PIC COMMENT # 1
I recommend the 7A choice. Looks like I have known for 84 years.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 2
65 ft is my first choice followed by 45 then 22
PIC COMMENT # 3
I am a resident of Rumson and hope that the new bridge will continue to allow bicycles and pedestrians, as well as, fisherman. I also hope that it will be visually appealing, as the bridge today is beautiful despite its age and condition.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 4
Subject: Build a new bridge
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 9:11 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Build a new bridge

The Oceanic Bridge is in very bad condition. The County needs to step up and build a new bridge that is up to date, draw bridges are outdated. Enough with the patches already!!!! Build the high span bridge!!!!
PIC COMMENT # 5
Hi,
My name is [redacted] I am a local resident of Monmouth County. I cross the Oceanic bridge every day on my commute to work and I'd like to vote in favor of the "alternative 7A 22 ft bridge" plan. I understand that most people involved are in favor of a low bridge over a high bridge. I and many other local residents were saddened by the recent reconstruction of the Route 36 bridge since it makes the area look more like an extension of the Turnpike than a local beach town. I hope that the next stages of the Oceanic bridge development show how much damage a tall bridge could do to the Navesink's views, users, and residents. It would discourage or prevent all kinds of experiences associated with the bridge that I have personally done and see people doing all the time, such as driving, kayaking, fishing, crabbing, running, and biking. It would also ruin the historic charm of the waterway and small town feel. The roads leading to and from are tiny, with a speed limit of 35, making the idea of a highway sized bridge even more ridiculous. A bridge that preserves the current positioning, functions, styling, and materiality is the only acceptable plan. I'd also like to mention how little I care about being stopped for boats. It hardly ever happens, and never for long.

In short, I'd like to see the people involved with this project prioritize design, historic preservation, and quality of life over minor inconveniences and cost concerns. The Navesink, its views, and uses from the bridge should be considered among the county's most valuable assets and treated as such.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 6

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
I am a Middletown resident in the Navesink neighborhood. I work in Little Silver, and use the bridge every day to go to and from work. I also belong to a congregation in Rumson, so I also use the bridge on weekends. I bike regularly, and ride over the bridge.

The Oceanic Bridge is an experience, not just a way over the water. It's design, whether intended or not, forces you to slow down. What a beautiful view. I was reading one of the articles about the project and was dismayed by one engineer's comment that the curve on the Middletown side would have to be changed because of limited sight distance, blah, blah, blah. Missing the whole point. Why do people love this bridge? It's unique. It's authentically ours. I am not in favor of speeding up the commute to accommodate and encourage faster driving. No matter what happens to the bridge, it still begins and ends in either direction, on local streets, not highway extensions. Keep a draw bridge. Keep it low. One lane each way with bike lanes. If drawings are available, let them stay on display at the Middletown Library and Rumson Municipal building for people to see.
Thank you for your additional comments. It will be shared with the project team.

Thank you.
Inkyung

---

On Aug 2, 2017 8:16 AM, "Engelhart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Engelhart@co.monmouth.nj.us> wrote:

Thank you for your comments. It will be shared with the project team.

Please visit the project website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com for project information.

Also, the boards/renderings from the June 20th Public Information Center meetings are available on the project website under “Community Involvement: Activities to Date”.

Thank you.
Inkyung

---

I am a Middletown resident in the Navesink neighborhood. I work in Little Silver, and use the bridge every day to go to and from work. I also belong to a congregation in Rumson, so I also use the bridge on weekends. I bike regularly, and ride over the bridge.

The Oceanic Bridge is an experience, not just a way over the water. It's design, whether intended or not, forces you to slow down. What a beautiful view. I was reading one of the articles about the project and was dismayed by one engineer's comment that the curve on the Middletown side would have to be changed because of limited sight distance, blah, blah, blah. Missing the whole point. Why do people love this bridge? It's unique. It's authentically ours. I am not in favor of speeding up the commute to accommodate and encourage faster driving. No matter what happens to the bridge, it still begins and ends in either direction, on local streets, not highway extensions. Keep a draw bridge. Keep it low. One lane each way with bike lanes. If drawings are available, let them stay on display at the Middletown Library and Rumson Municipal building for people to see.

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Droid
PIC COMMENT # 7
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) on Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: 

Mailing Address: 

Email: 

Comments/Suggestions:

7 A is best. Do not use

email

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 8
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ____________________________
Mailing Address: ________________________________
Email: ________________________________
Comments/Suggestions: 7A is best

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 24, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkying.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 9
Subject: Oceanic bridge
Date: Saturday, July 22, 2017 7:37 AM
From: 
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oceanic bridge

Repair the old bridge. Do not put a big span like the one in Atlantic Highlands. We have been residents of Rumson for 35 years.
Subject: The Oceanic bridge
Date: Saturday, July 22, 2017 7:40 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: The Oceanic bridge

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD A SO CALLED "MODERN BRIDGE" IT WILL DESTROY THE BEAUTY OF OUR AREA. FIX THE BRIDGE AND MAKE US HAPPY. WE ARE A FAMILY THAT RESIDES IN RUMSON FOR OVER 30 YEARS
PIC COMMENT # 11
For the small bridge, similar what is already there. Thank you
PIC COMMENT # 12
As a Rumson resident, I prefer a bridge with aesthetic integrity. Please consider 7a/22 ft.

Thanks.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 13
My name is [redacted]
I live at [redacted]
I strongly prefer design option 7A/22 Feet

I cross the bridge daily and am often walking and biking with my kids across

Please pick this option.

Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 14
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 7:30 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

I am a lifelong resident of Rumson and live a few blocks from the bridge. I'm in favor of the fixed span bridge, preferably the proposed bridge that is 45' high. This design will alleviate traffic from bridge openings and provide a safer and easier passageway for boaters. The existing bridge is outdated in design and opens too often for boats that can easily navigate under the bridge without an opening. I am also a boat owner. We do not need to hire bridge tenders for the next 100 years. I support a bridge with a wide pedestrian walkway and bike lane since the bridge is also heavily used by bikers and walkers in the area and one of the few scenic areas to view the river.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 15
To Whom It May Concern,
I am very concerned about the relocation of the bridge entrance to Navesink River Road (NRR). We already have heavy traffic on NRR road and the very sharp curve on the approach to Locust Point/Bingham.

By increasing the traffic volume on NRR, you are opening up the more aggressive driving around this curve. It just doesn’t make sense from a traffic perspective.

You will have the boat commuters from Rumson going over the bridge, speeding down NNR to get to Atlantic Highlands/Conners to catch the Seastreak. You should observe them in the mornings coming off of the current bridge, taking a right onto Locust Point Road. There is a yield sign which most choose to ignore. I have observed many near collisions with NNR residents and School buses (!). I would suggest monitoring the morning and evening commuting hours/traffic patterns --your findings will be disturbing.

Please take this intro consideration as you consider your options.

Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 16
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 3:47 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>

Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

I would select option 7a if it is absolutely necessary to replace the existing bridge.

Regards

[Redacted]
PIC COMMENT # 17
To whom it may concern:

I have lived in Middletown for over twenty-one years, and I must say that waking up everyday in this area really teaches you to soak up your surroundings and realize all the beauty around you. One of the most influential forms of tourism in this area is either related to the beach or some sort of water surrounding.

As we all know, the oceanic bridge connecting the Locust area to Rumson is in disrepair. With it being built in the late-1930s it is indeed time for an update. What's greatest about that bridge is the simplicity, the architecture, and the ability to see both west and east of the bridge, without being 65 feet in the air. It's simple design and flow allow drivers and visitors of the area to experience one of the prettiest views in New Jersey, all while soaking up the salty New Jersey air.

The current design is cleaner and quieter for surrounding neighborhoods and surroundings. The Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design is closest to existing bridge in form and function and 22-foot height is a safer configuration for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists and motorists.

Thanks,
PIC COMMENT # 18
**Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions**

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [redacted]

Mailing Address: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

- 65' Too High — Not Like Hwy 36 Bridge, Highlands/Sea Bright
- No Fixed Span
- Open Sides/Rails for View — Not like Front St. Bridge in Red Bank
- No 6-A/B
- Preserve Character of Area
- Minimize Traffic Increase as Possible

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 19
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 12:36 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Conversation: Oceanic Bridge Comment

I am a life-long resident on Monmouth County and have resided at [Redacted] since 1967. I am in the habit of walking across the Oceanic bridge 3-5 times/week and have probably driven across it more than 25,000 times. I clearly perceive its poor (and deteriorating) condition and welcome its replacement.

I prefer the “east” alignments.....7B or 8.

Clearance (height) is a real issue. I reject a low level, movable bridge. Visually, it obstructs. Functionally, it retards traffic on what is becoming a commuting route of increasing importance. Economically, it entails unnecessary and continuing expense. The only popular argument for it is that it continues the form and function of the existing bridge.....that seems the classic “don’t change anything” reaction of those who fear change.....it’s a position I reject since I see nothing magic in the form and function of the existing bridge.

Admittedly the 65’ clear bridge may be difficult (challenging?) for walkers and cyclists.....the 45’ alternative may be less challenging and economically acceptable since it will rarely open, most likely by appointment, and would not require full-time staff.

Other comments:
- Either the 45’ or 65’ options should include widened resting/seating areas for pedestrians at appropriate intervals.
- Vertical alignment should maintain a minimum pavement elevation to protect the route from storm-related tidal flooding (taking into account projections of sea-level rise).....the north end of the project is a particular concern. I recognize that maintaining access to adjacent properties will be an issue but considering the investment being made it is an issue which demands a solution.
- Consideration should be given to keeping portions of the existing bridge to accommodate fishing. It may be possible to raise the south end if the new bridge enough to provide “underpass” access to the old structure.
- The renderings of the higher level bridge options need study. The structure appears more massive than necessary....creative design may be able to produce a structure with a much lighter appearance. Less structure depth, greater pier spacing, fewer than 3 columns per pier. A creatively designed high-level bridge should provide better river view from eye-level than the current bridge provides.

Thank you for considering my comments. Good luck with your project.
PIC COMMENT # 20
Oceanic Bridge Comment

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thu, Aug 3, 2017 at 9:19 PM

I have lived in this area for 52 years and cross the Oceanic Bridge every day on the way to and from work. I also cross it on a regular basis to get to the places in which I like to recreate. It seems ridiculous to have hundreds of motorists sit in there cars burning fuel and time and creating extra pollution every time a boat wants to go under it.

The County of Monmouth should use the Highlands bridge as a shining example of how modern engineering can solve modern issues. The Highlands bridge looks great and doesn't cause traffic jams every time a boat goes under it.

The Oceanic Bridge has no more historic value than the old Eatontown traffic circle. It is simply one of many outdated bridges in the country. The current design is outdated. Today's infrastructure should be designed to meet the demands of today's motorists and boaters.

Please build a fixed span bridge and make everybody's lives better on a daily basis.
As a lifelong resident of the immediate area, and the last years living less than one-half mile from the Oceanic Bridge in Locust, I am strongly opposed to replacing it with a drawbridge. Also, I own a boat on the Nave sink River and keep it at Barnacle Bill's. I am intimately familiar with the inconveniences of the bridge. In the 20 years I have lived in Locust, I have seen the volume of traffic increase ten fold. Traffic backs up for the better part of a mile and more during summer months. The additional traffic by commuters using Seastreak, of which I am one of, contributes to the use and congestion.

I do very, very much enjoy the appearance of the existing bridge. It truly is an appealing structure and I will miss it. But it was built at a time when the population and vehicular traffic in the area were but a fraction of what we have today.

I find it ludicrous that the new fixed span bridge over the Shrewsbury was fine for that location and that a similar structure over the Nave sink is even in question. It is a no brainer.

While I fully understand that the wealthy property owners having a view of the bridge are opposed to a fixed span, it is not the driver behind the decision. And I dare say that many of the self proclaimed, pro-environment folks opposing the fixed span structure are incredible hypocrites. What of all of the emissions caused by hundreds of idling vehicles sitting along the roadways going nowhere day in and day out. And I am sorry that some people will lose their jobs with a fixed span, but those are jobs that are quite unnecessary in today's world. I will miss waving at them as I will miss the bridge.

I do love the looks and style of the existing bridge but it is time to be practical, real and to use the taxpayers' money wisely for a change.
PIC COMMENT # 22
My family lives within site of the Oceanic Bridge. We use the bridge frequently. I strongly believe the community will be best served by maintaining the new design and construction of the bridge as close as possible to the current design and construction.
PIC COMMENT # 23
Perspective

I am a 50+ year resident of the Rumson-Fair Haven communities, and I have been a frequent boater under the bridge as well driver on the bridge.

Comments

1. There is no question the bridge needs replacement, it appears to be far too aged and impacted to have a cost effective rehabilitation.
2. Ideally, the 65 ft option provides the least amount of ongoing maintenance and operational costs, however the height from an aesthetic and safety point of view could be problematic.
   A. A 65 ft span would impact sight lines on the river and put auto headlights at night at the same level as many surrounding homes
   B. In winter, the additional height could cause icing sooner and later in the season than lower roadways

3. The 45 ft option would be a nice compromise,(reducing openings to almost 0) however without knowing the compared 50 year cost structure to the 65 ft option, it would be hard to choose.

4. Route- The only realistic choices seem to be a new structure built in parallel, either east or west of the existing structure. The desire to smooth out the substandard curves on the Middletown side is honorable, however, again, this should be weighed against the increased cost of additional over water construction as opposed to re-using the existing road path. Since vehicles need to come to a stop at Navesink River Road anyway, the sharper curves do not seem to be an undue burden, and if properly marked, could actually enhance safety by requiring slower driving.

5. 22 Ft height: I realize this is probably not an option at all, however, there will be something lost in the charm of our community when crossing the bridge, having to stop once in a while and take in one of the most beautiful natural areas in the country. Even getting out of your car to breathe the fresh air and watch the boats go by while the bells sound forces us to slow down, and relax for 10 minutes. It's just something to consider in this whole process- we tend to focus on speed and efficiency, bigger and more modern structures, but sometimes some old school charm isn't a bad thing.

Lastly, after reviewing all the options, I would be voting for one that closely mirrors the existing path, but in order to make a more detailed choice, cost and environmental information, as well as length of construction time and disruption to cars and boats would need to be known.
PIC COMMENT # 24
Navesink residents comment

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thu, Aug 3, 2017 at 9:50 PM

We would like to see the bridge remain in the same location, without the addition of another bridge west near browns dock/ buena vista.

We would like the bridge to remain low level- not a large structure like the sandy hook bridge.

Thank you for asking for our involvement and including our opinion.
PIC COMMENT # 25
I am writing to voice my support for Bridge 7A/22 Feet to replace the current Oceanic Bridge. I have lived in the area for 17 years and I believe that the bridge design should be as close to the existing design as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
PIC COMMENT # 26
I am writing to you to voice my support for the 7A/22 bridge option. I have lived in the area for more than twenty years and think this is the best replacement option and most congruous with the locale.

Thank you.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 27
Subject: Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 9:15 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Bridge

We wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

We live at [Redacted] Thank you!
PIC COMMENT # 28
To whom it may concern,

The Oceanic bridge is an iconic part of the Navesink River. The boat traffic is mostly local mariners and the amount of time the bridge is lifted is minimal. To consider a single span bridge for this river would not be a wise decision for the area. Unlike the Highlands Bridge where you have a large tourist inflow and outflow to Sandy Hook as well as Sea Bright and the other beach communities south to Long Branch, Route 36 is a major thoroughfare. Bingham Hill Road is most traveled by the local communities of the two rivers, with slightly more traffic during the summer months as people tend to visit the local stores and restaurants in the area. By having a fixed bridge will decrease property values as well as the view of the river will be drastically changed in a negative way. Like the bridge on Route 70 between Brick and Brielle, make it a single lift. The bridges today are much faster than there predecessors. Keep the area scenic. Keep the bridge low.

I urge you to vote in favor of the design Alternate 7A with 22 foot high bascule bridge

Respectfully,
PIC COMMENT # 29
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 9:26 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehant, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehant@co.monmouth.nj.us>,
"monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

My name is [Redacted] and I live at [Redacted]

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there
(about 30' high at the highest point)

Thank you,

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail, delete, and then destroy all copies of the original message.
PIC COMMENT # 30
I'd like to advocate for the 7a/22 ft high bridge replacing the Oceanic Bridge. Something that would most closely resemble the historic design would enhance the community’s on both sides of the bridge. The design would continue to support pedestrians and joggers who use the bridge regularly. The accessibility to the bridge to see the view both from the bridge and from a boat makes a big difference so that there is not a huge structure that would take away from the beauty of the surrounding area.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 31

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
PAGE 1: General Comment Form

Q1: Contact Information
Name: 
Address: 
Email: 
Phone number: 

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:

AESTHETIC
Preserve the beautifully complementary profile of the present bridge/local skyline.
A taller profile violates the locale.

NAVIGATION
Present design perfectly accommodates local and appropriate transient craft. Greater vertical clearance is not a need.
THANK YOU

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

The report of the last meetings is thorough and hugely informative.
PIC COMMENT # 32
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

1. Please coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard to arrange for scheduled openings (vs. on demand)
2. The area is historic in nature, a high bridge would not enhance the area, a low 45 may be maintained.
3. The curve in the road on the middletown side is needed to control speed limits
4. Maintaining public access is important.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Hello,

On June 20th 2017, I complete a comment page at the evening meeting held at Rumson Fair Haven HS, and submitted it to your staff. However, I wrote an incorrect bridge height, inadvertently commented on a 45' height bridge in ERROR. Please correct my paperwork to reflect MAX HEIGHT 22'.

MAXIMUM BRIDGE HEIGHT SHOULD NOT EXCEED 22'

Other important comments I would like to reiterate:

-- Maintain curve in the road on the Locust side of the bridge as it controls speed on the roadway.
-- Negotiate with the US Coast Guard to enact scheduled opening of the Oceanic Bridge and discontinue openings on demand.

-- Maintain current location of bridge as much as possible.

-- Maintain public access in current location as much as possible.

-- Have only one pedestrian sidewalk across the bridge, (two sidewalks not necessary.)

-- Maintain the historic nature of the area in the design of the bridge.

Thank you,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 33
I vote for the 7A/22 foot bridge design! Please retain the current historic design and function. Thank you!
PIC COMMENT # 34
I like Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 35
In regard to the bridge in Rumson: I would like to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point), basically replacing what is already there.
PIC COMMENT # 36
Dear Mr. Englehart,

I applaud you and your group for conducting PIC meetings in conformance with State and Federal regulations regarding the fate of the Oceanic Bridge (S-31). My address is and as a resident of Rumson for more than 25 years, all of which have been in eyesight of S-31, the time is right for a new bridge. While I am concerned with the aesthetic, environmental character and safety of a new bridge, the opinion of the “Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association” nor local politicians is not necessarily the opinion of everyone in Rumson or Middletown. I would hate to think of just a few holding up such a significant and monumental project. The 65 Foot Azzolina Bridge in Highlands, N.J. is absolutely beautiful in every way. Great job. From a distance its barely cuts a thin line across the water and melds perfectly into its surroundings. Bridges are works of art. I would like to see the Oceanic Bridge (S-31) replaced as soon as possible with something very similar to the “Captain Joseph Azzolina Memorial Bridge”. Keep up the good work. By the way, the Browns Dock Road / Buena Vista Avenue Bridge is a great idea.

