



**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:**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
		<b>Community Stakeholders</b>
Fred	Andre	Borough of Rumson
Betsy	Barrett	Monmouth County Transportation Council
Daniel	Chernavsky	Sea Bright Police / OEM
John W.	Cummins	Resident, Atlantic Highlands
Lance	Cunningham	Carriage House Marina
Stephen	Cutler	Chapel Beach Club
Tom	Dooley	St. George's-by-the-River-Church
Kate	Grossarth – O'Neill	Resident, Adjacent Property Owner
Bonnie	Heard	T&M Associates, Rumson Boro Engineer
James	Hempstead	Rumson First Aid Squad
Richard	Kachmar	Sea Bright Borough
J. Clayton	Kingsbery	Sea Bright Beach Club
Marc	Leckstein	Sea Bright Council
Richard	Lilleston	Sea Bright Beach Club
Mary	Lindston	Resident, Rumson
Hon. Dina	Long	Sea Bright Borough
Kate	McBride	Resident
Dennis	McLynn	Nautilus Condo, Sea Bright
Arleen	Mulligan	Resident, Rumson
Read	Murphy	Sea Bright Borough
Charles	Murphy	Sea Bright Fire Dept.
Tom	Pattison	Nautilus Condo Assoc.
Thomas	Rogers	Borough of Rumson

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
		<b>Agency Stakeholders</b>
Jessica	Patterson	NJDEP, Green Acres
Dan	Saniford	NJ TRANSIT
Charlie	Welch	NJDEP, Land Use
		<b>Media</b>
John	Burton	Two River Times
		The Patch, Rumson
		<b>Project Team</b>
Kevin	Boulden	McCormick Taylor
Martine	Culbertson	M. A. Culbertson, LLC
Dennis	DeGregory	NJDOT, Environmental
Larry	Diffley	Cherry, Weber & Assoc.
Anthony	DiMaggio	McCormick Taylor
Pamela	Garrett	NJDOT, Environmental
Daria	Jakimowska	Monmouth County Engineering
Sarbjit	Kahlon	North Jersey Transp. Planning Authority
Jon	Moren	Monmouth County Engineering
Susan	Quackenbush	Amy S. Greene Environ. Consultants
Bruce	Riegel	Hardesty & Hanover
William	Riviere	NJDOT, Bike / Ped
Glen	Schetelich	Hardesty & Hanover
Wendy	Smith	NJDOT, Local Aid
Brian	Stankus	Orth-Rodgers & Assoc.

## 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 un-necessary 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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**

- 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

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 1 DISCUSSION**

JUNE 26, 2012

---

Table No. 1 Presenter/Recorder: Brian Stankus, Orth-Rodgers & Associates, Inc.  
Kevin Boulden, McCormick Taylor

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 4<sup>th</sup> 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?
5. Proposed temporary section? No fans of temporary Bridge.
6. 10' wide shoulders preferable? Police like it. Would like to explore idea of wider WB section, longer 2-lane section merge into 1

**North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority  
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**

**Attachment No. 2**

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 2 DISCUSSION**

**JUNE 26, 2012**

---

Table No. 2 Presenter/Recorder: Wendy Smith, NJDOT, Local Aid Unit 3  
Glen Schetelich, Hardesty & Hanover, LLP

There were five people at Table 2: A reporter from Rumson/Fair Haven Patch; Reporter from 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.

**North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority  
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**

**Attachment No. 3**

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 3 DISCUSSION**

**JUNE 26, 2012**

---

Table No. 3 Presenter/Recorder: Larry Diffley, Cherry, Weber & Associates, P. C.  
Sue Quakenbush, Amy S. Greene Environmental Consultants,  
Inc.

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

**North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority  
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**

**Attachment No. 4**

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 4 DISCUSSION**

**JUNE 26, 2012**

---

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 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.

**North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority  
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**

**Attachment No. 5**

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER MEETING NO. 2 – TABLE 5 DISCUSSION**

**JUNE 26, 2012**

---

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 / A  
Alignment w/ Detour

CONCEPT / B  
Alignment w/ No Detour

CONCEPT / C  
Alignment w/ Temp Bridge



CONCEPT 2

North Alignment

Cul-de-Sac

CONCEPT 3A

South Alignment

min impact

CONCEPT 3B

South Alignment

Cul-de-Sac

CONCEPT 3C

South Alignment

roundabout

CONCEPT 3D

South Alignment



CONCEPT 4  
1920 Alignment

- keep existing  
bridge

CONCEPT 5

High Level Fixed Span