MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Bridge S-32
on Rumson Road (CR520) over the Shrewsbury River
Borough of Rumson and Borough of Sea Bright

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2
MEETING REPORT

DATE: Tuesday, June 26, 2012
TIME: 1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Holy Cross School Gymnasium
30 Ward Avenue, Rumson, NJ

ATTENDEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Andre</td>
<td>Borough of Rumson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Monmouth County Transportation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Chernavsky</td>
<td>Sea Bright Police / OEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>Resident, Atlantic Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Carriage House Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Chapel Beach Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Dooley</td>
<td>St. George’s - by-the-River-Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Grossarth – O’Neil</td>
<td>Resident, Adjacent Property Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Heard</td>
<td>T&amp;M Associates, Rumson Boro Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>Rumson First Aid Squad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Kachmar</td>
<td>Sea Bright Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Clayton</td>
<td>Kingsbery</td>
<td>Sea Bright Beach Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Leckstein</td>
<td>Sea Bright Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Lilleson</td>
<td>Sea Bright Beach Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lindston</td>
<td>Resident, Rumson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dina</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Sea Bright Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>McLynn</td>
<td>Nautilus Condo, Sea Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arleen</td>
<td>Mulligan</td>
<td>Resident, Rumson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Sea Bright Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Sea Bright Fire Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Pattison</td>
<td>Nautilus Condo Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Borough of Rumson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lynda Rose Eastern Monmouth Area Chamber of Commerce
Dominic Sequeira DDJ Management, Inc.
Ellen Skowron Resident, Rumson
Jude Skowron Resident, Rumson
John Sorrentino Sea Bright Police Dept.
Rick Tobias Rumson Police Dept.
Roger Trendowski Holy Cross Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Patterson NJDEP, Green Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Saniford NJ TRANSIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Welch NJDEP, Land Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Burton Two River Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Patch, Rumson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Boulden McCormick Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martine Culbertson M. A. Culbertson, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis DeGregory NJDOT, Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Diffley Cherry, Weber &amp; Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony DiMaggio McCormick Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Garrett NJDOT, Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daria Jakimowska Monmouth County Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarbjit Kahlon North Jersey Transp. Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Moren Monmouth County Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Quackenbush Amy S. Greene Environ. Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Riegel Hardesty &amp; Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Riviere NJDOT, Bike / Ped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Schetelich Hardesty &amp; Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Smith NJDOT, Local Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Stankus Orth-Rodgers &amp; Assoc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE OF MEETING**

The purpose of this meeting is to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, and discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to County Bridge S-32 on Rumson Road over the Shrewsbury River. (See attached Agenda)

**MEETING SUMMARY**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Jon Moren, Monmouth County Project Manager, welcomed everyone on behalf of Monmouth County, and the cooperating agencies of NJTPA and NJDOT. He noted the importance of community input at this meeting and look forward to working with the communities and agencies as the project moves forward.
2. Community Stakeholders Update

After introductions by the project team members and attendees, Martine Culbertson, Community Involvement Facilitator reviewed the updated and new meeting handouts: Agenda, Project Team List, Community and Agency Stakeholders List, Stakeholders Survey Update Summary, b&w Project Overview Map indicating existing deficiencies, and the Purpose and Need Statement. The stakeholders who did not attend the first Community Stakeholder Meeting No. 1, also received a Project Portfolio with information distributed at that meeting.

3. Project Status, Purpose and Need Statement

Bruce Riegel, Hardesty& Hanover Project Manager reviewed the project status noting that the project is on schedule; the dates are on the Project Information Handout in the Project Portfolio. This Concept Development Phase is scheduled to be completed in 18 months, as of April 2013. The purpose of today’s meeting is to obtain input on the conceptual alternatives developed from the information collected to date and that meet the Project Purpose and Needs as indicated on the yellow sheet.

4. Conceptual Alternatives Overview

Anthony DiMaggio, McCormick Taylor Engineer, presented an overview of the conceptual alternatives to be discussed at each of the six round tables.

Two handouts were provided during the round table discussions: (1) a blank Comparison of Alternatives Matrix indicating the items in the alternatives analysis for consideration in selecting a preferred alternative and (2) a Description of Alternatives, which provides written details of each conceptual alternative under consideration.