Regards,
PIC COMMENT # 37
I live on the Navesink/Middletown side of the bridge and use it 2-4 times daily.

I am in favor of a new bridge to replace the existing one

- Accommodations should be made for pedestrians and cyclists in the design

  As a local resident, the frequency of draw bridge use is not a significant disruption and I don’t believe that the height of the bridge should be raised more than 5 feet to allow for nautical passage without drawbridge use

- It is a scenic area and it’s critical that the aesthetic of the bridge be a critical part of the planning

Thanks,
PIC COMMENT # 38
PAGE 1: General Comment Form

Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
All of the fixed bridge options look just fine in the conceptual "from here.." renderings. Very well presented! Its hard to see how these options would decrease property values as some have claimed.
PIC COMMENT # 39
Hello -

My name is:

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Many thanks!
PIC COMMENT # 40
Hello --

My opinion:
A low drawbridge that retains aesthetics and does not invite unnecessary traffic is optimal.

My details:

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 41
Good Afternoon,

I am writing to express my opposition to a higher bridge replacement for the historic Oceanic Bridge spanning the Navesink River.

The bridge design chosen will affect us personally. We live on the Middletown/Locust side at the foot of the bridge by the blinker light. The elevation of our driveway is the same height currently as the roadway. Obviously we have great concern on the choice of bridge design and height of bridge chosen.

The current Oceanic bridge in need of replacement should be replaced by a 22 foot high bascule bridge which blends with the scenic beauty of the river. Monmouth County is an area of magnificent natural beauty. There are many local artists and photographers drawing and photographing the current bridge along with the surrounding beauty. This bridge is used by not only the local traffic but is used by walkers, many along with their pets and baby carriages, joggers and fishermen. There is no need for a sidewalk on the west side of the bridge. That could be a dangerous situation with people crossing over.

The aesthetics of a tall fixed bridge would be detrimental to the character of the Navesink River and surrounding area.

I urge you to vote in favor of the 22 ft. high bascule bridge design 7A or 4A.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Sincerely,
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 42
Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS / OCEANIC BRIDGE PROJECT

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 12:18 PM

Hello!

Throughout the year, through all four seasons, at different times of the day, I take every opportunity to walk across the Oceanic Bridge. It has been very apparent to me that in recent years very, very few times does the bridge open to nautical traffic. No doubt this information can be readily confirmed. In effect, we are debating an issue that benefits a tiny handful of boaters. More specifically we are debating not only compromising the beauty and quality of life for many, but the extravagant expenditure of tax dollars on a project so that a very small number of folks have access to a very small section of river. Ridiculous!

Please folks, take your lawn chairs, and spend the week end at Victory Park and count the handful of times this bridge needs to open! And please do the math...calculate what each pass will cost the tax payer for those few boaters to pass under a manned, or mechanical, bridge.

And yes, there are numerous options on the ocean side of the bridge where boaters may safely dock their boats.

Regards,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 43
Hello, I am writing regarding the Oceanic Bridge replacement. I have some concerns about the new design. I feel that the height of the bridge presents some serious problems. One is the height of the bridge, which I feel can present problems during winter weather. It would create dangerous road conditions.

The other concern I have is that with such a high bridge, it can lead to potential suicides. There are other bridges in the state that have a similar design and have been used by depressed people to commit suicide.

I feel that protecting our citizens should be of utmost importance. Therefore, I feel that the Oceanic Bridge should be left at its present height.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 44

Commenter provided 3 comments during the comment period.
I personally am in favor of movable replacement of existing height 4B either existing or to the West, really doesn't matter to me either way. I am against a high Fix Span Bridge. I understand peoples concerns about movable spans, such as "What if An Ambulance couldn't get a Patient to The Hospital in time due to The Bridge being Open", however my point is how often does that happen, compare to the number of motor vehicle accidents during winter ice conditions on high Fix Span Bridges? So my vote is for A movable Span Bridge Replacement.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Hi I am writing in hopes that The Oceanic Bridge will remain a movable draw bridge. I find that a high fixed span bridge will cause more problems especially during the winter time, as they tend to cause more motor vehicle accidents. I understand that people are concerned about ambulances not being able to get across the bridge if it's open for Marine traffic, however I have not seen any proof about that being a real serious problem and/or frequently happening and I find that to be more easily avoidable then the problems that occur with fix span high bridges. I can clarify further what I mean by this if anything I am writing here is unclear and My Email Address [redacted]. I also find and can provide proof that the current draw bridge is not causing major traffic problems and therefore there's really no need to make The Oceanic Bridge a high fixed span bridge. I hope this is taken into consideration and that The New Oceanic Bridge will be the same type of bridge as the existing one.

Sincerely
Hi

I am writing in regards to The New Oceanic Bridge plans. I am hoping that the new bridge will be Alternative 7A with a 22 foot high bascule draw bridge with it being similar to the current existing bridge.

I have many reasons as to why I oppose the idea of having a high fixed span bridge. Not only will it be an obstruction to the views and scenery that currently exists, I strongly believe it will cause more serious problems then a movable draw bridge. For one thing, I have seen many high fixed span bridges cause major motor vehicle accidents, especially in the winter time during snow and ice storms. Also I am concerned about suicides becoming a huge problem, especially being that The Oceanic Bridge is in a residential area with easy walking access to it. Ever since The Old Victory Swing Bridge that separated Perth Amboy and Sayreville was replaced by a high fixed span bridge, the number of bridge jumping suicides became a huge problem, as even though that bridge is on A State Highway (Highway 35), it is still located in a residential area and people have an easier time walking on it, then they do The Route 9 Edison Bridge and/or The Garden State Parkway Driscoll Bridge. The Oceanic Bridge is locate at an all residential area, with even easier walking access then The Victory Bridge. Also there have been a large number of motor vehicle accidents and traffic really has not improved much with the high fixed span bridge. I know this because I lived in Perth Amboy for 10 years and 6 years I worked as A Perth Amboy Auxiliary Police Officer and I responded to many of these calls.

I understand those who are opposed to keeping a movable draw bridge, are opposed to reasons, such as traffic and the concern about an ambulance not being able to get a patient to the hospital in time due to the bridge being open for Marine traffic. I am not saying those reasons are not legit concerns nor am I saying that they are wrong. However I respectfully ask, how often does that happen, because I have not heard in any form of Media, that movable draw bridges are really causing a serious problem preventing ambulances from getting to hospitals on time, sure it could happen and I am sure it has happened at times, but not nearly as much as motor vehicle accidents and suicides from high fixed span bridges, which have made headlines as being a very serious problem. The fear of ambulances not making it to hospitals can also easily be prevented with all the technology and forms of communication we have now a days. Also the existing bridge really does not cause major traffic problems in the area it's located and again I can provide proof of that.

So in conclusion I stand by my hopes of The New Oceanic Bridge remaining a movable low level draw bridge. If I can be of any further assistance, I can be reached at [redacted]. Thank You very much for your time and allowing me to share my opinion of this important matter amongst my fellow residents and myself.

Sincerely

[Redacted]
I'm in favor of raising the height of the Oceanic Bridge; I'm totally against replacing it with another drawbridge. Prior to the replacement of the Highlands Bridge I heard nothing but complaints about its proposed height. However, since the bridge was built, I have only heard positive feedback, including the former critics. It's obvious the taller bridge is more practical on many levels (no pun intended). The practicality & lower cost over its lifespan far outweighs the visual effect of a lower bridge. At best it's a view that only a few people can see to appreciate on any given day. BTW...I live in Rumson & own a 31 foot boat that I dock in Fair Haven (the boat does not require the Oceanic Bridge to open).
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 46
Good morning ~

My name is [Redacted] and I reside at [Redacted]

I am writing to inform you & give my comments about the new Oceanic Bridge design. I like Alternative 7A with a 22 foot high bascule draw bridge for the following reasons:

1. it is closest to the existing bridge in form and function 2. the 22 foot height is a safer configuration for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists & motorists 3. it is cleaner and quieter than high, fixed span alternatives 4. the 22 foot profile is an historic design connecting two historic districts

Thank you for your time.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 47
-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 7:28 AM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: Vote for 7a/22

Hello
My name is [Redacted] I live in [Redacted] I am strongly in favor of option 7a/22 for the renovation of the Oceanic Bridge.

Thank you
PIC COMMENT # 48
Please go with 7A/22 feet for the oceanic bridge due to the below

- Closest to existing bridge in form and function
- The 22-foot height is a safer configuration for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists and motorists
- Cleaner and quieter than high, fixed-span alternatives
- The 22-foot profile is an historic design connecting two Historic Districts

Thank you.
Monmouth County
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 49
Oceanic Bridge Engineer committee:

I would like to advocate for the oceanic bridge in Rumson be replaced with a version that currently exists. The 7A/22 is that choice and fits ascetically in our area. That bridge and that area of the Navesink define the peninsula please respect that and do not put up a institutional bridge.

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 50
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR 8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Collector:
Started:
Last Modified:
Time Spent:
IP Address:

Page 1: General Comment Form

Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Comments/Suggestions:
Replace with least cost solution. A fixed span is preferred. Do not close existing bridge until new bridge complete
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 51
I believe traffic over this bridge has substantially increased over my lifetime. (I'm 69 yrs old). I remember when bridge openings with waiting vehicles numbering only 10 on each side. Lately I've seen openings result in vehicles backed up on Bingham Ave, south of River Rd and impacting traffic on River Rd. I think it's unfair for a single pleasure boat to impact that many vehicles.

I would like to see the bridge replaced with a fixed bridge, higher if necessary. Or if a fixed bridge is not an option, then a similar bridge with greatly reduced bridge opening times.

Sincerely,
First I am hearing about it is August 3

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thu, Aug 3, 2017 at 10:33 PM

I live in Navesink and this is the first I am hearing about this tonight: please keep the bridge as is.

There is really no need to change it. It serves its purpose for drivers and boaters.

It's baffling to think about the idea of "fixing" something that isn't broken.

I'd be interested in learning where this idea or suggestion of a new bridge came from.

My choice (I believe there was a survey) would be the to have the bridge at 30 feet high, basically replacing what is already there.
PIC COMMENT # 53
Subject: Oceanic bridge
Date: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 9:58 AM
From: [redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oceanic bridge

I first started fishing the bridge when I was fifteen years old. When I was around twenty five the local police started enforcing the no fishing rules. At that time I was fishing with twenty guys on a regular basis. After a long hard fought battle the police gave up. Then this new company took over and shut down the bridges. Highlands sea bright and the oceanic. Many of my die hard bridge buddies have disappeared. Bridge fishing was there life. Now they have turned to other things. Drugs, drinking, gambling. We loved fishing the oceanic. A beautiful bridge with incredible views. Being on that bridge many night from sunset to sunrise is a pleasure I don't want to forget. Please, if and when you build a new bridge, make room for the fishermen, that once called this bridge home.
PIC COMMENT # 54

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
Hi Inkyung-

On www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com it mentions that

"Written comments will be accepted through August 4, 2017. Comments may be mailed or faxed to: Inkyung Englehart, Project Manager".

Would a email be treated the same way? Should we CC monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com? Just want to make sure my neighbors and I input is put on record properly.

Is a major rehabilitation still on the table? Or is it just one of the two options proposed on the website?

Thanks
Subject: RE: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge
Date: Monday, August 7, 2017 10:21 AM
From: [redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge

Thanks for getting back to me. It would be a shame to have a fixed bridge replace the existing bridge. Not only for all of us that live on or have a view of the river but for the towns that surround the river and NJ. Historical value of the existing should come into consideration. It was be nice to see a major rehab, like the Pulaski Sky Way.

From: Englehart, Inkyung [mailto:Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2017 8:15 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge

Email Comments are treated/documented same way as written comments and may be sent either to my email or project email addresses:
Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
<mailto:Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us> OR
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
<mailto:monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Rehabilitation options are identified as Alternative 2A: Rehabilitation and Alternative 2B: Modified Rehabilitation and are being investigated. A list of alternatives is presented on slide 7 of the PowerPoint Presentation from the June 20th PIC No. 2 on the project website.

Thank you.
Hi Inkyung-

On www.monmouthcountyocceanicbridge.com <http://www.monmouthcountyocceanicbridge.com> it mentions that

"Written comments will be accepted through August 4, 2017. Comments may be mailed or faxed to: Inkyung Englehart, Project Manager".

Would a email be treated the same way? Should we CC monmouthcountyocceanicbridge@gmail.com? Just want to make sure my neighbors and I input is put on record properly.

Is a major rehabilitation still on the table? Or is it just one of the two options proposed on the website?

Thanks
copying, distribution or action taken or not taken in reliance on it, without the expressed written consent of the County, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, you should not save, scan, transmit, print, use or disseminate this message or any information contained in this message in any way and you should promptly delete or destroy this message and all copies of it. Please notify the sender by return e-mail if you have received this message in error.
PIC COMMENT # 55
Subject: Oceanic Bridge option 7a
Date: Monday, July 17, 2017 9:27 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge option 7a

I live at [Redacted]

I support bridge option 7A, because the bridge is used by many, pedestrians and joggers, the lower profile is far safer than other options, also aesthetically the lower profile would integrate with the surrounding area. Please approve 7A.
Thank you
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 56
Subject: RE: Conceptual Alternatives for the Oceanic Bridge
Date: Wednesday, August 2, 2017 4:26 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com"
<MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com>, "inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us"
<inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Conceptual Alternatives for the Oceanic Bridge

To: Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety

I have been a resident of Monmouth County for 50 years and have lived at [Redacted] for the last 35 years. Over the last 60 years I have visited many beautiful places around the world, however every weekend when I am in Locust and take the Oceanic Bridge over to Rumson, I marvel over how this setting is as beautiful as any place I have seen. The feeling that you get from being close to the water and the overall setting makes you feel good about being in Monmouth County.

I understand why many people don’t like the draw bridge aspect of the present bridge because it tends to slow things down. However slowing things down may not be a bad idea. What we have seen in New Jersey is the general overemphasis on development resulting in poor zoning, too many roads, bigger bridges and the result is that New Jersey has become the most densely populated state in the country. This result has not been particularly good for the state’s overall reputation, not to mention the fact that the state’s finances are also one of the worst in the country.

I was born in western New Jersey and remember in the 1950’s there were studies done of the United States pointing out that some of the top towns in the country were in New Jersey- places like Montclair, Westfield, Plainfield and South Orange as examples. Today, because of poor zoning and overbuilding, none of these towns would make the top rankings. It is easy to see that some of the decisions made by municipalities, while looking like progress at the time in retrospect had unintended consequences. We only have to look at Atlantic City as a classic example. Atlantic City was presented to the public as providing a great financial benefit to both the state of New Jersey and to Atlantic City. Instead,
Atlantic City is basically bankrupt and is costing the state money instead of providing a promised windfall.

I don’t know all the details of the three styles of bridges that are under consideration but I do know from experiences that slowing things down a bit and maintaining a certain amount of tradition actually benefits a community in the long run more than people realize. If there is anything I can do, please let me know.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 57
Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
I don't care if the bridge is a high fixed bridge or a draw bridge. The critical thing is that boats are not marooned on the Red Bank end of the Navesink River. Whatever outcome is decided the bridge must accommodate boats with masts up to 65 ft tall, the same as the Highlands to Sea Bright bridge. Let that be the starting point for any decision.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 58
Hi there

As a resident of Monmouth County for my entire life, since 1983, and my relatives dating back to The Keyport/Union Beach area since Pre-Revolutionary War times. I've always loved crossing this bridge, in a time when Monmouth County has been undergoing all these new transitions I would hope to try and keep something so lovely the same in details as it's always been.

I'm for change and growth but other than making this a structural and safety update I really don't see why going higher needs to be done. Traffic is manageable and boat traffic isn't worth making that much effort to go up. I actually like when the bridge goes up and I get to take a moment enjoy the views. It was part of my childhood and I hope for it to be in my children's.

Thanks for listening and I advocate for Alternative 7A with a 22-foot

Best,
PIC COMMENT # 59
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 
Comments/Suggestions:

Re: Sidewalks - I recommend against a sidewalk on the west side of the new bridge. Over the past 10 years I've seen too many "nearmisses" where people suddenly cross from the east side to the very small space on the west side.

Also, with a steeper slope, it is likely that the real speeds will be even higher than today, increasing the danger.

The wider sidewalk on the east side is good, especially with the additional 8-foot(?) berm on both.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 60
7A/22ft is the best choice.
I would go out of my way home to drive across this bridge to Fair Haven...thinking to myself, people fly and drive to other states just to have the same beautiful view that I have at least once a day.
I don't mind waiting if the bridge is open... More time for the view.
PIC COMMENT # 61
To Whom It May Concern:
I am fortunate enough to have lived in this area my whole life and raise a family here. My wife and I travel over the Oceanic Bridge daily and it is one of the loveliest vistas, year round. I would hate to see it drastically change. Therefore I am requesting the 7A plan.

Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 62
Hello! Attached below are my wife's comments for keeping the Oceanic Bridge a low draw bridge. Thank you for your support!
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions
Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):
Name: [redacted]
Mailing Address: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

OUR family is in favor of keeping/Replacing a low draw bridge. Having lived in Navesink prior to Rumson for over 11 years, we not only used the bridge at least 5x/day but we also appreciate the low draw bridge for character and aesthetic reasons.

Please keep a LOW DRAW BRIDGE!!

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCO Study - Public Information Center Meeting - 5/28/17
PIC COMMENT # 63
Subject: Single span tall bridge option
Date: Saturday, July 22, 2017 6:22 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Single span tall bridge option

Please add my vote to a single span option. I have sat too many times and for too long on both sides of the bridge when it is open for boats.

A single span would solve so many problems.

Thank you
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 64
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR 8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Collector:  
Started:  
Last Modified:  
Time Spent:  
IP Address:  

Page 1: General Comment Form

Contact Information
Name:  
Address:  
Email:  
Phone number:  

Comments/Suggestions:
I support 7A.
PIC COMMENT # 65
Hi my name is [Redacted] I live at [Redacted]. I am writing this email to ask that you consider keeping the bridge at its current height. I have lived in town for 33 years. I love walking over that bridge and seeing all the other people walking running and wheeling strollers. The bridge is a beauty to look at and standing on it to see the sunsets nothing like it. Sure there is traffics but that is part of living at the beach!! Thank you [Redacted]
Hi,

My name is [name redacted]

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Thank you,

[sender_redacted]

OceanicBridge.pdf
7784K
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 67
Do not build a bascule bridge, it's an unnecessary waste of money.
PIC COMMENT # 68
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 9:31 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

Hello Inkyung, just to relate to you my sentiments about keeping the Oceanic bridge a low rise bascule draw bridge. I live on [Redacted] with an open view to the bridge and would strongly prefer not to look at a high rise bridge as our crossing over the Navesink into Rumson. Thank you for any consideration you could give us as residents on Hartshorne Road. Best regards, [Redacted]
PIC COMMENT # 69
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ________________________________

Mailing Address: ________________________________

Email: ________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, August 11, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

AUG 04 2017

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 6/20/17
I have attended both public outreach meetings last fall and this spring regarding the Oceanic Bridge. I submit the following comments.

Although I now agree that a complete rebuild of the bridge is necessary for reasons of safety and economy, I strongly prefer retaining a drawbridge-type span that closely resembles the current bridge. Mainly for aesthetic reasons (but also because I have a fear of heights), I object to a 65 foot fixed span bridge. It would be incompatible with the surrounding vista of river and hills that is one of the most beautiful on the Eastern seaboard. I’m not a nearby resident and I don’t use the bridge daily or even weekly, but I often choose to drive over this bridge just to enjoy the views. Perhaps a 45 foot moveable span could be a compromise.

