediately follow one another) particularly time-consuming and difficult to coordinate.⁵⁵ A commute to work for a working parent, for example, may be preceded by trips to one child's school and a trip to a younger child's babysitter or daycare center. In the course of a week, a parent may need to take his or her children to medical appointments or recreational or social outings, and may need to make additional trips to stores or laundromats that are not needed by persons without children. Unless all of these places are very close to one another, a working parent relying on public transportation will need to begin his or her commute early enough to account for the schedules of all of the bus or train routes required to get to all

⁵⁵ See, for example, Blumenberg, Evelyn & Margy Waller, July 2003, *The Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families*, The Brookings Institution; http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/20030801_Waller.pdf.

destinations. He or she must take into account the time necessary to get to each stop, wait for the vehicle, ride the vehicle, and then walk to the destination. Depending on the schedules and reliability of the different routes, a working parent may need to build in time for missed connections or other problems in order to ensure that he or she will arrive at work on time. The state should work to develop flexible route, door-to-door transportation services (such as subsidized taxis) for parents who cannot afford their own cars. This investment would enhance the stability and self-sufficiency of low-income parents attempting to work and care for their children. Given the inefficiencies of bus travel, particularly on the limited routes operating in suburban areas, subsidized taxis can actually be a relatively cost-effective means of providing transportation assistance.

- The state should modify its contracts with transportation vendors to require companies to include, at no cost, minor children who must accompany a parent using Medicaid covered transportation for medical needs.

For example, Medicaid pays approved transportation costs to an allowed medical appointment for a Medicaid recipient parent, or for a recipient child and parent, when the parent has no other means of transportation. However, Medicaid will not cover the cost to transport a child who is not receiving treatment, no matter how young, although it may be necessary for the parent to bring the child with them to their own appointment. Many times, the only Medicaid covered transportation is by taxi. Because the parent may not have available childcare or the means to pay the transportation cost, this is a barrier to accessing health care to which the parent is entitled.

Assistance to Enable Automobile Transportation for Low-Income Households

Even with the best efforts to make public transportation work better, New Jersey will continue to need access to private automobiles to meet the basic transportation needs for daily living in many areas of the state. Car ownership, however, can be cost-prohibitive for low-income households.

- State subsidies, including tax credits and low-interest loans, should be available to people who cannot otherwise afford the purchase and maintenance of automobiles. Emergency subsidies should be provided during times of unusually high fuel costs.

Even in the absence of a permanent program to implement these subsidies, emergency subsidies should be made to low-income commuters so long as fuel prices remain at unusually high levels. In order to encourage fuel conservation and equitably support all varieties of low-income commuters, equivalent levels of subsidy should be available to low-income workers using public transportation.

- Automobile insurance rates and surcharges and ticket fee schedules should be structured to avoid a disproportionate impact on poor people.

- Legislation should be enacted to prohibit the use of credit-scoring to deny or impose premium rates on low-income individuals purchasing car insurance.

Disability Accommodations

- A state task force should be commissioned to examine the true transportation needs of people with disabilities.

The task force should consider the extraordinary barriers to mobility faced by particular populations of people with disabilities, and should have a broad mandate to propose effective solutions.

- NJ Transit should leverage additional Special Transportation Trust Fund capital improvement funding to increase the number of train stations that are accessible to the disabled.
- Funding for NJ Transit Access Link services should be increased to allow for expansions in service area and hours of operation, and decreased trip time.

As it currently stands, the cumulative effect of limits in these areas is sufficiently burdensome on passengers to prevent many from working or otherwise participating in the community.

- The state should fund pilot programs designed to provide real-time transportation access to people with disabilities.

Currently, people with disabilities are often left without any transportation when unanticipated yet common contingencies emerge, such as the need to leave work early when sick.

Conservation

- The State should use the market power of its millions of drivers to encourage the development and marketing of more fuel-efficient vehicles. In combination with neighboring states, New Jersey should regulate the average gas-mileage rating of automobiles sold in this state.
- The State should impose a surcharge on the purchase of privately-operated automobiles with poor fuel-economy ratings.

Models of SUVs and other light trucks not used for commercial purposes should be subject to a surcharge at the time of purchase if they have poor gas-mileage ratings compared to other passenger cars. Waivers of the surcharge may be granted to 1) people in rural or other areas that do not have efficient snow removal or have a legitimate demonstrable reason to haul larger objects; and 2) disabled people requiring the use of a larger vehicle to accommodate their disability.