5. Group Discussion on Alternatives

a. Martine provided facilitation of the round table discussions by indicating an estimated 10 minutes to review each alternative and 10 minutes opportunity for comments on the pros & cons associated with each alternative. Each table had two project team members, one responsible for presenting information and the other to assist and record comments.

b. Each attendee was also given 8 large dots and 8 small dots (two red, two green, two blue, two yellow) to be placed on newsprint charts to indicate support or non-support for the conceptual alternatives (large dots) and the proposed conceptual improvements at the eastern approach in Rumson (small dots). Each attendee could use all, some, or none of their dots at their discretion. The dot colors indicate: Green = In Favor/Support, Red = Do Not Support/Do Not Want, Blue = Like, But Needs Work, Yellow = Don't Like, But with Changes Maybe.

c. Each table upon completion of the alternatives discussion, took turns placing their dots on the newsprint which listed each of the alternatives. (See Attachment No. 7 - Alternatives List with dots on newsprint).

d. Martine explained the purpose of the dots exercise, which is to visually provide indications of support or non-support for alternatives and approach improvements. It is only an indicator to assist the team in the development process as to which alternatives have potential for improvement and those, which are not favored by the communities. It is not intended for decision-making, but as guidance as to what concepts have potential and those that are not favored. It is the information on the alternatives matrix to be entered and analyzed, which will be used by the Agencies to determine a preferred alternative to move forward to the Preliminary
Engineering Phase from the Concept Development Phase.

e. The summary notes from the discussions held at each of the six round tables are included as Attachments No. 1 through No. 6, respectively.

6. Group Discussion on Improvements – Six Questions

After each table had the opportunity to place their dots on the newsprint, each table was then asked to discuss and respond to the following six questions. Attachments No. 1 through No. 6 include the responses and comments from each table discussion respectively. Martine asked each table to share their responses to the six questions and the following noted for each question:

Question No. 1: Of the presented alternatives, which would be the most preferable alignment for a new bridge?

- Sea Bright N, Rumson S
- Concept 2, Concept 3B
- Concept 2, Concept 1C
- Concept 3A
- Concept 3B
- Roundabout not supported, cul-de-sac +/-, do nothing

Question No. 2: Is a temporary bridge needed or is a detour acceptable to minimize/eliminate impacts to the environmental properties?

- No detour. Public safety says no detour – can’t do that
- Yes/OK, for temporary bridge (consider wider temp). No, the detour is not acceptable.
- Maintain existence while construct new Bridge.
- Residents okay with detour, business/transit prefer temporary bridge.
- Temporary Bridge is acceptable. Detour is not acceptable.

Question No. 3: What scheme(s)/improvement(s) is/are preferable for the western bridge approach? (roundabout, cul-de-sac, do nothing, etc.)

- Prefer cul-de-sac
- Cul-de-sac – Not great, not terrible. Can’t get emergency equipment in there (can do cut through).
- Cul-de-sac
- Cul-de-sac and do nothing options
- Do nothing.

Question No. 4: Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (67’–6”)?

- OK
- OK
- Handout to show existing bridge width compared with the proposed and temp bridge section.
- Yes
- Yes, consider dedicated lane for cyclists

Question No. 5: Is the proposed temporary bridge section acceptable (35’-6”) with the intent of the existing crossing being available at all times for emergency vehicles and school buses?

- No fans of temporary bridge.
• OK, not great (wouldn’t mind seeing it wider).
• OK
• Crossing to be available at all times for emergency vehicles and school buses.
• Yes
• Yes, but some do not want a temporary bridge.

Question No. 6: Are full 10’ wide shoulders preferred as part of the RT36 improvements for the project?
• Police like it. Would like to explore idea of wider WB section, longer 2-lane section merge into 1.
• OK, wide shoulders better than narrow shoulders.
• Seems like unnecessary widening; for the length proposed, won’t improve much.
• Shoulders not necessary.
• No, the 10’ shoulders are not acceptable because of the impacts to the properties.
• Don’t want shoulders because of the impacts to the properties and lead to nowhere.