I object to alternative plans 3 and 4A that realign the bridge connection to Navesink River Road. It’s foolish to expect property owners, who would be affected by these plans, to sell their land at any price. Both of these plans show a connection onto curved sections of Navesink River Road that would be more dangerous than the current connection. I also don’t think it’s necessary to change the curvature of the Middletown bridge-approach roadway. Traffic just needs to slow down as it enters Middletown – a complete stop is just ahead!

The plans for half-on/half-off rebuilds should be considered to prevent long shut-downs. Commuters, local residents and workers, and boat owners will all have to make some compromises, but we should be able to build a bridge to be proud of.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown
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PIC COMMENT # 70
I support plan 7a design for Oceanic Bridge which I have seen every day since I moved here almost 40 years ago. It is the jewel on the Navesink, please respect this area with an appropriate replacement. Thank-you.
PIC COMMENT # 71
To whom it may concern,

By every reasonable assessment our historic bridge is at the end of its usable lifespan. This bridge is an important link between the peninsula of Rumson and the hills of Middletown. It is not only a vital means of transportation it is also a significant piece of architecture and style.

In replacing the bridge there are a few things that should be considered as fundamentally important to all concerned. The categories of concern to me are as follows and are not necessarily listed in order of importance: Aesthetics, Traffic (pedestrian, cycle, boat and motor vehicle) Grade, Durability and the impact on residents and local business.

The two river area is a place of great history and design. There are numerous significant sites of great architecture and style. It would be my hope that the design of the bridge reflects the cultural and social respect for high style and design that was exhibited in the design of the original bridge. It would please me greatly if the design of the bridge ignored the trend towards the modern and maintained a stately elegance.

Traffic is always an issue in the Summertime on the peninsula as the bridge serves as a short cut to the beaches in Sea Bright for many of our Middletown residents. Rumson is mostly built out and the roads in Locust and also in Rumson are already sufficient for the volume of traffic we generate. I realize the bridge designers and planners will need to consider future growth but it would be a great detriment to our communities if the roads were widened and the volume of the traffic on the bridge was increased. For this reason I am in favor of keeping the bridge to two lanes, with another narrow cycling and pedestrian lane.

The grade for this bridge should be kept to a minimum. I am opposed to a fixed span that is necessarily higher to accommodate boat traffic. In today’s world with all of the available technology and the certain improvements in technology, I see no reason to mandate a fixed span because of labor costs. There is no longer a need to “man” a bridge with a bridge tender as not only can this be done with technology but the calls to open could even serve as a source of revenue through an EZpass for boats system. Although there is plenty of real estate on the north side of the channel to gain sufficient elevation, the Rumson side does not have as much run as the Middletown side. I am concerned that raising the height of the bridge will negatively impact the Salt Creek Grill, its owners and its patrons. I am also of the opinion that higher is not better aesthetically, and would negatively impact the value of our properties and also the daily chores such as going to the post office.

Lastly I would like to address the durability of the bridge and compare it to some of the bridges that have spanned centuries instead of decades. Perhaps it is a bit unrealistic to design a bridge that will last for centuries but by implementing a design of replaceable component parts, a bridge built on a structural foundation that was built to stand the test of time augmented with replaceable sectional components that are readily interchangeable we could be doing our children and grandchildren a great service.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on such an important project.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown
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PIC COMMENT # 72
Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
Dear Sirs/Madams,

I was born at Riverview Hospital in Red Bank and grew up in Rumson from 1970 through 1991.

I must have crossed the Oceanic Bridge several thousand times going to and from the Navesink Country Club to play hockey or tennis.

The only logical option to replace the bridge is Option 7A, a low draw bridge.

Please take into very serious account the opinions of current and former residents of the area when deciding what kind of bridge to put there.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 73
Please just build a fixed span bridge that will allow for the majority of the boat traffic to pass beneath it. I travel over the bridge every day and recognize that recreational boaters are in the minority and that commuters, shoppers and pedestrians should have the right of way.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 74

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
Subject: Oeanic Drawbridge
Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 8:21 AM
From: <redacted>
To: <inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oeanic Drawbridge

This aged structure should absolutely be replaced as soon as possible with a fixed span structure tall enough to accommodate the tallest sailboats. The view as you drive the bridge will be awesome and it will save the County millions of dollars over the next 75 years. I understand that the riverfront property owners are most vocal on the issue, but The County must remember that all of the County taxpayers will be funding this project, not just the riverfront property owners.
The people in Rumson and Navesink will quickly forget about the old bridge after they never again have to stop for the drawbridge opening, and they will adore the sunrise view from the top of the span.
PIC COMMENT # 75
We support a 22ft bridge.
Alternative 7-A

Thank you for your work.
PIC COMMENT # 76
-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Saturday, July 22, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: 7A/22

Please register our vote/desire to have the 7A/22 bridge design. We need to keep the design in line with the historic areas it connects.

Thank you!
I like the structure of the existing bridge and strongly support the concept of keeping as close to it as possible. It is such a beautiful landmark in the area - I would hate to see it replaced with a high bridge. I run across the current bridge weekly and don't mind getting stopped when the bridge raises - it is such a scenic place.
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PIC COMMENT # 78
To the County Engineering Office,

I would like to add my name to the list in favor of Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design. I worked on Sandy Hook for many years and crossed from Highlands to Sandy Hook on the old draw bridge as well as the high fixed span bridge. In my opinion, the fixed span poses risks for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists, and motorists. It's great height leads to higher speeds where control becomes an issue as well as increasing noise. In addition, the fixed span detracts from the aesthetic beauty of the highlands.

I live a short distance from the Oceanic Bridge and cross it regularly. I have always been satisfied with its operation. I enjoy the look of the bridge and think that its design complements the river area.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 79
I am a Middletown resident. I commute daily from Middletown to Rumson. The bridge should be a solid bridge and not a drawbridge. It should never have to be raised so it never has to open and close continually, hindering traffic on land and on the water. With a solid bridge there would be no ware and tear and repairs or replacement on the mechanism that is needed to open and close a drawbridge. A solid bridge would be cost efficient in the long run.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 80
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

This may be too early in the discussion but I am hoping that stakeholders/residents will have some input on the design of the bridge. It is important that the bridge complements fits into the local aesthetic.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
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PIC COMMENT # 81
To whom it may concern:

In response to the LCD Study phase.... I would like to see the bridge keep what's there by completely redecking with steel repairs. This would be considered a Major rehabilitation of the bridge, similar to NJDOT's Pulaski Skyway project. Not an uncommon way that the state addresses both major and minor structures that are historically significant.

It is part of our community and should be recognized as historic.

Thanks,
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PIC COMMENT # 82
Hi There-

My name is:

I would prefer a low bridge, at 30 feet high, similar to what is already currently there.

Thank you -
PIC COMMENT # 83
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [redacted]

Mailing Address: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

GENERAL COMMENTS: MUST KEEP VEHICULAR TRAFFIC OPEN DURING CONSTRUCTION

- MUST CONSIDER BICYCLEST & FISHERMEN

- MUST HAVE OPEN RAILINGS

- MUST HAVE SHIELDED LIGHTING

- MUST MAINTAIN LANDINGS CURVES MAY BE CONSIDERED "SUBSTANDARD", BUT ARE FINE.

- 65' CLEARANCE ACCOMMODATES 10% ?? SAILBOATS ??

PLEASE CONSIDER FLEXIBLE COAST GUARD FOR 45' CLEARANCE

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 84
Hi,

I would like to see the new bridge in the same position and as a drawbridge, and I am okay with the height increasing by 4 feet to allow that. I did not like any of the other options. I am quite pleased that the new bridge will have shoulders on both sides and pedestrian sidewalks on either side!!

Best of luck with the final outcome!
Many thanks for allowing extra time for the community comments.
PIC COMMENT # 85
I am not in favor of an expansive new Oceanic Bridge as for one thing it will ruin the beautiful views in both directions of Navesink River. I vote for the 7A/22 proposal.
PIC COMMENT # 86
Just copied and pasted a comment I wrote. Believe it says everything I need to say. --- Be creative and be the lead engineer that fixes the faults but keeps the iconic Oceanic bridge as similar as possible and be a legend OR just be an average and good, emphasis on average, cost analysis engineer to save a few bucks. So will you be a local legend? Or just another boring textbook engineer? Heck, it's your legacy. I don't know who you are but which one do you want to be?...

I love the Highlands bridge. I love speeding and racing other cars to get in the lane I need to be in. I love feeling like I'm driving somewhere north on the parkway with all the tourists. I love that pedestrians are terrified to cross it, let alone enjoy the magnificent view. I love how having a home and business under the bridge has done wonders for profits and home values. It's such an amazing and quick drive over that bridge!! And that 2-3 seconds you can possibly enjoy that magnificent view feels like an eternity!

Ha! Yah. It sucks! But I'm glad you get to cross it quick... I'm sorry but if you can't handle some summer traffic, you're in the wrong area my friends. Yes, the Oceanic Bridge has its faults, which need to be dealt with; however, building a monstrosity like the Highlands bridge? Um... no thank you! I've driven down the east coast to Miami far too many times and being on the Oceanic Bridge is one of the best half miles of the whole entire drive... But heck, maybe we should just get rid of one the most beautiful and iconic bridges in damn near Jersey and make it "parkway/highway like" so Joe-smoe can invade our beaches and our home towns 5 minutes faster? Well maybe 10 if it's a beach day. Yes! A beach day! Smh 😂

Whomever is hating on our bridge so much, please know, that you are more than welcome, and are encouraged to, go another way! ☺️ 😊 🐻❤️

All the best,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
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PIC COMMENT # 87
Oceanic Bridge commentary on Bridge reconstruction or Bridge rethinking

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Cc: [redacted]

Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 4:45 PM

The historic Oceanic Bridge is a source of great pride in Monmouth County as a whole and in particular to the many 25,000-plus residents of the neck of the Neversink and Shrewsbury Rivers.

The Oceanic Bridge is not only a Rumson treasure but also a New Jersey historic site - the same as the Twin Towers and the Sandy Hook Federal buildings, military barricades, and lighthouse. As a WPA work of art, it was created in a time of great USA renewal and to those not yet born during its creation, it is a tie to the past offering reverence and remembrance of the great strength of our nation in hard and frightening times. Why not create a state or federal historic site of it?

Not only has the bridge served as a conduit for commerce in all of its glorious history, it has become a favorite recreational site for all of the local population. They celebrated its arrival following the destruction of the old wooden bridge and it should be revered for all time.

I run across the bridge daily - in sun, in rain, and in snow - and I see people in wheelchairs, pushing carriages, people fishing, crabbing, talking, singing, biking, walking, driving - all with a sense of renewal from the views, the air, the beautiful character of a well-designed bridge. Wouldn't we all love to know and celebrate who engineered and designed this great addition to the Rumson village of 1939? Can we get some creative thinking on this problem? 

Tearing down this bridge and treating it as "some kind of piece of highway to be improved" is folly. A waste of valuable archival history! Whoever decides it must come down will be an accomplice to the same ruinous thinking as the person who brought down the great Pennsylvania Station in NYC among other lost treasures - and they almost lost Grand Central! Same stupid thinking. Same.

This is a recreational bridge, a historic bridge, a pride of the community, a delimiter of traffic through the sweet and savory small town of Rumson - which is a treasure of how American traditional lives are lived - as a Community! We can lift up this town in this fight to ensure history is valued, American traditions are valued, the community is valued - what is the problem with this issue?

The attempt to tear down historical buildings to create an "on-ramp" for the bridge and to tear down this bridge (which can be replaced with a replica with the new cement that strengthens as it ages - especially in saline waters - look it up) is a prime example of the STUPID thinking that will DESTROY:

1) the home values of Rumson and Fair Haven, Red Bank and Sea Bright (ergo the tax revenue).
2) the history of the town and the very valuable and underappreciated village of Rumson - houses from the 1850s, founding families residing since before the last century. Treasures that are irreplaceable.
3) the nature of a town that does not need and can ill afford the road repairs needed with high-weight truck travel that will ultimately come with a high gage bridge
4) the air quality of a town that now has greatly increased traffic and need of better residential services - TAX increases!
5) the source of communal recreation of a beautiful and compelling bridge over the Navesink, around which the history of this peninsula was created
6) the fragile nature of the Navesink River with increasing large boat and ferry traffic (polluting our air and adding fecal and personal waste to our river)
7) the exclusive nature of a historic town - already being destroyed by lax building approvals causing loss of historic and tourist income value
8) .....
I could go on, but I am just repeating what others have said.

As to the cost of the bridge keepers - we can proudly say that those positions if we do this right, will be open to internships for environmentalists, oceanographers, photographers - all kinds of people - who get funding from foundations, private donations, corporations, for the time they work with the bridge keeper supervisors, paid for by the county.

Let us be creative, forward thinking, smart people! If the only people considering what to do here are engineers and politicians, maybe we need a council of runners, young mothers, boaters, and artists. No offense - we need some creative thinking and balance.

With all of my best hopes for a better solution,
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 88
Dear Inkyung,

Thank you for the discussion and presentation your team gave on Tuesday 6th. The amount and quality of work that has gone into the Oceanic Bridge project is impressive. The residents of Monmouth County are fortunate to have such a team.

Our comments concern access to the existing Oceanic Bridge for non-vehicular use.

At present I do not walk as often as I could on the existing Oceanic Bridge, essentially because there is traffic at all hours, and the traffic is noisy. The tire noise on the concrete can be heard from hundreds of yards away. Further, there is the ever present danger from fast moving vehicles with no protective barrier. The same might be said for the new Highlands Bridge, which also has limited pedestrian traffic and a concrete road surface.

The description of your Alternative 3 states, "The existing bridge would remain and be maintained for non-vehicular use." Though Alternative 3 envisages a new bridge some distance away, the same might apply to other alignments. In particular Alternative 8, East Alignment.

There are several advantages to maintaining the existing bridge for non-vehicular use, foremost access to water, air, and recreation. The quality of these experiences will be considerable better, in fact it is a win-win as vehicular traffic can then travel unimpeded on a high span bridge (65 feet alternative). Pedestrians and cyclists will be protected from vehicles and the loud noise of tires on the concrete surface - which I understand is the likely surface on the new bridge.

To be specific I envisage the new Oceanic Bridge curving away from the bottom of Bingham Avenue in an easterly direction. The new footpath at the west side of the new bridge will fork, with one branch heading onto the existing Oceanic Bridge. The width of this connector to the existing bridge may allow for limited vehicular access, for maintenance and emergency vehicles.

There would be a similar arrangement on the Middletown side, likely allowing for greater vehicular access to parking. Parking may be on the existing roadway, and possibly on land-adjacent portions of the bridge itself.

On the Rumson side, there is adequate parking on streets and at businesses.

Imagine then, parking at the Middletown side and walking across to Rumson to Crazees or to Salt Creek Grille, or to one of the other restaurants and commercial establishments. Or imagine parking in Rumson for ice cream, lunch, or dinner and then strolling across the bridge.

The existing bascule bridge can be dismantled. A moveable bridge suitable for non-vehicular use may be a folding bridge can be constructed for around $1M, according to press reports from London. Another alternative is a thrust bridge. Or with the addition of stairways, there might be a ferry service. With all these alternatives,
hours of operation can be limited - with appropriate signage at the ends of the bridge! - and possibly privately funded. There is no requirement for pedestrian and bicycle end-to-end access at all times. However, having a bridge or ferry at limited times will add considerably to the appeal.

Could you please clarify the implications of maintaining the existing Oceanic Bridge for non-vehicular use going forward? The life span for non-vehicular use should be considerably longer than the life span allowing vehicular use. Clearly, parts of the bridge can be closed off or even removed. The surface of parts of the bridge may be removed and replaced with a surface more suited to pedestrian and cyclist use. Half the width of the existing roadway will be adequate.

Maintaining the existing Oceanic Bridge for non-vehicular bridge will add considerably to our areas amenities. It will be a boon to our health, to our businesses, and to our recreational opportunities.

We need only look as far as New York and the Highline to see the benefits of a dedicated pedestrian & cyclist span. The Oceanic Bridge as a non-vehicular resource that would not be built from scratch for that purpose, but let's not demolish it now that we have it. The opportunities are endless, from walking, strolling, biking, yoga on the bridge, perhaps a pop-up cafe, a performance space, an outdoor film theater, and great viewing, as always, of July 4 fireworks. It is the best spot around.

Please do share these comments. It is fine to make them publicly available.

---

Virus-free. www.avast.com
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PIC COMMENT # 89
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions
Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: .................................................................
Mailing Address: .......................................................
Email: .................................................................

Comments/Suggestions:

- Fixed bridge is best regarding traffic delays, nuisance to the local community/residents, and is less hazardous for boating.
- Public Access (Fishing, parking, etc.) should be a priority especially on the north side (even expanded as in Plan B).
- Tie MCPS should develop (and maintain) Re norw to increase recreational needs (which are lacking).
- Speed needs to be drastically reduced on the existing and future bridge.
- Traffic on the south side is a nightmare for local residents. "Traffic-calming" methods and lower speed limits are needed.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

And portions of the existing bridge should be kept for recreation, etc.
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PIC COMMENT # 90
We live near the bridge and use the Oceanic Bridge multiple times daily. In our opinion, it is imperative to preserve the historic nature of the bridge which includes keeping it as a movable drawbridge as close to the current height specifications as possible. Preserving public access along the curved area on the Middletown side is critical; as well as maintaining the current road curve on the Middletown side to eliminate any danger from speeding drivers, especially during the busy summer season.

The enhanced width suggested in Alternative 2B would be a welcome improvement to enhance the safety of pedestrians and bikers. We feel Alternative 2B is the best choice for repairing and also preserving this current historic bridge.
PIC COMMENT # 91
Put in a tall bridge like the Sea Bright/Highlands bridge. If the local homeowners want to maintain the drawbridge to preserve their view, they should establish an escrow account to fund the perpetual cost to fund the staff for the drawbridge.
PIC COMMENT # 92
Hello,

My name is:

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Many thanks!
PIC COMMENT # 93

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
To: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com

Good Day.

I attended the recent meeting and provided perspectives from the cycling community, but my handwriting is awful, and I thought I would take a few moments to re-state some of our concerns, since I am a much better typist than a writer.

First I should say, that I don't represent any specific group in any official capacity, but I ride with many different groups and have ridden throughout the county for more than 35 years. The Oceanic Bridge is a major access corridor for the cycling community, and I feel like I can provide some perspective.

To begin with, we need to acknowledge that just as with vehicular traffic, there is a wide variety of cycling traffic that uses the bridge. I have edited various sentences trying to classify us, but the reality is, we don't need classification. When it comes to our roadways being safe for all modes of transportation, then it becomes clear quickly that design elements that achieve a safer operating environment benefit all of us.

For example, pedestrians in crosswalks have the right-of-way is clearly the safest implementation. They are the most vulnerable user of our transportation grid, and nobody should argue that they shouldn't have right-of-way presence in crosswalks, both non-controlled, and controlled. This doesn't affect the bridge considerations per se, but it brings me to safety practices and design elements that affect the other vulnerable users: cyclists.