7. Next Steps - Closing Comments

a. In summary, the next step is for the project team to fill in the alternatives matrix, to review the community input from today’s stakeholder meeting, and schedule to meet with the agencies to discuss the alternatives and identify a preferred alternative to propose to move forward in the process. A local officials briefing and public meetings will be held in September/October 2012 to present the information and obtain public input on the project.

b. Similar to the prior public meetings, one will be held in the afternoon in Sea Bright and the other in the evening in Rumson (details listed in section below). The PIC meetings will be advertised in local papers and posted to the Borough web sites. Both PIC meetings will be an open house format with display boards, a brief presentation at each, and comment forms available for the general public to provide input.

c. In closing, Martine asked attendees and the project team for closing comments. The following feedback was noted:
   • Keep going.
   • Good start.
   • Provide info on right-of-way process.
   • October for next Public Information Center (PIC) meeting.

d. The project team thanked attendees for their input. Meeting minutes will be provided and distributed to attendees and the community and agency stakeholders unable to attend. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

KEY ACTION ITEMS

1. Attendees to review Project Portfolio information, Purpose and Need Statement, Alternatives Matrix and Description of Alternatives. Please provide any suggestions or additional comments prior to the PIC meetings.
2. H&H and project team will enter data on Alternatives Matrix in coordination with County and in preparation for presentation for meeting with FHWA and the future Public Information Center (PIC) meetings.

3. Martine will provide via email the following items: meeting minutes, update the Community and Agency Stakeholders List, color of aerial project map with deficiencies; and provide PIC meeting notice and Comment Form to the Community Stakeholders and to Rumson and Sea Bright Boroughs for posting to their website.

**NEXT MEETING** - Public Meeting

Date: October, 2012 *(to be determined)*

Time: 2-4 pm and 5-7 pm *(with 3pm & 6pm brief presentations - to be determined)*

Location: Boroughs of Sea Bright and Rumson *(facilities to be determined)*

We believe the foregoing to be an accurate summary of discussions and related decisions. We would appreciate notification of exceptions or corrections to the minutes within three (3) working days of receipt. Without notification, these minutes will be considered to be record of fact.

Martine Culbertson
Bridge S32 Community Involvement Facilitator
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Bridge S-32
on Rumson Road (CR520) over the Shrewsbury River
Borough of Rumson and Borough of Sea Bright, Monmouth County, NJ

Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2
Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Holy Cross School Gymnasium, 30 Ward Avenue, Rumson, NJ, 1:00 p.m.

AGENDA
The purpose of this meeting is to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, and discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to County Bridge S-32 on Rumson Road over the Shrewsbury River.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
   • Project Status
   • Community Stakeholders Update

II. MONMOUTH COUNTY BRIDGE S-32
   • Purpose and Need Statement
   • Conceptual Alternatives Overview
   • Group Discussion on Alternatives - Pros & Cons
   • Group Discussion on Alternatives – Improvements
   • Group Results - Key Points

III. COMMENTS AND NEXT STEPS
   • Community Feedback
   • Action Items – Next Public Information Center Meetings
   • Closing Comments
Rehab

Major rehab
Replace super-structure, sub-structure
Now bascules
Adding cap, over-stress piles? Lots of extra weight
Rehab will restrict access – would destroy businesses
Even 1 lane temporary bridge, traffic would suffer
“Anything involving the existing bridge is a no-go"
Previous history of major impacts in town during bridge disruptions
Oceanic bridge closure “destroyed” us
Detours affect infrastructure

Concept 1A – existing alignment with detour
Disruption of traffic, “not an option"
July 4th fireworks – 2 lanes
Access issues with Dunkin Donuts, beach clubs
Entering bridge, going uphill, slow

Concept 1B
Exist alignment with temporary bridge
When temporary bridge comes down, what happens to property?
Dunkin Donuts access issue is main problem area – if temporary bridge takes over Dunkin Donuts
that’s some improvements
Taking Dunkin Donuts property for temporary bridge seems inefficient
This is preferable to building closer to residences

Concept 1C
Temporary on Rumson Road old alignment would slow traffic – 1 lane eastbound
Issues with lower temporary bridge – would have to open more often, risk of flooding?
Concept 2
N alignment – cul-de-sac
Cul-de-sac – shouldn’t be a problem
Anchorage would need to be taken
Make Dunkin Donuts safer because farther from bridge
Cul-de-sac could be included in any option
“Taking of Anchorage could be a major adverse impact” on Sea Bright
What happens to old Anchorage property? State property? Possible to create parking?
“Would be best thing if you weren’t taking apartments”
“Best option of any SD so far”
Least impact on both towns
Seems Rumson / Sea Bright ok, Sea Bright more impact

Concept 3A
S. alignment, minimum impacts
Dunkin Donuts is gone, but minimal impacts of Option 3 scenarios
3 is “good for Rumson”
Built in stages
Sea Bright – wishes there was an option that doesn’t take property

Concept 3B
Same as 3A, with Ward Avenue improvements
Adds 10’ shoulders on RT36

Concept 3C
Shifts RT36 to east – loss of parking spaces – too much would kill parking – “worse one yet”,
biggest impact yet
Many properties lost under this scenario
Rumson chief – no intersection with roundabout

Concept 3D
S alignment, 1 stage
Fixed horizontal curve at Ward
Shifts 520 ???? between Ward, W side of bridge
Anchorage stays, parking / beach clubs okay
Dunkin Donuts is gone under 3D
Rumson proffers cul-de-sac, but this option at Ward is also okay

Concept 4
1920 alignment – major impacts on Rumson residences, Sea Bright Mayor doesn’t like it
Sea Bright Police prefers #2
**Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 1**

1. Did table find most preferred alternate?  Sea Bright N, Rumson S
2. Temporary needed?  Detour access?  **No detour.**  Public safety says **no detour** – can’t do that”.
3. Preference western bridge approach? – cul-de-sac
4. Proposed bridge section access?
6. 10’ wide shoulders preferable?  Police like it.  Would like to explore idea of wider WB section, longer 2-lane section merge into 1
There were five people at Table 2: A reporter from Rumson/Fair Haven Patch; Reporter form Twin River Times; Tom Dolly from St George’s Church; William Rivere from NJDOT Bike/Ped. Program; and a Rumson Resident (possibly involved with the EMT too)

- No Build: “Will bridge be downgraded to 3 Tons?” Bridge is inspected every 2 years (min), that is when the determination is made.

- Really not 2 lanes going west now (no way left turn from 36 NB and right turn from 36 SB can happen at the same time).

- Pedestrian crossing at Rt.36 / Rumson Rd intersection is a good idea. Note that NJDOT Ped/Bicycle rep was at the table with us. (Before the session started, a Beach Club representative mentioned that he thought having pedestrians crossing at the intersection was not a good idea – he didn’t offer an alternative).

- Not happy with roundabout at Brookdale College.

- General Opinion of the Options
  - 1920’s don’t like effect on neighborhood
  - Option 3 – ok, but impacts businesses
  - Option 2 – ok, but impacts homes

Questions from attendees and responses:

- What is life expectancy of existing bridge if “No Build” alternative is ?

- How long will life of bridge be prolonged using rehab option? 75 years

- Reporter at the table indicated roundabout in Option 3C was a bad idea. Compared to Brookdale/RT520 – Saw no improvement with that one.

- Will construction cost estimates separate bridge costs and roadway cost? Yes
Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 2

1. Of the presented alternatives, which would be the most preferable alignment for a new bridge?

2. Is a temporary bridge needed or is a detour acceptable to minimize/eliminate impacts to the environmental properties? Yes (they wouldn’t mind seeing it wider). No, the detour is not acceptable.

3. What scheme(s)/improvement(s) is/are preferable for the western bridge approach? (roundabout, cul-de-sac, do nothing)? West approach cul-de-sac – Not great, not terrible. Can’t get emergency equipment in there (can do cut through).

4. Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (67’ – 6")? OK

5. Is the proposed temporary bridge section acceptable (35’ – 6")? OK, not great (they wouldn't mind seeing it wider).

6. Are full 10’ wide shoulders preferred as part of the RT36 improvements for the project? OK, wide shoulders are better than narrow shoulders.
No Build
• “Keep putting oil in the car”

Rehab (major)
If rehab can maintain ex. Alignment, might outweigh cost new bridge

Concept 1 (prefer 1B)
#1 - Less adverse impact on community and environment; temporary Bridge preferred to detour

Concept 1C
No good – new light / intersection at RT36 – far away from existing; temporary bridge in front yards

Concept 2 (Preferred over Concept 1)
# 2 – like! Shorter construction duration, no temple structure

Concept 3 (Concept 2 or Concept 3B overall preferred)

Concept 3A
Pro: Avoids ROW acquisition, but still take Dunkin Donuts; no detour, no temporary bridge = good

Concept 3B
More right turn lane space from RT36 = good
Okay; #2 still preferred
Rumson Road Resident – cul-de-sac = GOOD!