So, first let's talk about the new proposals that all failed to indicate a bike lane as such. One item to clear up is that when sidewalks are mentioned, sidewalks are where kids, and parents with kids ride their bikes. Sidewalks, technically are off-limits for bicycles, as bicycles are technically vehicles and are not allowed on sidewalks. The point is sidewalks cannot be considered a cycling option for using the bridge.

Second, I understand that the shoulder is where you want the cyclist to be. I would like to see future drawings indicate the bicycle lane as part of the shoulder, and specifically that part of the shoulder that hugs the vehicle lane. Not the part of the shoulder that hugs the curb. The curb is where the most debris will be. The cyclist needs a 3’ buffer on both sides, so the width of the cycling lane has to be 6’-7’.

The Rumson connection side displayed some road engineering that provides middle turn lanes for the businesses, as well as the various side streets, as an attempt to alleviate some of the congestion associated during high volume dinner times at the Salt Creek Grill, and the Post Office. The result of this, is that there is no room to continue the bicycle lane buffer all the way to River Road on either side of the street. What needs to be done there is signage with the words "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" in each direction, and chevrons in the middle of the lane which indicate that the roadway use there is shared.

Signs that say "Share the Road" that depict a cyclist are confusing to drivers because drivers don't see themselves as the majority user. Why would a sign be directed at the minority user (cyclist) telling them to share the road with the majority user? Its absurd, but that is exactly how many drivers interpret those signs. They see us as pests, and we are practicing safe cycling techniques, we require the full lane.

I suggest you familiarize yourselves with the videos at SavvyCycling.org https://vimeo.com/album/1881848 is a link to their videos which demonstrate "Using the Lane" to ride safely. Many of the specific situations in these videos will apply to the Oceanic Bridge replacement.
Lastly, there is the subject of the height of the span. From a cycling point of view we prefer spans in which our progress is not impeded by a draw bridge. Being at the meeting there are many voices opposed to the fixed span for purely aesthetic reasons. If a non-fixed span is chosen, then in the interest of maximum safety, the Bike Lane section should NOT be metal grating. We have had enough with navigating wet metal grates, and want a road surface that is safe 24x7x365.

Hopefully I have been clearer here than I was on my index cards. :)

Cheers

7/14/2017
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

Happy to see the elevation profile renderings, but A&B are obviously ground level. The other 3 I wasn't sure what the camera altitude was. It appears to be right on the water. So it represents the boaters perspective. Just noting that for the folks who live on the shores their perspective will be higher.

That said I do see a big difference in the perception of the different profile heights. I do feel that I would like to avoid a movable option, however as long as

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
The bike lanes can be made safe in all weather situations then I think the cycling community can tolerate the 22' movable option.

As for alignments, I see no reason for any alignment that is west of current.

For the 1/2 on 1/2 off, the only issue I have with that is the safety of the cycling traffic when only half the bridge is available. I used to take the lane on the highlands bridge while those lanes were substandard.

As for what is left I feel like 7B should yield to 8 which eliminates a turn. So I feel like it is either 7A or 8. It does seem like 8 offers the best solution overall, but we cyclists would be fine with 7A, 8B, or 8.

One Take away I see on the Middletown side is that the right-of-way lines appear to show that the county could make that section of lowcost a lot safer for the cycling traffic by widening the road 3' on each side. That being a major cycling thoroughfare, it disturbs me to see that this issue could have been addressed years ago.
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PIC COMMENT # 94
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

Agreed up in Rumson, N.J. Remember the wooden bridge & then in '39, I think the present bridge went up. It still is very attractive design even with the holes on the road part. '70 Bridge Rd has its twin.

I strongly want a low bridge that is like what we have now. I want it to open and it does low tall boats.

I have lived at [Redacted] since 1967. Traffic is bad now. Keep Bridge simple looking.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
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PIC COMMENT # 95
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

1. *PEDISTRIAN ACCESS "MUST" B6 ADDRESS (EGRESS) @ SALT CREEK GRILLE!
2. *OPTION 3 "CLEANEST" OPTION / GIVE ROADWAY TO MON CTY PARKS!
3. *OPTION 3 RIDICULOUS (BUGNA VISTA? RLY?!) NO!
4. NO LEFT TURN SOUTHBOUND FROM BRIDGE UNTIL LIGHT TO RIVER RD!
5. TRAFFIC LIGHT SHOULD B6 PLACED C. LOCUSI PT/NY RIV RD WITH LEFT TURN RED TO ACCOMMORATE SNORL STORY TRAFFIC!
6. FIXED SPAN PREFERRED DUE TO LOWER MAINTENANCE FROM STAFF ND R&D
7. PAINT THE BRIDGE BLUE AND WHITE W/MARACAS AND RAILS
8. REPAIR SIMPLY CANNOT B6 DONE - KEEP CLOSURES FOR CONNECTION TO NEW BRIDGE BETWEEN (JAN 1 - MAY 1) 4 BUILD NEW SPAN TO LAST LOWESST!

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 - August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 96
Hello,

I am a long time resident of the area and I easily cross the Oceanic Bridge everyday. I am NOT in favor relocating the bridge or raising it 80 feet in the air. It will NOT be in keeping with the neighborhoods charming, quaint look and feel. Anything more is frankly unnecessary. Replace what is already there, a low drawbridge.

Thank you for your consideration.
Dear Sir/Madam,
I am a resident of Rumson residing at 10 Bay Street.
I would like to register my preference for version 7A/22 of the Oceanic bridge reconstruction. I travel and view that bridge daily and would be so disappointed to see a high span bridge ruin the historic quality of the area as well as ruin the bucolic views of the Navesink and both district sides.
Thank you for your consideration!
PIC COMMENT # 98
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions. (Please print legibly):

Name: 

Mailing Address: 

Email: 

Comments/Suggestions:

I would like a fixed bridge. Fast.
I want constant access when the new bridge is being built. Also want sidewalks for easy safe walking across bridge.

Thank you.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 99
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [redacted]
Mailing Address: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

I have lived in Locust for the past 7 years. My family chose this area specifically for its historic designation and for the unique aesthetic that is provided by the convergence of the Navesink river, Huber/Hartshorne Woods, and the peninsula region which is adjoined by the Oceanic Bridge. I strongly believe that the Oceanic Bridge is a critical component in preserving the overall character to the area and thus the desirability that drew my family to the area. While I recognize that updates are required, I ask that the governing bodies aim to repair the current bridge or install a new bridge that is similar in size/stature/impact as the current bridge. Please do not install a large, tall bridge that will adversely impact the area in which we live.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 100
I am writing to state my support for the current Oceanic Bridge being replaced by Alternative 7A—a low drawbridge.
PIC COMMENT # 101
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]

Mailing Address: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

First and foremost - hurry up! This bridge is getting worse each day.

I believe it should be replaced by a new high-level bridge, thus avoiding the continual cost of maintaining and operating a moveable bridge.

Can't you shorten this ridiculously long process?

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

________________________

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 102
To whom it may concern,

I reside at [redacted] and I would like to register my preference for version 7A/22 of the Oceanic Bridge reconstruction. A high-span bridge is not indicative of the Rumson/Middletown area landscape and aesthetic. I don't believe a high-span bridge would benefit these two areas in any way other than higher traffic flows which our street design doesn't allow for.

Thank you for your consideration,
PIC COMMENT # 103
Hello

My name is [REDACTED]

I would like to keep the bridge low as it is (30ft)

Many Thanks

[REDACTED]
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTER (PIC) MEETING – JUNE 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 104
To Whom it May Concern,
I would like you to vote in favor of option 7A/22 foot configuration because it is closest to the original architecture and the height is safer for pedestrians and joggers.
Thank you,
PIC COMMENT # 105
Comment On Oceanic Bridge

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 8:05 AM

Hello,

We need to preserve the open clearance (60 feet or above) for boats to pass under the new bridge.

It is important to have the Navesink for shelter as a "hurricane hole" for area boats in case of severe storms. During storm events, many boat owners requests for haul outs are denied by marinas because of limited capacity. It is important for boat owners with high clearance boats, (both sail and power) to have a sheltered place to anchor. Atlantic Highlands and Sea Bright area is extremely exposed during a storm event.

A bridge with lower clearance would effectively cut off that part of the Navesink to a significant percentage of boats in our waters. It would lower real estate values for waterfront commercial and residential property on the inland side of the bridge. It would also cripple the marine industry on the inland side of the bridge.

Please continue to consider this in your decision making process.

Thank you,
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 106
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2017 4:51 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Dear Ms. Englehart,

It was good to meet you during the project review meeting at the RFH High School. The purpose of this note is to provide you with our comments about the direction of the Oceanic Bridge reconstruction project. As a Rumson residents living at [Redacted] this project is of high importance and interest to us. Our comments follow:

1) Of the 3 options for the new bridge, we favor the one that most closely parallels the height of current span with the addition of generous walkways and bike paths on one or both sides. It seems to us that the popularity of using the bridge will increase enormously in future years as more people: a) move into neighboring communities on both sides of the bridge and, increasingly, rely on this strategic and critical crossing to accomplish their daily activities, b) pursue a healthy active outdoor lifestyle and c) desire access to experience the extraordinary beauty of the Navesink River.

2) We favor the option that locates the bridge's access -- Brigham Road & Navesink River Road -- at their current locations...beginning and ending at generally the same spot on both sides of the river.

3) We are decidedly and wholeheartedly NOT IN FAVOR of the proposal to identify a left-turn lane, with painted lane lines and arrows, etc., on to Oak Tree Lane for cars traveling West to East across the bridge into Rumson. For us this would be an added, dangerous and unnecessary invitation for drivers to "beat the light" at River Road and Bingham Avenue by driving through our peaceful, child- (walker, stroller, jogger, biker) -friendly neighborhood. It might also have the effect of backing up traffic during heavy commuting hours on to the bridge as drivers slow to negotiate around these unwanted left-turning vehicles.

Please feel free to contact us directly to discuss these or any other issues regarding the project for the new Oceanic Bridge.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 107
Subject: I favor alternate 7A/22'
Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 11:34 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: I favor alternate 7A/22'

TWIMC -

Thank you for your willingness to receive feedback.

My name is [Redacted] and I live at [Redacted]

I want to put my 2 cents in in favor of alternative 7A (the 22' high version) for the next Oceanic Bridge.

Many thanks,
Subject: Comments on Oceanic Bridge Alternatives
Date: Thursday, August 3, 2017 4:52 AM
From: [Redacted]
Reply-To: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Comments on Oceanic Bridge Alternatives

Greetings,

Below are my contribution to the public comments on the various alternatives for the Oceanic Bridge presented in recent public hearings.

The labeling of the alternatives are those provided in the object of the link labeled: PowerPoint Presentation - Public Information Center (PIC) No. 2 which is at the URL: http://37.60.255.241/~countyof/monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2017-06-20-PIC-Presentation.pdf

The replacement to the bridge will be used for many decades, during which traffic speeds are likely to increase. It is foolish to spend money on a replacement that has curves with substandard radii of curvature, even by today's standards. This concern eliminates alternatives 1, 2A, 2B, 4B, 5, 6A, and 7A.

If the work is to last for decades, it is also foolish to leave parts of the existing bridge extant. It has outlived its lifetime by several decades and any rehabilitation or maintenance will require constant attention and require early replacement. This concern eliminates alternatives 1, 2A and 2B.

The current alignment becomes icy on cold winter nights along the cliff face at the northern end. The ice buildup is particularly dangerous because it usually occurs unexpectedly in the sharp curve. It would be safer to avoid this problem by not hugging the cliff. This concern eliminates alternatives 1, 2A, 2B, 4B, 5, 6A, and 7A.

Alternative 3 adds 2 miles, (perhaps 5 minutes) to the journey of those traveling between the Bay Shore towns and locations east of Bingham Avenue in Rumson. A substantial fraction of the bridge traffic is in this category. There also exists the possibility of a dangerous intersection at the northern end because Navesink River Road is in a hollow there. Eastbound traffic on Navesink River Road could have particular difficulty seeing backed-up bridge traffic in time to stop. Most of the bicycle traffic connects to the bridge using Locust Point Road, If Alternative 3 is chosen, some road widening will
need to be done to allow bicycles to travel safely along the narrow and steep section of Navesink River Road to the new bridge. This alternative would also put additional bicycle and car traffic on the unpaved Browns Dock Road to the north of Navesink River Road, so it will likely have to be paved. The above concerns eliminate Alternative 3.

Alternative 4A would necessarily be high for the northern half and low for the southern half. This large asymmetry in the height profile would be aesthetically displeasing. This concern eliminates Alternative 4A.

The above concerns eliminate all but alternatives 6B, 7B and 8.

Alternative 8 is my preference. It appears to offer low outage during construction and stays farther away from the shore-based fishing and crabbing than Alternatives 6B and 7B, which are acceptable but not preferred.

Regarding the choice between a fixed and a movable bridge, I prefer the fixed bridge. Movable bridges impede all motorists some of the time and some boats all of the time. If we are going to a large effort to build a bridge that will be used for many decades, we should not select a design that is only half useful. Due to the uncertainty about whether or not the bridge is open, a motorist with a deadline must allow an extra 10 or 15 minutes every time they cross a moveable bridge. Thus every time a moveable bridge is used to go to work, catch or meet a ferry, go to the movies, meet someone, go to a restaurant etc., 10 or 15 minutes is wasted. The cost of this wasted time vastly exceeds the maintenance and labor costs that are usually used to determine the cost-benefit ratio of a fixed bridge.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this message using

if such notification is not provided automatically. If you require an alternative format for submission, such as a fax, please notify me.

The comments are provided by
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 109
Good Morning,

My husband, [redacted], and I would like to keep a low drawbridge similar to the existing bridge (about 30’ at the highest point). A higher bridge, or one in a different location, would dramatically change the views and appeal of the Navesink.

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 110
Please keep a drawbridge in place!

Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 6:27 PM

To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Good Afternoon,

As a person that travels over the Oceanic Bridge almost daily, I do feel that I should take some time to comment on the options of the future Oceanic Bridge structure.

I live near the Navesink Country Club in Middletown and my little girl attends school in Rumson so I do use the Oceanic Bridge several times during each school week.

I also am a parishioner at Holy Cross Church, so I use the bridge to drive to Church along with driving to school, dining in the area, shopping at Sickles, getting ice cream at Crazee's, and visiting friends. While I do experience a hiccup in traffic when the drawbridge opens to accommodate a sailboat or another type of tall boat, the wait is not long and is well worth preserving the beauty of the area. The wait is also worth avoiding the HUGE expense of building a new bridge.

I think it is ridiculous of some persons to comment that building a new bridge is a money saving effort because the salaries of the persons attending to the drawbridge will be avoided! If the salaries paid to the persons that attend to the bridge along with the benefits of those bridge operators are considered, it would take AROUND 1000 YEARS of salaries/ benefits saved to come close to the estimated amount of $130,000,000 to build a new bridge! Plus it is a fair guess that the estimated amount of building a new bridge is very much lower than what the actual cost will inflate to. Also to be considered are the lost revenues and the loss of collected sales tax during what will be a traffic nightmare for what will probably exceed the estimated eight month construction period. While I am aware that there are costs of required repairs to the current bridge along with the cost of bridge operators, those combined costs should still be far below the cost of building a new high bridge.

When the bridge went through the major repair several years ago, my little girl was not yet attending school in Rumson and I went into that area on very few occasions.

During that period, I went to Salt Creek Grille ONE time, which I previously attended several times a month. During that time, we avoided Rumson and found other dining spots in areas such as Red Bank and Point Pleasant that became new favorites. We also avoided the Atlantic Highlands during that time because there was so much traffic. I suspect
the repair of the bridge will be a project that will take much less money and much less time than building a new high bridge. If the construction of the new bridge is estimated
to be a eight month long period, I suspect the true length of the project (which is opposed by so many local residents / taxpayers) will extend to well over a year.

There are several other factors to consider, one of which is that many of the persons that live along the Navesink River, and pay a large amount in taxes because they do so, want to preserve the view they believed they would enjoy as long as they owned their homes when they purchased their properties. It would be such a disappointment to so many families if they may no longer be able to enjoy the view and the scenery they expected when they made the decision to purchase their homes.

Also, the depreciation of property values which might be a result of the traffic and loss of a lovely view should be considered. Most people that choose to live in the residential area along the Navesink River of Rumson and of Middletown, do not want to look out their windows and view a high bridge. I believe a high bridge will rob from the beauty of the area and will rob from the value of the area.

Also to be considered is the height of a high bridge that would guarantee that is serves one of its intended purposes. How high would it need to be that ALL boats with extensive antenna heights etcetera would be able to pass underneath? An open drawbridge will continue to insure easy passage with no limitations on height.

Thank you for being open to forming an opinion on the bridge by considering the commentary of local residents. I truly do believe that a low drawbridge is in the best interest of the local residents, the businesses in the area, the fiscal health of the area and will preserve the beauty of the area that we all enjoy and treasure.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 111
I strenuously request that the Oceanic bridge should be replaced with one of similar size and with a drawbridge style. There is no need for an ugly behemoth like the Highlands to Sea Bright monstrosity. I understand why that was necessary but the Navesink does not have or require that volume of passage. I've using the bridge at least 4 times per week for 45 years and have never been upset with waiting for the bridge to cycle. I understand from the sailors that I know from Red Bank and Fair Haven, they have no issue with the height of the bridge, other than the very few who would benefit from a higher opening.
PIC COMMENT # 112
One of the beautiful things about living near the ocean is slowing down, smelling the salt air, taking a moment to see the view and nature all around us.

Personally, I love sitting and waiting for the drawbridge. Watching the boats pass by. Wondering where the boat is headed (and why these lucky people are not going to work).

A fixed span bridge will make the short trip over the small river a little faster-sure. But what it will also do is cut off Navesink & Rumson from pedestrian & bike traffic. The height and grade will make it difficult, and even unsafe, to cross except for in a vehicle (adding to pollution even). Not to mention what a terrifying experience it would be to cross in high winds or icy snow. The river is not wide enough for an attractive fixed span alternative.

Locals know the bridge goes up and make accommodations to prepare for it. When I was pregnant, we had two routes to the hospital (over the bridge was 12 minutes and over Cooper was 15) in case the bridge was up. We were prepared for the bridge.

Slow down, keep a drawbridge.

Thank you for letting my voice be heard.
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 113
Hi, I would like to vote for option 7a.

Thanks,
PIC COMMENT # 114
Attached Message

From: Englehart, Inkyung <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 7A 22 feet
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2017 11:41:03 +0000

Mr.

Thank you for your comments. It will be shared with the project team. Please visit the project website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com for project information.

Again, thank you.
Inkyung

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 30, 2017 1:46 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: 7A 22 feet

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY
This message, including any prior messages and attachments, may contain advisory, consultative and/or deliberative material, confidential information or privileged communications of the County of Monmouth. Access to this message by anyone other than the sender and the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken or not taken in reliance on it, without the expressed written consent of the County, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, you should not save, scan, transmit, print, use or disseminate this message or any information contained in this message in any way and you should promptly delete or destroy this message and all copies of it. Please notify the sender by return e-mail if you have received this message in error.
Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
When they build a bridge in Florida it is beautiful. They add parks and fishing piers under the bridges, areas to picnic, multiple uses. Design a bridge like that, beautiful and multi functional. I see you tried to do it with the Hubbards bridge with a pocket park but some how it ended up part of the marina, no explanation released for that. Do right by us, make it useful.
PIC COMMENT # 116
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 7:44 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: please keep similar bridge!
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 117
I prefer the 7A/22 plan as it is stated to be cleaner, quieter, better for human interaction/walkers & bikers!
PIC COMMENT # 118
Hello – Please see my comments about the Oceanic Bridge renovations attached to this email.
Thank you
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ____________________________________________

Mailing Address: ______________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

I prefer to keep a low drawbridge similar to the current version for character and aesthetic reasons.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017-August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 119
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 2:08 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

Alternate 7A is my choice because it represents this area in the best of ways as well as preserving the beauty of the Navesink River as the current bridge has down. A 22ft bridge with similar alignment as well as close characteristics of the 1939 bridge would make most residence happy including me. This current bridge is a staple of our lifestyle that only true residence that grew up here would understand. Thank you! Sincerely, [Redacted]
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 8:34 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

Hello, my name is [Redacted] My husband, myself and our 2 year old daughter are building a home and moving to Rumson in 6 months. I'd like to say I think the new bridge should remain in the same location as it would preserve the aesthetic views and history of the bridge. I think it should still have the gate lift so not to limit boat height. I think it should have double shoulders and double sidewalks and perhaps gas lanterns or nice lights. I hope the bridge does not become a massive 70 ft bridge as I believe it will take away much of the charm and character of the area. The bridge is beautiful and hope it always will be. Thanks for considering the public's opinion!

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 121
Hi

My name is [redacted] I live at [redacted] right up the street from the Oceanic Bridge.

I would like to see the Bridge replaced with an option that most replicates the existing. It's a unique and special experience to traverse it by foot or bicycle or car. Equally and perhaps more so to pass under it on a the water is magical. It's presence and presentation are visually comforting from all approaches. The bridge is a member of the community.

Some of the alternatives rob the community of the character and quality that the current design anchors. The history of the bridge, it's form and function are key components of the two Rivers area and Monmouth County.

I think that the 7A option best ensures the the community, county and it's visitors are supported by a new safe environmentally complementary bridge that they will be proud to experience.

Best regards

[redacted]
PIC COMMENT # 122
Subject: Vote for Bridge
Date: Thursday, August 3, 2017 1:03 PM
From: [Redacted]
Reply-To: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Vote for Bridge

I vote for any of the options for what is most cost-efficient and timely. If all are the same, my vote is to replace the existing bridge as is.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 123
June 24, 2017

MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: 

Mailing Address: 

Email: NO EMAIL

Comments/Suggestions:

We are in favor of a non-moving, high-rise replacement bridge for the following reasons:

Most of the cost of a stationary high-rise bridge will be subsidized from federal and state coffers.

The cost of salaries and benefits to operators of an opening and closing type bridge will be eliminated.

The negative impact on stopping.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street,
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
on Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: _____________________________

Mailing Address: ____________________________

Email: ____________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

traffic flow for tourists and locals will end. In the event of a catastrophe, the size of emergency vessels (medical, fire, military, evacuation, etc.) will be limited by the narrow, low-type bridge. We will also be deprived of the beautiful vistas that a high-rise bridge can offer such as the Captain Angeline Bridge over the Highlands. It provides beautiful vistas of Sandy Hook

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
iskyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ____________________________________________

Mailing Address: ____________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:
Lighthouses, the Navesinks, its coast, the Atlantic and the many pleasure and commercial vessels, etc.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 124
Subject: OCEANIC BRIDGE COMMENTS  
Date: Sunday, August 6, 2017 12:55 PM  
From: [Redacted]  
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Conversation: OCEANIC BRIDGE COMMENTS

Dear Mr Englehart,

My sister and myself truly treasure the Oceanic Bridge in its current configuration. It's an enjoyable drive with wonderful views of the river and bay area.

As you know, it's an essential thoroughfare for our local area. We believe a full rehabilitation of the bridge, keeping it's current style and history, is in the best interests of all involved, residents and towns in the surrounding area.

If the decision is that the bridge must be rebuilt, we request that the new one be created in the original design configuration, enabling the breathtaking views of the area that we enjoy today. Some bridge rebuilds, like the bridge in Red Bank that connects Red Bank with River Plaza on Front Street, may look nice, but the view as you drive across is obscured by the brick sides. What was once another nice view of the river area is gone. We hope this doesn't happen with the Oceanic Bridge.

We trust that the Local Concept Development (LCD) Study will come to the best decision for all involved, especially residents like ourselves, who will both benefit from the results and continue to support the local towns around the bridge in the years to come.

Appreciate your time on this matter, and the opportunity to voice our thoughts and concerns.

If you'd like to contact us, our phone numbers are listed below, along with our email addresses.

V/R,

[Redacted]
PIC COMMENT # 125
Q1: Contact Information
Name:  
Address:  
Email:  
Phone number:  

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
In support of option 7A with Low Draw Bridge
PIC COMMENT # 126
Dear Mrs. Etters,

Suggest 5 years ago,
Please learn the
Oceanic Bridge
Law: It's a beautiful
thing to behold & I'd
like it to stay that
way. Been here since
1973ish.

July 31, 2017
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 127
I like Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design:

- Closest to existing bridge in form and function
- The 22-foot height is a safer configuration for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists and motorists
- Cleaner and quieter than high, fixed-span alternatives
- The 22-foot profile is an historic design connecting two Historic Districts
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 128
Hi
My name is [redacted]

I would like a low draw bridge similar to what is already there.

Thank you
PIC COMMENT # 129
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Public Comments & Suggestions
Date: Monday, July 10, 2017 8:43 AM
From: [Redacted]
Reply-To: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge Public Comments & Suggestions

Dear Ms. Englehart,

Please find attached our comments regarding the Oceanic Bridge project. Thank you for taking the time to talk with me at the public meeting at Rumson Fair Haven High School. I have found everyone on the project to be both forthcoming and eager to listen. We would be happy to meet with you here at the site or at your office if it would be at all helpful. It is obviously of utmost importance to us, given our location.

Best regards,
Name: 
Address: 
Email: 

Comments:

Being primary stakeholders, and quite possibly the single most affected property in the proposed plans, we have several key points to address regarding the reconstruction of the Oceanic Bridge:

1. This bridge is not a major thoroughfare to the Jersey Shore, nor should it be presented as one to the Federal agencies being asked to pay for its reconstruction. Routes 35 and 36 are the major arteries, and they have large, recently reconstructed bridges to support their traffic. The Oceanic Bridge, on the other hand, connect two tiny suburbs, with a crosswalk leading to a children’s playground mere feet from the foot of the bridge in Rumson. More traffic, at a higher rate of speed due to a steeper grade, is not only dangerous, it is unnecessary.

2. This bridge should not be widened on both sides to encourage bicycle traffic. Neither Locust Point Rd, Navesink River Rd, nor Bingham Ave have bicycle lanes. Widening the bridge only puts bikers at more risk once they are off the bridge.

3. If the bridge is being built with two 8ft shoulders to accommodate bicycle traffic, why would we also be considering a bridge way too high for any normal human to ascend on a bike? The 5% grade proposed for the 65ft high bridge is simply impossible for children and non-elite-athletes to bike over, so a wider bridge is not necessary. It should simply be a motorist bridge with clearance for boats. Where are people biking (or walking) to anyway? On the Middletown side, there are no sidewalks, narrow roads, and no stores or restaurants.

4. The plans in every version show a widening of Bingham Ave. at the foot of the bridge on the Rumson side. This directly affects our property value, and threatens the very expensive 12 cherry trees that we planted years ago, water and tend. They are well-grown and worth tens of thousands of dollars at this point. Why widen Bingham? Consider:
   a. There is no reason to widen the road simply because the bridge is wider. The bicycle lane gets lost immediately at the foot of the bridge anyway.
   b. Left turn only lanes are drawn in on the plans we viewed, seemingly to take up the obviously unnecessary space. A left turn lane is not necessary to access the Salt Creek Grille / post office parking lot. Once a week, usually on a Friday night in the summer, there is occasionally a little back up there. That does not necessitate a permanent turning lane. In a small town, people wait for each other. And certainly there is no need at all for a left turn only lane onto tiny Oak Tree Lane. Our street is a narrow country lane. We all already withstand property damage on our front lawns from traffic. And, people are
already tempted to use our street to beat the light at River Rd. *Please* do not encourage traffic on our street. It cannot handle it, and children on bikes and people with dogs would simply have no safety while people whipped through to avoid the light.

c. The easements drawn on the plans we saw do *not appear to* match the plans that were approved by the zoning board just 5 years ago.

d. We were told at a recent meeting that it just “makes sense” to widen Bingham along our property because it widens further South. But, in actual fact, the road is only wider next to Crazee’s Ice Cream and the light at River Rd., where a left turn lane is necessary to access River Rd. If you stand on the corner of Hunt St and look North toward the bridge, it is obvious where the widening takes place—*i.e.*, between Hunt St. and River Rd., on the *West* side of Bingham. If any widening needs to be done, it should be done on the *West* side of Bingham, where widening has already been done next to Crazee’s. Why cut into property on the other side of the street? Further, a widening on the West side would only affect commercial properties, whose owners could be more easily compensated monetarily (and who would likely reap the benefit of any widening). It is simply unjust to force a road widening on private property owners, who do not want it, and then to take their land to accommodate the widening. Money *cannot fairly compensate* for the loss of the aforementioned cherry trees, the shrinking of our property, and the additional *noise, injury and death* that a closer, wider roadway will surely bring.

We still hold that a wider Bingham Ave. between the bridge and Hunt St. is *not needed*. But if the road were to be widened, please do not take a slice off the only piece of property we own in this world. We do not have a vacation house or a boat. This is our spot. It’s not for everyone. It’s a little noisy, a little lacking in privacy, and it needed a lot of TLC when we bought it. But we have beautified this corner and have many plans for making it more beautiful not just for us, but for our town. Please respect our home, our children’s safety, and our small town by building a bridge that simply meets the basic needs of the communities it serves and not by trying to convince the Federal government that it serves the entire Jersey Shore (and thus should receive federal subsidies).
PIC COMMENT # 130
I am writing to express my opinion that option 7A is the best option for the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge in Rumson, NJ. While I understand the current bridge needs to be replaced, the visual of that bridge is beautiful and I want to see any replacement visually similar in height as the current bridge. I believe that the higher elevation replacement, would make the area look horrible and detract from the natural beauty of this area.

Thank you for your attention to this.
PIC COMMENT # 131
Hello,

My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED].

I wish to see the bridge be replaced by a 30' drawbridge and stay where it currently is.

Thank you,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 132
Hello - My name is [reddacted]. My residence address is [reddacted].

I am a resident and also a boat owner that navigates on the Navesink River.

If the current Oceanic Bridge is beyond reasonable repair, then I vote for a new bridge.

However, the replacement bridge should be in the same location as the current bridge.

The replacement bridge should be a draw bridge (not a high stationary bridge like the Sandy Hook Bridge).

The appearance of the bridge should be kept consistent with the community.

We do not need a four lane bridge. Two lanes are sufficient.
PIC COMMENT # 133
Thank you for providing the opportunity to present comments regarding the future of the Oceanic Bridge. My family and I live on Navesink River Road and cross the bridge frequently as well as pass under it, typically on weekends, during the boating season. My wife estimates she's crosses the bridge approximately 6 times daily during the week and a couple times on the weekend.

In thinking about a replacement or upgrade a few things come to mind:
- we hope the project will limit down time given how frequently we utilize the bridge
- aesthetics and impact to property values
- we're not bothered by the movable (draw bridge) and feel it's actually part of the character of the bridge.

I reviewed the various "alternative" drawings during the public meeting at the Middletown Library on June 20th. I prefer alternative 7A and second choice would be 7B. Further I'm in favor of the 22' structure rather than increasing the height. I was pleasantly surprised to see at the meeting that the majority of boaters today currently pass under the existing bridge without need for opening.

I hope you find this information useful. I look forward to staying informed as to the various next steps.

Regards,
PIC COMMENT # 134
I am [redacted] across the street at [redacted]. I agree with everything he said. I have a young son and cars coming through to beat the light are presently an issue as they travel at high speeds. Our road is already congested with cars parked on the west side of N park ave for church overflow. Not just on Sundays. They have many meetings and events throughout the week. Bridge traffic would further complicate this small neighborhood.

---Original Message---
From: Englehart, Inkyung [mailto:inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us]
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2017 7:34 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge

Thank you for your comments. It will be shared with the project team.
Please visit the project website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com for project information.

Again, thank you.
Inkyung

---Original Message---
From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2017 4:51 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Dear Ms. Englehart,

It was good to meet you during the project review meeting at the RFH High School. The purpose of this note is to provide you with our comments about the direction of the Oceanic Bridge reconstruction project. As a Rumson residents living at [redacted] this project is of high importance and interest to us. Our comments follow:

1) Of the 3 options for the new bridge, we favor the one that most closely parallels the height of current span with the addition of generous walkways and bike paths on one or both sides. It seems to us that the popularity of using the bridge will increase enormously in future years as more people: a) move into neighboring communities on both sides of the bridge and, increasingly, rely on this strategic and critical crossing to accomplish their daily activities, b) pursue a healthy active outdoor lifestyle and c) desire access to experience the extraordinary beauty of the Navesink River.

2) We favor the option that locates the bridge's access -- Brigham Road & Navesink River Road -- at their current locations...beginning and ending at generally the same spot on both sides of the river.

3) We are decidedly and wholeheartedly NOT IN FAVOR of the proposal to identify a left-turn lane, with painted lane lines and arrows, etc., on to Oak Tree Lane for cars traveling West to East across the bridge into Rumson. For us this would be an added, dangerous and unnecessary invitation for drivers to "beat the light" at River Road and Bingham Avenue by driving through our peaceful, child- (walker, stroller, jogger, biker) - friendly neighborhood. It might also have the effect of backing up traffic during heavy commuting hours on to the bridge as drivers slow to negotiate around these unwanted left-turning vehicles.

Please feel free to contact us directly to discuss these or any other issues regarding the project for the new Oceanic Bridge.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 135
Hope the look and lower height of the bridge can be preserved...a favorite place and view in our area.
PIC COMMENT # 136
I wish to choose Alternative 7A as the replacement for the Oceanic Bridge which will keep intact the current Historic look of the Rumson area!
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 137
Ok, enough is enough. Replace this bridge with a fixed span bridge that doesn't need to open and cause traffic to back up. There is plenty of room to make that possible.
PIC COMMENT # 138
I agree that the bridge must be replaced. I also would like the replacement design be as near as possible to the existing bridge. Please nothing higher that the current structure!
PIC COMMENT # 139
Q1: Contact Information
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
I am standing behind the option for 7A Low Draw Bridge option to replace the filing Oceanic Bridge. I live on the cusp of Locust and Navesink, and travel back and forth at least 6 times per day. The thought of travelling over, or even the sight of a C-span, like Highlands Bridge, cutting into the beautiful vista on either side of the river, would be a travesty!
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 140
Subject: Bridge
Date: Friday, July 28, 2017 10:46 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Bridge

I suppose a high bridge would be more practical, but I would love to see it rebuilt in similar fashion to the way it is now. I think it would be more in keeping with the character of the area. For sure it needs to be rebuilt. A trip on a boat under the bridge is enough to convince anyone of that.
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

- Ophirns 7B & 8 that take the bridge path off the
descending land on the Middletown side are picked.

- A fixed span bridge is (over time) less expensive
and more practical as there will not be as many
maintenance issues. Drawbridge maintenance is a
major issue now as is the high frequency of draw
bridge opening.

- Sidewalks on both sides + a shoulder for bikers would

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
linkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 142
Good Afternoon:

Please accept this as formal comment to the Oceanic Bridge Project. My name is [redacted], and we live at [redacted]. My husband and I use the bridge daily we would like to see it be kept to a low drawbridge similar to what is there, about 30' high at the highest point. It is a beautiful bridge and the current height is consistent with the landscape. Thank you. If you any other info please let us know.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 143
Good Afternoon:
I would like to say after a lot of debate regarding the Oceanic Bridge that I support the replacement/rehabilitation of the bridge in its current form. It is a beautiful bridge. I understand the Federal Government is only interested in large stationary bridges, such as the bridge in Belmar and Highlands. It is interesting to note that the approaches to those two bridges are on major highways namely Highway 35 and Highway 36. That certainly is not situation with the Oceanic Bridge. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge on Highway 95 around Alexander, Virginia is the same type of bridge as the Oceanic Bridge and they were able to maintain the same concept when the new bridge was built just a few years ago. The Oceanic Bridge is located in historical areas between Rumson and Middletown. To build a very high stationary bridge would forever destroy the landscape and beauty of the area which we all know and would deny future generations of what was. Too much of that has happened in our County, State and Nation.
As a former Monmouth County employee, a resident of Rumson and currently a resident of Middletown Township, it is my hope that the current style bridge be replaced or rehabilitated.
Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 144
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ____________________________

Mailing Address: ________________________________

Email: ________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

See attached letter setting forth the position of

Riverside Drive Association, Friends of the Oceanic Bridge, Inc. and ____________________________

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 - August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Friends of the Oceanic Bridge, Inc.
Riverside Drive Association
P.O. Box 87
Locust, NJ 07760
rdm@redbanklegal.com

July 5, 2017

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

RE: Oceanic Bridge (S-31)

Dear Ms. Englehart:

This letter will serve as a response by Riverside Drive Association ("RDA") representing approximately 240 families in the southerly portion of the Township of Middletown in the area of the Navesink River, Locust Point, Browns Dock and Bowne Roads, Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Inc. ("Friends") and the undersigned.

As you are aware, the County of Monmouth by and through the Office of the Monmouth County Engineer ("County Engineer") and the State of New Jersey Department of Transportation proposed the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge commencing in 2004. Friends filed its Certificate of Incorporation with the Treasurer of the State of New Jersey on December 3, 2004. I am enclosing a copy of that Certificate of Incorporation (Exhibit A) which reflects that when the initial proposal was made to replace the Oceanic Bridge, Friends was formed to oppose any bridge higher than the present Oceanic Bridge which has a clearance of approximately 22 feet above the Navesink River. Note the purposes of Friends in Paragraph 2 of the Certificate. At that time, the two alternatives being proposed by the County and State were a bascule ("draw") bridge in the same configuration and height as the present Oceanic Bridge and a new fixed bridge having approximately 55 feet of clearance over the Navesink River with a total height of approximately 70 feet. Friends strongly opposed any bridge higher than the present bascule Oceanic Bridge. At that time, scoping hearings were held, meetings took place, municipalities and organizations adopted resolutions supporting a low bascule bridge, and funds were spent by the county, the state, the municipalities and local citizens, all to no avail. After approximately ten (10) years, it is my understanding that the Federal government changed the regulations, the original process was "scrapped" and a new process commenced.
Presently, a Local Concept Development Study ("Study") is being undertaken which proposes approximately ten (10) different alignments of a new bridge crossing the Navesink River. Additionally, each alignment has three (3) variations, to wit: (i) a bascule bridge having a clearance of approximately 22 feet over the Navesink River, which is the clearance of the present Oceanic Bridge; (ii) a bascule bridge having a clearance of approximately 45 feet over the Navesink River; and (iii) a fixed bridge having a clearance of approximately 65 feet over the Navesink River. The public has been asked to comment on the various alignments and variations.

The purpose of this letter is to set forth the positions of RDA, Friends and the undersigned that Alternative 7A is preferred, a bascule bridge having approximately 22 feet of clearance over the Navesink River. Alternative 3 is disregarded which proposes building the bridge one mile to the west of the present Oceanic Bridge and connecting Buena Vista Avenue in Rumson with Browns Dock Road in Middletown. As I am sure that you are aware, this alternative is a "nonstarter."