Concept 3C
Can you do roundabout with cul-de-sac? Don’t like roundabout with cul-de-sac? Don’t like roundabout. Cul-de-sac preferred.
Concept 3D
Much more invasive than 3B; Not worth the additional impacts; park more used on south side

Concept 4
No. No. No. Too much impact to residences.

Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 3

1. Preferred alternate? Concept #2 Concept #3B
2. Temporary bridge or detour? Maintain existence while construct new Bridge.
3. Preference for cul-de-sac / roundabout? Cul-de-sac
4. Widths of typical section? Okay
5. Widths of temporary bridge section? Okay
6. 10’ full shoulders on RT36? Seems like un-necessary widening; for the length proposed, won’t improve much
COMMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 4 DISCUSSION

Table No. 4 Presenter/Recorder: Jon Moren, Monmouth County Engineering Department
Pamela Garrett, NJDOT, Environmental Project Support

Pros / Cons:
How long will “No Build” option take – can bridge be maintained?
Where are we in the process?

Rehab
How long?
Temp walking bridge floating

No Build
Con: Dunkin Donuts ROW

Rehab
Pro: No ROW
Con:

Concept 1A - with detour
Pro: Safety and not displacement
Con: No Bridge for pedestrians
    No improvements to Ward Avenue
    Detour

Concept 1B – without detour
Pro: No detour, exp.
Con: Dunkin Donuts ROW, cost, park impact

Concept 1C
Pro: Dunkin Donuts no ROW
Con: Impacts to temporary park and residents
    Traffic near park
Concept 2
Pros:  Safety (access to the park)
      Traffic flow – controlling intersection
      No ROW from Dunkin Donuts
      Impact to the park
Cons: Impact to residential property
      Possible fishing
      Possible Dunkin Donuts additional parking
      Improving RT36 traffic flow
      Better park configuration
      Block 24, Lot 101 – ROW impacts, parking loss

Concept 3A
ROW impacts – acquire Dunkin Donuts
ROW impacts – Parkland
      Closer to residents – provides for stacking on RT36N
Pro:  Possible fishing access
      Maintenance transit
Notes: 1) Residents are accustomed to detours
        2) Ferry traffic

Concept 3B
Pro:  Improve Ward intersection
      Cul de sac - ?
Con:  Impacts to Dunkin Donuts and gas stations (possibly provide access via park parking lot)
      Park impacts
      Impact to apartments
Note:  Speeding occurs, consider rumble stripes.

Concept 3C:
Pro:  None
Con:  Too much like an expressway
      Children crossing round-a-bout
Note:  Consider on street parking instead of shoulder
Concept 3D:
Pro: Maintenance transit route
  Improved alignment (split)
Con: Alignment closer to residents
  ROW impacts (parks, Dunkin Donuts)

Concept 4:
Pro: Maintenance transit
  No park impacts
Con: Impact to residents
  No access to Dunkin Donuts and gas
  Access to the park

Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 4

1. Of the presented alternate, which would be most preferable alignment for a new bridge? 2, 1C
2. Is a temporary bridge needed or is a detour acceptable to minimize/eliminate impacts to the environmental properties? – residents okay with detour, business / transit prefer temporary bridge.
3. What scheme(s)/improvement(s) is/are preferable for the western bridge approach (roundabout, cul-de-sac, do nothing, etc.)? cul-de-sac and do nothing.
4. Is the proposed temporary bridge section acceptable (35’-6”)? – again suggest a hand-out to show (stamped as draft) with the intent of the existing crossing being available at all time for emergency vehicles and school buses. During the summer months it would be expected that the existing crossing will be used along with alternate routes.
5. Exist. 52’. Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (67’–6”)? I suggest we provide this is as a handout (stamped preliminary DRAFT) for people to clearly see and understand – ok, separate shoulder from sidewalk.
6. A full 10’ wide shoulders preferred as part of the RT36 improvements of the projects? Shoulders not necessary.
Table No. 5 Presenter/Recorder: Anthony DiMaggio, McCormick Taylor
Dennis DeGregory, NJDOT, Environmental Project Support

No Build
Not Acceptable

Rehab (major)
Too costly
May not work

General Comments Regarding Concepts:
Proposed typical section is acceptable
Proposed temporary bridge typical section is acceptable
Table did not want to cul-de-sac Rumson, or a round about at Rumson and Ward intersection.
Table is not in favor of 10’ shoulders on Route 36.

Concept 1A
10 mile detour for 2.5 years is not practical and will be a major problem

Concept 1B
It is acceptable
In favor of the existing alignment with the temporary bridge.