As set forth above, RDA, Friends and the undersigned prefer Alternative 7A – East Alignment which would connect the new Oceanic Bridge to Bingham Avenue in Rumson at the southern abutment and to the existing roadway near the existing parking area in Middletown. Alternative 7A would place the new Oceanic Bridge approximately 60 feet east of the existing bridge. RDA, Friends and the undersigned also greatly prefer the first variation which is a bascule bridge having approximately 22 feet of clearance over the Navesink River.

Before proceeding, it is respectfully suggested that the Study include the elimination of the westerly sidewalk over any new Oceanic Bridge. It is not needed, one does not exist now and it would be a sidewalk to nowhere. The elimination of the sidewalk would save design, construction and maintenance costs. It is also suggested that the access roadway from Middletown to the bridge be raised by 6 or 8 feet so it will be above the level of storm tides, e.g. Sandy. We would suggest a final level that is deemed satisfactory and appropriate by the County Engineer.

It is firmly believed that the NJTPA and the County Engineer should add an alternative between 22 and 45 feet clearance over the Navesink River. There should be an alternative of approximately 30 feet over the Navesink River. To double the height from 22 feet to 45 feet and then to 65 feet appears to be unreasonable. We understand from informal discussions that 45 is more of a limit the Coast Guard set to the height of a bascule bridge that would minimize openings. That would imply that heights between 22 and 45 feet can also be considered options, and we would put 30 feet as our upper limit.

Why do RDA, Friends and the undersigned prefer a low bascule bridge having approximately 22 feet of clearance over the Navesink River? Why did the municipalities of Middletown, Rumson, Fair Haven and Little Silver as well as the Middletown and Rumson Historic Districts, the Board of Chosen Freeholders, the County Engineer, the Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissioners, RDA and Friends prefer a low bridge some 12 years ago? Some of the reasons are as follows:
1. “The replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge is of utmost concern to the historic districts in both the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Its impact on the historic character of the neighborhoods in both municipalities can be a disaster or it can be completed sympathetically with respect for the design of the present bridge and its harmonious relationship with the Navesink River, the beauty of the Middletown hills and the integrity of the historic districts.” (Resolution #2011-178 adopted by the Borough Council of Fair Haven on October 11, 2011) (Exhibit B).

2. “The present Oceanic Bridge which was built in 1939 is the longest and most handsome bridge in Monmouth County. It is a masterpiece of Art Moderne design with its rounded flowing curves evident in its railings, piers and twin control towers. It is part of the Middletown and Rumson historic districts and is individually eligible for The National Register of Historic Places.” (Resolution #2011-178, Id.).

3. A high bridge would block the river view from many of the homes and businesses near the Oceanic Bridge.

4. A high bridge would cause bicyclists, joggers and strollers including those with baby carriages to have a difficult time crossing such a bridge.

5. A high bridge would cause vehicles to be less able to safely cross the bridge in icy and snowy weather.

6. A high bridge would diminish the property values on both sides of the Navesink River based on the adverse impact on their viewsheds.

7. A Resolution supporting a low bascule bridge replacement for the Oceanic Bridge between Middletown and Rumson was adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders in the County of Monmouth on August 27, 2009. I am attaching a copy of that Resolution which sets forth the position of not only the Board of Chosen Freeholders, but the positions of the County Engineer, the Boroughs of Fair Haven and Rumson, the Township of Middletown, the Board of Recreation Commissioners as well as many state legislators, and most importantly, the reasons therefor (Exhibit C). While Friends will attempt to obtain updated Resolutions from the Board of Chosen Freeholders, the Board of Recreation Commissioners and various municipalities and letters from our legislators, given the short amount of time that has been provided for public comment on ten (10) different alignments, each having three (3) variations, all of the documents and letters may not be received by August 4, 2017. Nevertheless, they will be filed with the County Engineer and with the New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority.

8. I am also attaching the Resolutions of the Township of Middletown (Exhibit D) and the Borough of Rumson (Exhibit E), the two municipalities that will be most affected by a new bridge. Please pay particular attention to the reasons set forth in the two Resolutions as even with the ten (10) different alignments, each with three (3) configurations, it is respectfully submitted that the reasons that the two municipalities supported a low bascule bridge during the initial process have not changed.
9. I am also enclosing a copy of the Resolution of the Middletown Landmarks Commission which was adopted on August 11, 2005 in connection with the first round of scoping which sets forth its reasons for supporting a low bascule bridge. I believe the Resolution of the Middletown Landmarks Commission explains in great detail why a low bascule bridge is preferred as opposed to a much higher bascule or fixed bridge (Exhibit F).

10. A high bridge will adversely dominate the views from the entire Rumson, Locust and Hartshorne waterfronts as well as from parts of the Sea Bright waterfronts and from the Navesink and Shrewsbury Rivers.

11. The Federal government has supported bascule bridges much longer, much more costly and with much more traffic than the Oceanic Bridge. For instance, the Wilson Bridge which crosses the Potomac just south of Washington and carries traffic between Oxon Hill, Maryland and Alexandria, Virginia on the heavily trafficked Interstate 495 is a bascule bridge. In connection with the construction of the Wilson Bridge, the Federal Highway Authority found that a movable bridge would best preserve the historic character of Old Alexandria and the surrounding areas.

Accordingly, RDA, Friends and the undersigned support a low bascule bridge between the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown similar in architecture and height to the present bridge - consistent with modern construction codes.

By copy of this letter to Honorable Lillian G. Burry), I would request that the Board of Chosen Freeholders adopt a Resolution supporting a low bascule bridge as it did on August 27, 2009 (Exhibit C)

Respectfully yours,
Riverside Drive Association
Friends of the Oceanic Bridge, Inc.

By: [Signature]
RICHARD D. McOMBER, Vice President

cc: Board of Chosen Freeholders of Monmouth County
   Attention: Honorable Lillian G. Burry, Freeholder Director
   Attention: Thomas A. Arnone, Freeholder
   Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., Monmouth County Engineer
   Office of Monmouth County Council
   NJTPA
   Attention: Martin A. Hofler, Director
   NJTPA Capital Programming & Project Development
CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

- -of- -

RIVERSIDE DRIVE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the undersigned

do hereby associate themselves into a corporation under and
by virtue of the provisions of an Act of the Legislature of
the State of New Jersey, entitled "An Act to incorporate
associations not for pecuniary profit," approved April 21,
1898, and the several supplements thereto and acts amendatory thereof.

FIRST.- The name of the corporation

is RIVERSIDE DRIVE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

SECOND.- The purposes for which this

corporation is formed are: To enable the members to keep in-
formed as to all matters affecting those living on or near
riverside Drive, in the Township of Middletown, Monmouth
County; to take united action with reference to the same;
to advance the welfare of the members generally and to

EXHIBIT A
(c) to encourage, stimulate, seek, solicit, accept and receive resources, services, money or property (real and personal, tangible and intangible, restricted, designated or unrestricted) from grants, endowments, contributions, devises and gifts offered by individuals, corporations, foundations, their agencies or commissions, and others;

(d) to maintain, use and apply those resources, in whole or part thereof, to promote and preserve the historic and esthetic qualities of the historic Oceanic Bridge or any replacement bridge which carries County Route 8A over the Navesink River between the Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, in the County of Monmouth, New Jersey;

(c) to maintain, use and apply those resources, in whole or part thereof, to obtain reports from professionals engaged in various fields of expertise about the present Oceanic Bridge and a possible replacement bridge;

(f) to receive any property, real, personal, or mixed, by gift, devise, bequest, purchase, lease, loan or otherwise, absolutely or in trust, and to carry out the directions and exercise the powers contained in any trust or other instrument under which such property may be so received, including, without limitation, the expenditure of the principal, as well as the income, of any property so received, if authorized or directed in such trust or other instrument; and, if so received without any designation of specific use, to expend the income and principal thereof for any one or more of the purposes set forth
herein and in such manner and amounts and at such time or times as deemed proper by the Board of Trustees of this Organization;

(g) to use appropriate means consistent with law to achieve the mission of the Organization;

(h) to provide funds for staff development;

(i) to provide funds for supplementing building or improvement programs for the present or a new Oceanic Bridge;

(j) to enter into contracts with other persons and corporations under which the Organization would carry out any and all of the activities of the Organization;

(k) to do and engage in any and all lawful activities that may be incidental to or reasonably related to any of the foregoing purposes, and to have and exercise all other powers and authorities now or hereafter conferred upon nonprofit corporations under the laws of the State of New Jersey;

(l) notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of these Bylaws of the Organization:

(i) no part of the net earnings of this Organization shall inure to the benefit of, or be distributable to, its Trustees, Officers, or other private persons, except that the Organization shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered to the Organization, to make reimbursements for expenses incurred in conducting its affairs and to carry out its purposes, and to make payments and distributions in furtherance of the purposes set forth above;

(vii) the Organization shall not make any investments which will subject it to tax under Section 4944 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or by the corresponding provisions of any subsequent federal tax law;

(viii) the Organization shall not make any taxable expenditure as defined by Section 4945 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or by the corresponding provisions of any subsequent federal tax law;

(ix) the Organization shall not give any gift, grant, or financial support of any other kind to any organization which does not qualify as an exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, contributions to which are deductible under Section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or under the corresponding provisions of any subsequent federal tax law.

THIRD: All funds received by the Organization will be expended solely for the purposes specified by this Certificate.

FOURTH: The Organization shall have no Members.

FIFTH: The method of electing Trustees and Officers of the Organization shall be as set forth in the Bylaws of the Organization.

SIXTH: The initial Registered Office of the Organization shall be 54 Shrewsbury Avenue, Red Bank, New Jersey 07701, and the initial Registered Agent at that location is Richard D. McOmber.

SEVENTH: The number of Trustees constituting the first Board of Trustees shall be seven. Their name and addresses are:
NAME:  
Todd Thompson, President
Linda Mckeau, Vice President  RUMSON
Christopher S. Colman, Vice President – MIDDLETOWN
John Lewis, Vice President – HARTSHORNE WOODS
Richard D. McComb, Secretary
Daniel Crabb, Treasurer
Kimberly Warman

ADDRESS:  
504 Locust Point Road
Locust, New Jersey 07760
70 West River Road
Rumson, New Jersey 07760
458 Navesink River Road
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
33 Hartshorne Lane
Locust, New Jersey 07760
54 Shrewsbury Avenue
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
904 Navesink River Road
Locust, New Jersey 07760
535 Locust Point Road
Locust, New Jersey 07760

EIGHTH: The name and address of the incorporator is as follows:

NAME:  
Richard D. McComb

ADDRESS:  
54 Shrewsbury Avenue
Red Bank, Jersey

NINTH: In the event of the dissolution of the Organization, the Board of Trustees shall, after paying or making provisions for the payment of all of the liabilities of the Organization, dispose of all of the remaining assets of the Organization (except any assets held upon condition requiring return, transfer, or other conveyance in the event of dissolution, which assets shall be returned, transferred to conveyed in accordance with
such requirements) exclusively for the purposes of the Organization in such manner, or to such organization or organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable, scientific and educational purposes as shall at the time qualify as an exempt organization or organizations under Section 501(c)(3) of the Code, as the Board of Trustees shall determine. Any of such assets not so disposed of shall be disposed of by the court of general jurisdiction of the county in which the principal office of the Organization is then located, exclusively for the purposes of the Organization, or to such organization or organizations qualifying under Section 501(c)(3) of the code, as said court shall determine. No part of the assets of the Organization may be distributed to any director or officer.

TENTH: To the fullest extent permitted by the laws of the State of New Jersey, as they exist or are here amended, the Trustees and Officers of the Organization shall not be personally liable to the Organization for damages for breach of any duty owed to the Organization, except that the provisions of this Section shall not relieve a Director or Officer from liability for any breach of duty based on an act or omission (a) in breach of such person's duty of loyalty to the Organization, (b) not in good faith by involving a knowing violation of law, or (c) resulting in receipt by such person of an improper personal benefit.

ELEVENTH: The Organization shall not issue capital stock.

TWELFTH: The duration of the Organization shall be perpetual.
THIRTEENTH: The Officers of the Organization shall include a President, one or more Vice Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer and such additional officers as the Board of Trustees may determine to be necessary or convenient from time to time.

FOURTEENTH: Every current or former corporate agent, including the Trustees and Officers, of the Organization (as defined in N.J.S. 15:3-4) shall be entitled to indemnification to the full extend provided in the New Jersey Nonprofit Corporation Act as in effect from time to time. The Organization may purchase insurance for indemnification.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, the incorporator of the above-named Organization, has signed this Certificate of Incorporation on this 3rd day of December, 2004.

WITNESS:   DATE:   INCORPORATOR:

Francine Hess   December 3, 2004   Richard D. McOmber
COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF FAIR HAVEN
MONMOUTH COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
RESOLUTION

Motion by: Councilman Marchese Second by: Councilman Wilhelm

AFFIRMATIVE: Councilmembers Koch, Lucarelli, Marchese, Wilhelm
NEGATIVE: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Councilmembers Banahan and Peters

RESOLUTION #2011-178

TITLE: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE POSITIONS OF THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON AND THE TOWNSHIP OF MIDDLETOWN REGARDING THE OCEANIC BRIDGE

RECITALS

A. The Office of the Monmouth County Engineer has determined that the Oceanic Bridge between the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown (S-31) is beyond repair and in need of replacement.

B. The County of Monmouth does not have sufficient funds to replace the Oceanic Bridge and accordingly will make application to the United States Federal Highway Authority for federal funding for the new Oceanic Bridge.

C. The Federal Highway Authority encourages that are financed in whole or in part by federal funds to be fixed bridges.

D. The Monmouth County Engineer has advised that if a fixed bridge were to be constructed over the Navesink River between the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown, in all likelihood a minimum of 55 feet of clearance between the bottom of the bridge and mean high water would be required which would result in a bridge that would be at least 70 feet high.

E. The replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge is of utmost concern to the historic districts in both the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Its impact on the historic character of the neighborhoods in both municipalities can be a disaster or it can be completed sympathetically with respect for the design of the present bridge and its harmonious relationship with the Navesink River, the beauty of the Middletown hills and the integrity of the historic districts.

F. The present Oceanic Bridge, which was built in 1939, is the longest and most handsome bridge in Monmouth County. It is a masterpiece of Art Modern design with its rounded flowing curves evident in its railings, piers and twin control houses. It is part of the Middletown and Rumson historic districts and individually eligible for the national Register of Historic Places.

G. The Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Fair Haven have made the following finds of fact. A 70-foot high fixed bridge would:

1. Degrade the traditional character of the Rumson and Middletown historic district.
2. Adversely dominate the views from the entire Rumson, Locust and Hartshorne waterfronts, as well as parts of the Fair Haven and Sea Bright waterfronts and from the Navesink and Shrewsbury Rivers.
3. Cause many of the homes and businesses near the Oceanic Bridge to have their river views blocked.

EXHIBIT B
4. Limit the use of said and power boats that can use Navesink River (e.g. some sailboats 36 feet in length and assuredly those of greater length would not be able to go under the bridge.)

5. Cause bicyclists, joggers and strollers including those with baby carriages to have a difficult time crossing such a bridge.

6. Cause vehicles to be less able to safely cross the bridge in icy and snowy weather.

7. Diminish the property values on both sides of the Navesink River based on the adverse impact on their viewsheds.

H. The Professionals engaged by the Office of the Monmouth County Engineer have found and determined that a low level movable (bascule) bridge provides the best balance between the issues of minimizing costs, controlling traffic impacts and mitigating historic impacts.

I. The Federal Highway Authority has funded movable (bascule) bridges which carry far greater amounts of traffic over longer distances than the Oceanic Bridge. For instance, the Wilson Bridge which crosses the Potomac River south of Washington and carries traffic between Oxon Hill, Maryland and Alexandria, Virginia on the heavily traveled Interstate 495 is a movable (bascule) bridge as the Federal Highway Authority found that such a bridge would minimize the adverse impact on the historic resources in Alexandria and other resources in the region.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Recitals set forth above are incorporated into and are hereby made a part of this Resolution.

2. The Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Fair Haven, Monmouth County, New Jersey finds and determines that replacing the Oceanic Bridge with a low level movable bridge is the best alternative when considering all of the adverse impacts that a 70-foot high fixed bridge would cause.

3. The Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Fair Haven would urge that its legislators and the Federal Highway Authority do all in their power to assure that any replacement to the present Oceanic Bridge is a low level movable (bascule) bridge.

4. The Clerk of the Borough of Fair Haven is directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to all of the following:

Honorable Chris Christie, Honorable Frank Lautenberg, Honorable Rush Holt, Honorable Frank E. Pallone, Jr., Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders Director Robert Clifton, Federal Highway Authority Division Administrator Victor M. Mendez, Office of the Monmouth County Engineer, Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc., Asbury Park Press, Two River Times, and The Star Ledger.

I, Allyson M. Cinquegrana, Municipal Clerk of the Borough of Fair Haven in the County of Monmouth and the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct and true copy of a resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Fair Haven in the County of Monmouth in the State of New Jersey at a meeting held on October 11, 2011.

Allyson M. Cinquegrana
Municipal Clerk
RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A LOW BASCULE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
FOR THE OCEANIC BRIDGE BETWEEN
MIDDLETOWN AND RUMSON

WHEREAS, the County intends to replace the Oceanic bridge, also known as County Bridge S-31 which connects the Borough of Rumson with the Township of Middletown; and

WHEREAS, within the County there have discussions and various proposals concerning the height of the new Oceanic Bridge. Two main alternatives have emerged: one is that the new Oceanic Bridge have a clearance of 55 feet from mean high water with an overall height of some 70 feet. The other is that the Oceanic Bridge remain a bascule bridge generally at the same level as the present Oceanic Bridge; and

WHEREAS, representatives of Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc. ("Friends of the Oceanic Bridge") have appeared before the Board of Recreation Commissioners and requested that the Board of Recreation Commissioners endorse a low bascule bridge for reasons including the following:

1. While the Oceanic Bridge itself is not a park or a part of the Park System, its recreational uses are many including substantial use by bicyclists, joggers, walkers, strollers with baby carriages, and fishermen. This recreational use is not limited to those living in the vicinity of the bridge, but is enjoyed by many throughout the County and beyond.

EXHIBIT C
2. If the Oceanic Bridge were replaced with a 70-foot-high fixed bridge, it would greatly impede those individuals who presently use the bridge for recreational purposes.

3. Not only would a 70-foot-high replacement destroy the appeal of the bridge as a recreational resource, it would also degrade the traditional character of the Rumson and Middletown historic districts, which are connected by the present Oceanic Bridge -- which is eligible for registration on the National Historic Register.

4. A 70-foot high fixed bridge would adversely dominate the views from the entire Rumson, Locust and Hartshorne waterfronts and from the Navesink River itself;

5. Many of the homes and businesses near the Oceanic Bridge would have their views blocked by a 70-foot-high fixed bridge.