Concept 1C
Not acceptable. The temporary bridge will impact several residential and commercial properties.

Concept 2
Northern alignment is not acceptable. This alignment impacts a residential property in Rumson and
acquires the Anchorage (apartments in Sea Bright).
Not in favor of the improvements at Ward Avenue or the cul-de-sac.

Concept 3A
The two stage alignment is acceptable, in favor of no detour during the duration of construction.
Concept 3B
The location of the bridge is acceptable however the 10’ shoulders on Route 36 will impact several properties.
The table was not in favor of the 10’ shoulders.

Concept 3C
The proposed bridge alignment was acceptable however it is not their favorite concept. The table was not in favor of the roundabout in Rumson or the 10’ shoulders on Route 36.

Concept 3D
The proposed bridge alignment and improvements on Route 36 is acceptable however it is not their favorite concept.

Concept 4
The concept is unacceptable, prohibits access to the park. The concept impacts several residents. The table stated that this concept creates an unsafe condition.

High Level
Not acceptable

Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 5

1. Of the presented alternatives, which would be the most preferable alignment for a new bridge? 3A
2. Is a temporary bridge needed or is a detour acceptable to minimize/eliminate impacts to the environmental properties? Temporary bridge is acceptable. Detour is not acceptable.
3. What scheme(s)/improvement(s) is/are preferable for the western bridge approach? (roundabout, cul-de-sac, do nothing, etc.). Do nothing.
4. Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (67’ – 6”). Yes
5. Is the proposed temporary bridge section acceptable (35’ – 6”). Yes
6. Are full 10’ wide shoulders preferred as part of the RT36 improvements for the project? No, the 10’ shoulders are not acceptable because of the impacts to the properties.
COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 6 DISCUSSION  JUNE 26, 2012

Table No. 6 Presenter/Recorder       Bruce Riegel, Hardesty & Hanover
                                      Sarbjit Kahlon, NJTPA, North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority

No Build
4/5 not an option because pushing the problem down the road
1/5 person is neutral

Rehab (major)
Too costly
May not work

Concept 1A
Storm drain on the traffic light (RT36) is giving flat tires
RT36 right turning lane length
Don’t like the detour (OEM and transportation) (walk)
Students will not be able to get to church
Design is not bad, but with the detour it is not practical

Concept 1B
Like it
It impacts businesses

Concept 1C
Like it even better than 1B because of where the temporary Bridge is located
It has less impact to businesses

Concept 2
It eliminates the queuing at RT36 – like the right turning movement
Like the improvements at Ward Avenue
Like the location of the Bridge, but it may be too early
Concept 3A
3/6 people – like it the best if we add improvements to RT36 from Concept 2

Concept 3B
RT36 improvements – will it help traffic?
It will impact a lot of properties
RT36 shoulder to nowhere

Concept 3C
Don’t want a roundabout in front of her house
Causes a lot of confusion → traffic nightmares
Too much impact on properties on both ends
Roundabout is an extra cost

Concept 3D
Like the improvements on RT36

Concept 4
Unacceptable

High Level
Not at all

Six Questions Discussion - Group Responses – Table 6

1. Of the presented alternatives, which would be the most preferable alignment for a new bridge? 3A
2. Is a temporary bridge needed or is a detour acceptable to minimize/eliminate impacts to the environmental properties?
3. What scheme(s)/improvement(s) is/are preferable for the western bridge approach? (roundabout, cul-de-sac, do nothing, etc.)
4. Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (67’ – 6’)? Yes
5. Is the proposed temporary bridge section acceptable (35’ – 6’)? Yes, but this table doesn’t want temporary bridge, 1 person does want a temporary bridge
6. Are full 10’ wide shoulders preferred as part of the RT36 improvements for the project? Don’t want shoulders because of the impacts to the properties and lead to nowhere.
No Build

Rehabilitation

Concept 1A
Alignment w/ Detour

Concept 1B
Alignment w/ No Detour

Concept 1C
Alignment w/ Temp Bridge
CONCEPT 2
North Alignment

CONCEPT 3A
South Alignment

CONCEPT 3B
South Alignment

CONCEPT 3C
South Alignment

CONCEPT 3D
South Alignment
CONCEPT 4
1920 Alignment
- keep existing bridge

CONCEPT 5
High level Fixed Span