6. The Office of the Monmouth County Engineer, the Boroughs of Fair Haven and Rumson, and the Township of Middletown have all endorsed a low bascule bridge;
   
   A. A new Oceanic Bridge should be similar in architecture and height to the present bridge consistent with modern construction codes;

   B. The Board of Recreation Commissioners has been advised that Friends of the Oceanic Bridge has obtained a real-estate analysis that opines that a 70-foot-high fixed bridge would reduce the real-estate value of homes and businesses not only near the bridge but also east and west of the bridge on both sides of the Navesink River;
C. In times of inclement weather, including icy and snowy conditions, pedestrians and vehicles would find it difficult to cross a 70-foot-high bridge with the same ease that they would a low bridge;

D. Many state legislators have endorsed a low bridge;

E. A few drivers are not able to tolerate traversing a high bridge. For them, a high bridge is a major obstacle;

F. A bascule bridge will permit watercraft of any size to traverse the Navesink River whereas a high, fixed bridge would prevent some sail boats and even power boats from proceeding underneath; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Recreation Commissioners has passed a resolution supporting a low bascule bridge replacement for the Ocean Bridge.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth hereby endorses and fully supports a low bascule bridge replacement for the Oceanic Bridge.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board urges the Federal Highway Authority, the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Inc, and the New Jersey Department of Transportation to do all in their power to ensure that a low bascule bridge replaces the present low bascule bridge.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk forward a certified true copy of this resolution to Governor Jon Corzine, U.S. Senators Frank Lautenberg and Robert Menendez, Congressmen Frank Pallone and Rush Holt, State Senators Joseph Kyrillos and Sean Kean, Assembly Members Sam Thompson, Amy Handlin, Dave Rible, and Mary Pat Angelini, the Federal Highway Authority, the North Jersey
Transportation Planning Authority, Inc., the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and the Mayor and governing bodies of Middletown and Rumson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREEHOLDERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>MOVED</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Burry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Clifton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mallet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D’Amico</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. McMorrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THE ABOVE TO BE A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF MONMOUTH AT A MEETING HELD August 31, 2009

[Signature]
CLERK
WHEREAS, the Oceanic Bridge, spanning the Navesink River and connecting the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson, was built in 1939 and is the longest and most aesthetic bridge in Monmouth County, being a classic example of the Art Moderne style with rounded flowing curves evident in its railings, piers and twin control houses, and

WHEREAS, this existing bridge is part of a Middletown historic district, connects to a historic area of Rumson, is eligible on its own for the National Register of Historic places, and in its present design and height blends into and harmonizes with surrounding hills, historic areas, and river setting, and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Monmouth County engineer has determined that the present Oceanic Bridge is no longer serviceable and requires replacement and, due to the substantial cost and expense of this replacement, the County of Monmouth requires the financial assistance and funding of the Federal Highway Administration on this proposed project, and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration by policy apparently proffers that bridges for which it provides funding assistance be a fixed bridge, meaning that in this instance as determined by the Monmouth County engineer the bridge clearance would be at least 55 feet and the entire bridge would be an estimated 70 feet in height, and

WHEREAS, after careful review of this possibility, the Township Committee has concluded that such a 70 foot high fixed bridge would have the following detrimental affects on the area.

1. Degrade the traditional character of the Rumson and Middletown historic districts.

2. Adversely dominate the views from the entire Rumson, Locust and Hartshorne waterfronts, as well as from parts of the Fair Haven and Sea Bright waterfronts and from and on the Navesink and Shrewsbury Rivers.

3. Block the views of the river from many of the homes and businesses near the Oceanic Bridge.

4. Limit the size of sail and power boats that can use the Navesink River; it appearing that some 36 foot sailboats and almost all larger sailboats would not fit under such a bridge.

5. Render it more difficult and less safe for bicyclists, joggers and walkers to cross the new bridge, particularly in inclement weather.

6. Render it more difficult and less safe for vehicles crossing the bridge, particularly in icy and snowy weather.

7. Diminish property values on both sides of the Navesink River by imposing an out of proportion structure on their view sheds, and
occasion provided funding sufficient to preserve the historic and aesthetic features of the area; for example, the Wilson Bridge that carries Interstate 495 across the Potomac River between Maryland and Alexandria, Virginia was constructed as a movable bridge so as to preserve the historic character of Old Alexandria and surrounding areas, and

WHEREAS, the Township Committee of the Township of Middletown strongly endorses the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge by a low level (bascule) bridge, should federal funding be made available for this low level proposal, and requests that the county officials and appropriate legislative officials representing the Township pursue the funding of the low level proposal through the Federal Highway Administration.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Township Committee of the Township of Middletown that the Township of Middletown requests and urges the Federal Highway Administration to authorize the appropriate funding be authorized for the replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge by a low level movable (bascule) bridge, and further endorses that bridge design as the best alternative and proposal so as to avoid the numerous adverse impacts arising from a fixed bridge.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County of Monmouth and its officials are requested to pursue the low level movable (bascule) bridge design for the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge, should federal funding be authorized for this design.

ADOPTED: June 6, 2005

Thomas G. Hall, Mayor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. O'Grady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Parkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Scharfenberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor T. Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATION

I, Heidi Abs, Clerk of the Township of Middletown hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Middletown Township Committee at their public organization meeting held on June 6, 2005.

WITNESS, my hand and the seal of the Township of Middletown this 6th day of June, 2005.

HEIDI R. ABS, Township Clerk
RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE HEIGHT OF THE PROPOSED OCEANIC BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

WHEREAS, it is clear determination of fact that the Office of the County of Monmouth Engineering Department has concluded its bridge (S-31), known as the Oceanic Bridge, spanning the Navesink River between the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown, is well beyond repair and therefore in need of replacement; and

WHEREAS, insufficient funds are available to the County of Monmouth to replace the Oceanic Bridge requiring application to the U.S. Federal Highway Authority to secure federal funds for this project; and

WHEREAS, bridges that are financed in whole or in part by funds authorized by the Transportation Act of 2004, administered by the Federal Highway Authority, are primarily, but not always, deemed to be high level fixed spans; and

WHEREAS, the Monmouth County Engineering Department has determined that a high level fixed bridge should be constructed over the Navesink River to replace the Oceanic Bridge; such bridge would result in a minimum 55 feet clearance, mean high water to bottom of structure, and a structure height of 70 feet minimum; and

WHEREAS, replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge as proposed above caused very grave concern to the Borough of Rumson, adversely affecting the integrity of the community and its unique character; and

WHEREAS, the present Oceanic Bridge terminates in an area of Rumson contiguous to several blocks of historic neighborhood; the type and nature of the proposed high level fixed structure will disastrously impact the bucolic and treasured environs so tastefully preserved herein; and

WHEREAS, the present Oceanic Bridge, constructed in 1939, is a graceful, beautiful, low level, drawbridge that totally compliments the magnificent beauty of its location; views of both east and west from the bridge immediately attest to the all encompassing magnificence of this beauty; view from all surrounding landborn vistas evidence this bridge to be in complete harmony with the treasured surroundings; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Rumson, having diligently studied the presentations made by the Office of the Monmouth County Engineering Department and its thesis for this particular proposed design, we present the following:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that replacing the Oceanic Bridge with a 70 foot high structure would permanently degrade the uniquely historic districts that border both the north and south bridge extremities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that construction of this type of structure would permanently obliterately and/or dominate the magnificent vistas that are presently inherent in the Rumson and Middletown waterfron, as well as being a permanent visual blemish from the water and from the neighboring communities of Fair Haven and Sea Bright; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that construction of this type of structure, with its extremely steep grades, would almost totally deprive walkers, joggers and bikers of a venue that has been valued since the origin of the present Oceanic Bridge; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that construction of this type of structure, with its extremely
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this Borough Council meeting held on May 19, 2005.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Rubin and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Broderick, Conaty, DeVoe, Kammerer and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: Conklin.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Borough Council of the Borough of Rumson at a regular meeting held on May 19, 2005.

Thomas S. Rogers
Borough Clerk/Administrator
RESOLUTION

The Middletown Landmarks Commission unanimously supports Federal Funding for Replacement of Monmouth County Bridge S-31, the Oceanic Bridge, with the Low Level Movable (Bascule) Bridge.

Whereas, the Oceanic Bridge is an integral part of the Locust Historic District which was established by Ordinance #97-2463 by vote of the Township Committee on March 18, 1997. Lands within an historic district are subject to additional rules and regulations as set forth in Section 16-10.34 of the Planning and Development Regulations of the Township of Middletown, as amended by adoption of Ordinance #2017, approved Jan. 25, 1988. The Landmarks Commission has review of all additions and new construction in the district.

Whereas, the Locust Historic District consists of 69 properties and two historic bridges, the Oceanic Bridge and the Claypit Creek Bridge. The historic district borders Claypit Creek and the Navesink River which have profoundly affected its history. It begins at Lakeside Avenue, running easterly down Locust Point Road to the intersection with Navesink River Road, and continues east up Navesink River Road for a mile.

Whereas, the Locust Historic District is significant in Middletown’s history as an early 18th century farming and fishing village which evolved into an important summer estate area after the Civil War. The creek was an ideal harbor for the boatmen who sailed to New York with clams and oysters for the restaurant trade. In the 1850’s a large dock was built at Locust Point, now the site of the Middletown end of the Oceanic Bridge. Steamboats stopped here to take Locust produce and oysters to the city. They brought back the first summer visitors to the area, and by the late 19th c. Locust had three small hotels.

Whereas, in 1891 the first Oceanic Bridge was opened on Decoration Day, connecting Middletown with Rumson. The bridge enhanced the prosperity of the entire river area. Two summer residents, Mrs. Caroline Gallup Reed and the Rev. Haslett McKim of New York, donated the land for the approach and contributed to the construction of the causeway which is still being used today. This causeway is the old original road to the steamboat dock.

Whereas, despite some encroachment, the Locust Historic District still retains a significant amount of its original building stock, and reflects the prosperity of a community whose fortunes have depended on the surrounding waterways.

Whereas, the Locust Historic District has been declared eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and the Oceanic Bridge, an integral part of the district, has been declared individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The National Register is the nation’s list of historic structures and sites worthy of preservation.

Whereas, in 1939 the present Oceanic Bridge was built, replacing the old bridge. It is Monmouth County’s longest bridge and its most handsome. It is a masterpiece of Art Moderne design with its emphasis on streamline, rounded curving forms evident in the railings, twin control houses, and piers.

EXHIBIT F
Whereas, the Monmouth County Engineer’s Office has found that the Oceanic Bridge is in dire need of replacement because of serious decay in the deck from years of salt penetration, and erosion of the supporting piers and substructure as well. Due to the substantial cost of a new bridge, the County must seek funding from the Federal Highway Administration.

Whereas, one of the Federal Highway Administration’s proposed designs is the High Level Fixed Bridge which would be 55 ft. above median high water for boat clearance and 70 ft. at its topmost. This inappropriate choice will have the following adverse impacts on the Locust Historic District:

1. The High Level bridge’s design will be totally inappropriate with the 19th c. rural village character of the Locust Historic District, as it swoops down from 70 ft.
2. The High Level bridge will be aesthetically insensitive to the natural beauty of the river, Claypit Creek and the Hartshorne Woods of the Middletown hills.
3. The old historic causeway, still in use after over 150 years, will be abandoned and become a nuisance problem area for neighboring properties.
4. The High Level bridge’s approach will be an eyesore for many of the homes along the Navesink River and Claypit Creek. It will be in their view and will have a costly negative impact on property values and quality of life issues.
5. The attractive minipark with parking and water access, which now marks the entrance to the historic district and the Township, will be compromised by this project at the very least.
6. Families with children, recreational fishermen, walkers, joggers, cyclists will no longer enjoy the bridge in safety because of its height and steep pitch.

Whereas, the County of Monmouth consulted with the Middletown Landmarks Commission in 1999 on the proposed reconstruction of the Claypit Creek Bridge (MT21) which is located in the Locust Historic District. Under Section 106, the County worked to mitigate the adverse impacts on the bridge and the historic district, cooperating with the Commission in holding two open public meetings to gather public input. The bridge is currently under reconstruction and will preserve its historic appearance to be sensitive to its setting in the historic district.

Whereas, the Middletown Landmarks Commission wholeheartedly endorses the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge with the Low Level Movable (Bascule) bridge, and requests that the Monmouth County Engineer’s Office and other county and legislative officials representing the Township pursue the funding of the Low Level Movable bridge proposal with the Federal Highway Administration.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, by the Middletown Landmarks Commission that we urge the Federal Highway Administration to authorize the necessary funding for the replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge with the Low Level Movable bridge, and further endorse that bridge design as mitigating the adverse impacts on the integrity of the Locust Historic District.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Middletown Landmarks Commission urges the Monmouth County Engineer and the Federal Highway Administration to further lessen the impact on the integrity of the Locust Historic District by utilizing the historic causeway for the new bridge’s entrance into the historic village.
MIDDLETOWN LANDMARKS COMMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Anderson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bugbee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Curtiss</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Johnson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Kiernan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Scharfenberger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATION

I, Mary Ann Kiernan, Secretary of the Middletown Landmarks Commission hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Middletown Landmarks Commission at an open public meeting held on August 11, 2005.

Mary Ann Kiernan, Secretary

# 05-001
PIC COMMENT # 145
suggestion

To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thu, Aug 10, 2017 at 9:59 AM

Whether the bridge is to be rebuilt or replaced, it's current appearance is an essential contributor to the visual character of the Navesink River and the surrounding communities. Please do not replace it with a high bridge similar to the one recently built over the Shrewsbury at Sandy Hook. Such a bridge and its elevated approaches would mar the beauty of the Navesink River. Replace or repair the current bridge with a drawbridge that retains many of the historic design elements and architectural features of the current Oceanic Bridge.

Thank you

Best Regards,

8/10/2017
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 146
My name is [redacted] and I live at [redacted].

My preference for the new Oceanic Bridge is Option 7A.
PIC COMMENT # 147
Subject: Oceanic Bridge comment
Date: Thursday, July 27, 2017 10:07 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: <inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Conversation: Oceanic Bridge comment

Alternative 7A, with a 22 foot draw bridge is the most contextually acceptable choice. The environmental aesthetic of this low profile option will maintain the dominance of the hills on the north side of the bridge. Additionally, the scale of this option is most compatible with the residential, low intensity use this bridge has traditionally had and will likely have in the future.

As with any design, it will be the talent of the designer that will make all the difference to the success of the project.

The seamless connection the existing bridge has to the land and the water should be a goal of the new design.
PIC COMMENT # 148
Hello Inkyung,

Thank you for taking all of the inbound comments regarding the new Oceanic Bridge in Monmouth County. I’m writing to express very strong support for a Low-Rise bascule draw bridge, Alternative 7A. My family lives in Locust on Hartshorne Road and we have had the everyday pleasure for many years of viewing the Oceanic Bridge from my home and driving over it multiple times a day. It is without question a beautifully integrated bridge into a beautiful rural landscape. They certainly did it right back in 1939! Anything other than a Low Rise bascule draw bridge would ruin the beauty and aesthetic of the area. Also, it serves as an elegant, approachable roadway for runners, walkers, bikers, and other community-oriented activities, which adds substantially to quality of life for everyone, existing and future residents. NJ is unfortunately littered with ugly, massive highway projects; let’s not destroy this area too.

In terms of economics, a High Rise fixed bridge would negatively impact property values and harm business in Rumson and Middletown. Ugliness and an imposing bridge are not the creators of value – beauty, lower traffic, and convenience are value enhancers. Likewise, businesses would suffer too. A high bridge would create a physiological barrier and a less convenient crossing over the Navesink River between Middletown and Rumson and cut into demand for each other towns’ businesses. Additionally, my understanding is the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of a Low Rise bridge is similar, or less than, a High Rise fixed bridge, so why change what has worked so well for nearly 80 years.

We live in a bucolic, rural area and few seem to mind when the draw bridge is up. Boaters too should be indifferent to bridge type and may actually prefer a draw bridge given no height limit.

The solution is clearly a Low Rise bascule draw bridge in an adjacent location to the existing bridge.

Thank you for taking these comments. I’m happy to discuss my thoughts further, if necessary.

Kind regards,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 149
Hello and thank you for considering our perspective on the new bridge. Please keep the bridge low rise. It would be awful for the community to have a high rise bridge both aesthetically and from an economic perspective. I would implore you to keep the existing bridge in place while the new bridge is being constructed and would strongly urge you to have the drawbridge open as on a 30 minute schedule instead of at will for the convenience of the boaters.
PIC COMMENT # 150
Dear Sirs,

I vote for Alternative 7A with 22 feet high Bascule draw bridge.

The 22 foot height is safer for cyclists, pedestrians, joggers and motorists. It is proposed to be quieter (than a high fixed span bridge) which is key for our low key and family oriented community. And it is in keeping with the Oceanic Bridge's current historic and iconic design. As a life long Rumson resident, this is of the utmost importance.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 151
I just moved to a home on the Navesink River with a view of the Oceanic Bridge.

I believe any new bridge should be configured much like the existing bridge, a low bridge with a draw bridge over the channel. The new bridge should have wider walkways for cyclists and walkers and sightseers.

A low bridge would be less obtrusive regarding the view of the river by everyone, including boaters and paddle boarders and hikers/cyclists stopping at public river viewing overlooks both east and west of the bridge, and residents with homes that have views of the river and guests at the Molly pitcher, and even patients at Riverview Hospital.

A low bridge is far more friendly to cyclists and walkers compared to a steep tall bridge.

A low flat bridge is safer for drivers during icy conditions.

A draw bridge will let tall masted boats through while a fixed bridge will be limited as to mast heights that can safely pass under.

The inconvenience of a draw bridge to cars only occurs in certain seasons and at limited times and is in keeping with the relaxed pace of life in the beautiful Rumson/Middletown area.

The inconvenience that a draw bridge occasionally causes to tall boats can be managed by the captains of such larger boats provided they pay attention to the draw bridge opening schedule and only a limited number of people with large boats are impacted by the draw bridge operation.

It’s all about the natural beauty of the river. Why dominate this beautiful river with a huge overbearing and out of scale man made bridge? To save a few minutes of driving time during the summer? It would make no sense to build a big tall bridge in such a beautiful location.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 152
Q1: **Contact Information**
Name:  
Address:  
Email:  
Phone number:  

Q2: **Comments/Suggestions:**
Whilst not a resident of the Navesink communities I do keep my boat at Monmouth Boat Club and utilise the Oceanic bridge regularly. With regard to the various options, I personally have no preference as to whether it's a 22' or 45' draw bridge or a 65' fixed bridge (although that would be quite handy!) and feel the local people really should have the decision. My only concern is that whatever decision is made the Navesink remains navigable by tall vessels - I personally require 50' of clearance.
PIC COMMENT # 153
I vote for the 22' Alternative 7A design for the bridge. It closest to the existing design and safer for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 154
Hello!

My name is [redacted] and my address is [redacted]. I love the new Highlands bridge. I love the view when I am on it, I love how it looks in the distance from the Sea Bright bridge. I can't, however, imagine such a structure in the heart of Rumson. It would be an eyesore to the many homes that border the river. I would make it more difficult for runners/walkers to enjoy the peaceful walk across the river. It would de-value properties.

I advocate for alternative 7A, which I understand to be a 22 ft drawbridge.

Kind Regards.
PIC COMMENT # 155
Hello,
I am a long time resident of Monmouth County. Over the past 30 years I have resided in Atlantic Highlands, Fair Haven and currently the Navesink section of Middletown. Over the years I have traveled over the Oceanic Bridge numerous times by car, bicycle and on foot. I also frequently sail and kayak under the bridge. I strongly advocate for the replacement of the current bridge with a similar design - Alternative 7A which will retain the character of the area as well as continue to enable the use of the bridge for pedestrian activities.
Thank you,
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 156
Having crossed over and boated under many times, and loved the Oceanic Bridge, for my 65 years as an Oceanport/ Monmouth County native, I certainly favor the alternative 7A design for this icon.

Thank you,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 157
To the Oceanic Bridge Study,

The current bridge design and alignment are optimal with regard to function and esthetics. I support duplicating the current structure with modern materials for improved design life and maintenance. I also believe that the design should support clear, plain and enjoyable visibility of the river on each side from the seats of an ordinary (non-SUV height) passenger car, and *not* block or obstruct such visibility as does the new bridge from the east short of the Navesink to the west in Red bank.

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 158
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):
Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 
Comments/Suggestions:

ALTERNATE 74 EAST IS BEST

LOW BRIDGE FITS INTO LOCATION ESTHICALLY

EASE OF USE BY PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLES

BETTER FOR HANDICAP USAGE

ALLOWS CLEAR VIEW DOWN RIVER TO UPRIVER HOMES

ALLOWS PARTIAL USE DURING CONSTRUCTION

LOW ACCESS ALLOWS MOST P2 BOAT PASSAGE

LOWER COST

HIGH BRIDGE IS A VISUAL MONSTROSITY!

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 159
To whom it may concern:

Please accept the rendering of the Oceanic Bridge that most closely resembles what is there now. I believe the closest to what currently exists is the 7A/22 option. Please keep the beauty of the navesink river in mind when deciding.

Thank you,
PIC COMMENT # 160
Hello -

My name is:

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Many thanks!
PIC COMMENT # 161
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 11:54 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>, "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

Hi,

I wish to keep a low drawbridge about 30 feet high at its highest point. The existing view is simply amazing!! To change it would be a crime.

Thank you.
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR 8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

#16

COMPLETE

PAGE 1: General Comment Form

Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
I like the old bridge.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

As a Rumson resident, I think that replacing the current bridge as it is 55' high would be the best option for our town. This would affect the least homes and keep the amazing look of the river and the town the same.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 - August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7766
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 164
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ________________________________
Mailing Address: ________________________________
Email: ________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

WS1 (H-61-1) ALTERNATIVE 5
THE FIXED BRIDGE IS FAR TOO HIGH FOR THIS AREA. I WOULD RATHER PAY A BRIDGE TENDER FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE, THE MOVEABLE IN ALTERNATIVE 5 BRIDGE IS FAR SUPERIOR AND REPLICALES MORE CLOSER THE CURRENT BRIDGE.

WHY: THE AREA IS VERY SCENIC. A HIGH FIXED BRIDGE WOULD DESTROY THE VISUAL BEAUTY OF THE AREA. THE LOWER BRIDGE WOULD BE MORE OF A REPLICALES OF THE CURRENT BRIDGE WHICH IS ALMOST HISTORIC AT THIS TIME,

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
The current curve into & out of Navesink slows the traffic and should remain.
PIC COMMENT # 165
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Comment
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 10:52 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge Comment

Hello,

I wanted to take the time to advocate for option 7A for the Oceanic Bridge project - a low bridge following a similar path to the one now. I think one of the most important aspects of this bridge is to not have it soaring into the air, affecting the ambience and sights of the area. With 7A, I feel you can maintain the integrity of the current bridge, while constructing a new one with modern requirements. In terms of design, a bridge that’s low, blends into the landscape and takes into account the historic and New England/Jersey Shore flair of the area would be best. It would further strengthen the unique character of the surrounding area without screaming for attention.

Thank You!
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 166
To whom it may concern: My name is [redacted] and I live in [redacted] and have a direct (albeit distant) view of the Oceanic Bridge from the rear of my house. The area connected by the Oceanic Bridge is one of the most picturesque on the entire East Coast. It demarks the southernmost point of glacier-created waterways and typography that is unmatched anywhere south on the entire East Coast. I strongly advocate building design 7A. There exists no socio-economic or safety reason to construct anything larger. As such, please take my suggestion (along with the thousands of my neighbors) to opt for the least intrusive bridge design which will not spoil this beautiful location. Thank you — [redacted]
PIC COMMENT # 167
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 8:54 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject:

Please build the 22 foot bridge. Thank you
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 168
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ___________________________
Mailing Address: ___________________________
Email: ___________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

NO 65' Bridge! This is a unique location, one of the most beautiful in the state of New Jersey. A safer bridge is needed. An option that is cost effective while preserving the imposing vista and dominating it is essential.

The bridgework also represents an opportunity to increase safe recreational opportunities for the public. To that end, safe bike lanes, safe space for walkers, fishing and other public events call for vision and creativity. Please seize the opportunity!

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 - August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Engelhart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
linkyung.engelhart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 169
August 3, 2017

I would like to express my opinion regarding the need to replace the deteriorating Oceanic Draw Bridge with a new fixed span bridge. As a member of the [redacted], who first settled in Rumson in 1906, and we continue to raise our families here taking great pride in Rumson and the surrounding areas.

Everyone admires the aesthetics of Rumson and particularly the beauty of the Navesink River. However, due to population growth in our area (Monmouth County in general) it doesn’t make sense to hold up hundreds of cars creating traffic problems throughout the two river areas due to a few boaters with need to have the bridge opened.

The Highlands Bridge was a big improvement on the old draw bridge and did not impact the look of the area at all... in fact many, including myself see the new view there as improved. Travel down to South Carolina to see the newer fixed span bridges which have not detracted from the charm of their area.

I ask everyone to just imagine themselves or a loved one in an ambulance that is on the opposite side of a bridge that is opened... whether for a boater or simply stuck as happens from time to time. This delay can mean the difference between life and death.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 170
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR 8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Page 1: General Comment Form

Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Comments/Suggestions:
7A with Low draw bridge
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

171
Subject: Bridge Design  
Date: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 6:32 AM  
From:  
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>  
Conversation: Bridge Design

As a longtime Rumson resident I would like a BIG bridge like the highlands bridge. Drawbridges are antiquated, expensive to man and maintain. Let's build for the future not the past.

Very truly yours,
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 172
Bridge Suggestion

To: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com

Hello

Just a suggestion for the future of the bridge. If you put light posts on the bridge, please have barbed wire or spikes at the top of the fixtures so the birds do not perch and mess the area below. Thank you kindly for the consideration.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 173
---Original Message---
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2017 8:50 AM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: 7A/22 oceanic bridge

Oceanic bridge option 7A/22
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ____________________________

Mailing Address: ________________________

Email: ____________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

Please see attached letter — not much has changed since 2005.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7785
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
May 4, 2005

Mayor John Ekdahl and Borough Council

Mayor John and Honorable Council Members;

As you know, the county is in the preliminary stages of planning the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge and, as we are all aware, the bridge eventually constructed as a result of these plans will affect the borough for many years to come.

The present draw bridge is an asset to the borough. It is in scale and harmony with its surroundings and is architecturally attractive. Its low height encourages foot traffic ranging from serious runners, to walkers, to mothers with baby carriages. The reward for “hoofing” it across the bridge varies, but it can provide the opportunity to see the sun rising over the low line of Sea Bright houses or to see it disappearing below brilliant orange clouds in the west. It can provide the opportunity to view up-close the waves rolling down the river on a windy day, to feel that icy blast of winter air crossing the half-frozen river surface, or to feel the cool breeze on a hot summer day. There may be boats about and, occasionally, the bridge opening ceremony unfolds. Nearly always there is a chance to greet other walkers and sometimes the bridge keeper, and, while the fishermen are an uncommunicative lot, one can sometimes observe their catch. For the birdwatcher, the bridge’s neighborhood provides seasonal accommodations for egrets, herons, a variety of ducks, scaup, brant, lots of gulls, and an occasional osprey. This week a loon has arrived for a stop-over. In short, traversing the Oceanic Bridge on foot is one of the things that makes life in Rumson pleasant and stimulating. If the new bridge is a high, fixed structure these experiences will be lost.

So I appeal to you to recognize the recreational and esthetic value of a new, low drawbridge for the residents of Rumson and to rally your talents and the incredibly diverse resources available in the borough to influence the planning of the new bridge so that we all may continue to enjoy a bridge that is an architecturally pleasing structure and a recreational gem.

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 175
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 10:11 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>,
"Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

My name is:

[Redacted]

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Thank you
PIC COMMENT # 176
---Original Message---
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 22, 2017 3:04 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: Advocate for 7a/22 bridge

...advocates for the the 7a/22 bridge design.

Thank you,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 177
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly).

Comments/Suggestions:

I prefer Plan B because it doesn't impact private property on the Middletown Side. It can accommodate a sixty-five foot span without impacting the views of the residents living on either side.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 (August 4, 2017) to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 178
Hello,

The current design of the bridge seems to be optimal with regard to function and esthetics. I think a replacement should mirror the original design while incorporating any modern materials which could improve design life and maintenance.

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 179
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: ________________
Mailing Address: ________________
Email: ________________

Comments/Suggestions:

1. For aesthetic reasons a low drawbridge replacement (40' or less) in close proximity to existing structure is most preferred.

2. Concerned that fixed span bridge will destroy local + character of the area.

3. Concerned that fixed span bridge will bring increased traffic into already congested area in a small town.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 20, 2017 to August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

NITPA
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 9/20/17
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 180
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study — Public Information Center Meeting — 6/20/17

MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

AS THE CURRENT OCEANIC TERMINI ARE BOTH IN OR FLOW INTO RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE NEXT OCEANIC BRIDGE BE LIMITED TO SINGLE LANES IN EACH DIRECTION. I WOULD PREFER THE BRIDGE BE BUILT TO THE CURRENT HEIGHT OR TO "MID-LEVEL", BUT NOT TO THE 80' LEVEL OF THE "HIGHLANDS-SEABRIGHT" BRIDGE. THAT BRIDGE IS PART OF A MAJOR STATE HIGHWAY WHERE MULTIPLE LANES OF TRAFFIC REQUIRED THAT TYPE AND SIZE TO ACCOMODATE TRAFFIC SAFELY.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 181
Hi,

After reviewing the drawings we prefer the look of the moveable bridge on option 7a as it maintains the look of the existing structure.
PIC COMMENT # 182
As a long time Monmouth County resident, I have used the Oceanic Bridge many times, in a car and on a bike. Although I know it will add to the cost of construction, operation and maintenance, I hope that it will continue to be a low bridge (that, I know, will require a draw bridge component). Making a higher bridge will change the character of the bridge, and the surrounding community, and not in a good way.

I also request that bike lanes are added.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 183
Inkyung,

I appreciate you taking the time to note my opinion regarding the new Oceanic Bridge in Monmouth County. I am writing to express unequivocal support for Alternative 7A, a low-rise bascule draw bridge. Every strong community is a mix of new and old, modern and old fashioned. We have plenty of new and this new structure will be great to improve the safety of all of us who drive over and boat under the bridge. I believe we have plenty of new design. I think it makes for a much stronger community and more attractive community to replace the existing structure with the low-rise bascule draw bridge. What a great way to retain the wonderful heritage of our community.

Many thanks for your time and consideration.
PIC COMMENT # 184
I have two comments/questions on the study. I realize that this is past the due date.

- I was surprised at the pilings illustrated in the fixed bridge renderings. I would expect the pilings could be much more modern looking and streamlined. I would expect the final pilings would not be the 3 column pilings illustrated. Am I wrong?
- With the 45’ opening span, what would be the opening schedule? I worry that it would be in frequent, and ignore tide and wind concerns. The Navesink channel is tricky, and larger boats can’t navigate it at low tide. If the bridge opens at 7 am and 7 pm, and these coincide with times of low tide, the openings are not very useful. Winds are also a concern. Navigating the bottom of the Shrewsbury on a strong north west wind is dangerous. Limited openings make avoiding these harder.
PIC COMMENT # 185
--- Original Message ---
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2017 6:04 PM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: Vote for alternative

[Redacted]

- a high bridge will be dangerous for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians in addition to clashing with the historic aesthetic of the area.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 186
Please include me for the voting of the Oceanic Bridge!

Thank You.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 187
Dear Sir,

I am in favor of the Alternative 7A design for the new bridge. A bridge similar to the current bridge will be much more aesthetically pleasing than a larger fixed bridge while maintaining the historical significance of the bridge. It also lends itself to a nicer and safer walk for those of us in town that use the bridge in our daily activities and not just for driving. I hope there is strong consideration of the local opinion as we see and use the bridge every day and its design impacts us more than the typical "passer-through".

Thank you,
PIC COMMENT # 188
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge. First I need to know what type of bridge is being consider (my understanding is that as many as 10 concepts are under review) and construction costs as well as annual operating costs. I need to know if the Federal funds will be used or will local tax money be required. I am concerned about the back up of traffic as many more vehicles cross over the Navesink each and every year. As the wait time for openings increases the many idling vehicles are emitting pollution into the atmosphere and emergency vehicles are unnecessarily delayed. At this time, I am leaning toward a higher bridge but I am willing to wait for the engineering report before I can make a final decision. I am a long time Rumson resident.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 189
My name is [redacted], and I live at [redacted]. I use the Oceanic Bridge numerous times each week...on my way to Sea Bright beach, to my daughter's dance classes in Rumson, to work at a client's home, and to restaurants we have patronized for years. I believe that it would be a great disservice to everyone in Middletown and Rumson to construct a 70 ft high fixed bridge....It will look terrible and ruin the magical view of the Navesink River. I advocate for the 22ft bascule bridge. We will achieve a new updated bridge, but retain the familiar and traditional charm of the existing bridge. Our area is blessed with so much historical significance, it would be a crime to erect a high, modern structure that will not be in keeping with the character of our neighborhoods.

Please, please count my vote for Alternative 7A.

Thank you for your consideration,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 190
I hope that the 7A/22 design is chosen for the new bridge. I much prefer this design as it is a more fitting span for our communities. It is much safer for pedestrians and bicyclists. My husband often rides to Hartshorne and the Huber woods trails and the 7A/22 design is the much preferred option. I drove and parked in Rumson today, just to walk over the bridge. Whether driving or walking over the bridge, I feel connected to the river in a way that a high span option would not provide. By the way, my daughter is a commuter to the ferry and has never viewed the occasional delay (if the bridge is up) as a problem. Please vote in favor of the 7A/22!

Sincerely,
PIC COMMENT # 191
I support the lower version of the bridge as it maintains the character of the area.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 192
Hello,
We are residents of Middletown and former residents of Rumson, since 1979 and use the bridge often. The bucolic location deserves a bridge to preserve the beauty and service the many people using it. We definitely prefer 7A/22 Feet, which retains the historical design and function. It will be horrendous to build a high span bridge. Truly hoping the county is thinking along these lines. 7A/22 would retain the beauty of the Navesink while servicing the community. Thanks for considering our opinions.
PIC COMMENT # 193
August 2, 2017

Inkyung Englehart, Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7785 inkyung_englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

I have been living in Rumson since October, 2014.

Early on the Oceanic bridge was closed to all traffic for several months for structural repairs.

Months later, more repair work was done closing one lane.

There is still sporadic road work and structural work being done.

The roadway is pock marked with patches where repair work was done.

Knowing that the bridge was built in 1939, it seems to me that the bridge needs a full replacement.

If it could be built high enough to allow fishing boats to pass through, without requiring a drawbridge, that would be highly desirable.

Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 194
Hello
We prefer the low bridge (match existing) which will have the least impact visually.
We also rarely see boats pass underneath.
The high bridge would look terrible and the roadwork would ruin the local small town feel.

Kindest Regards
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 195
Hi my name is [redacted]

I wish to keep a low drawbridge similar to what is already there (about 30' high at the highest point)

Many thanks!

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you have received this communication in error (you are not the addressee or authorized to receive for the addressee), you should delete this message. Any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Thank you!
PIC COMMENT # 196

Commenter provided 2 comments during the comment period.
Q1: **Contact Information**
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: **Comments/Suggestions:**
It is the position of the Monmouth Boat Club and our 220 area member families that the Rumson to Middletown Bridge, should either:

1. Open as it does today
2. Be the same height as the Highlands to Sea Bright bridge also known as the Joe Azzalino bridge.

We are firm in our request for either #1 or #2. Please let me know what further information you might need.
From: [Redacted]
Reply-To: [Redacted]
Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2017 09:25:13 -0400
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Good Morning, I just wanted to say how much I enjoyed the Middletown Meeting on Tuesday.

Thank you for inviting me to the meeting on Tuesday in Middletown, I thought it was very well done, and that the team did a great job in laying out creative options, and seemed to be welcoming all the input from the community.

I had an idea at the end of the meeting that I wanted to share, I think there is some angst, in the community that you are looking at fixed bridges that are lower than 65', that would limit the ability of boats to get up into Red Bank, where I am a trustee of the Monmouth Boat Club [http://www.monmouthboatclub.org](http://www.monmouthboatclub.org)

If you truly only looking at opening spans of 22' or 45' or a fixed bridge of 65' (the same as the Joe Azzolino bridge between Highlands and Sea Bright), I would encourage that your public statements reflect that.

For the sailors, and those that do commercial traffic on the river would find that to be a great bit of relief that there is not a plan you are studying that would be lower than that bridge between Highlands and Sea Bright. I think this would go a long way to reducing the angst of those concerned that a lower fixed bridge might be implemented that would change the way the river is being used.

Thanks for listening, and again it was a great meeting on Tuesday, and I was so impressed with everyone I met, both the attendees, as well as the professionals participating in and running the meeting. It was the best public planning meeting I have been to. Details were considered even down to the snacks on the table, and the open and direct facilitation, I think everyone left that meeting feeling that their opinions were considered, and I hope to use some of the techniques I saw in my workplace interactions.

As a boy I grew up knowing Mr Banfield, who built that building, and he would be pleased it was being used this way.

Thanks again.
PIC COMMENT # 197
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:
Mailing Address:
Email:
Comments/Suggestions:

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 198
Dear Mr. Englehart,

I assume that you are very familiar with the state of the Oceanic Bridge, so I will not waste any time debating whether repairs or a full replacement is the proper course. I bike over the bridge frequently, and there is simply no doubt that a replacement bridge needs to erected.

This leaves the more controversial decision regarding the replacement bridge being fixed span or a drawbridge. I am in full agreement with the federal guidelines that a drawbridge should only be built if a fixed span bridge is simply not feasible. My primary reasons for this stance include the following problems posed by a drawbridge when compared to a fixed span bridge:

* Additional labor costs to open and close the bridge
* Greater maintenance costs due to the presence of moving parts
* Unnecessary and dangerous pollution from idling automobiles when the bridge is open

Based on the distance between the Middletown and Rumson sides of the Raritan River where the bridge would be built, I see no logical reason why a fixed span bridge would be considered infeasible. Thus, I logically conclude that a drawbridge is only being considered due to "view complaints" by residents on both sides of the river. I do understand these complaints, but I in no way believe that they override the many deficiencies of a drawbridge including those that I mention above. Also, since similar complaints were raised by the far less wealthy citizens of Highlands and Sea Bright when the Route 36 bridge replacement was being planned, I believe that a correct precedent has been recently been set in the area.

Based on my comments above, it is my honest opinion that the only way that a drawbridge will be built is if the collective wealth of the nearby residents overrides logic. I believe that such a decision would be a travesty and further reinforce that money, and not what is best for the majority, is what dictates government decisions and actions.

I will be unable to join the June 20 sessions, but I am passionate about my stance here. Thus, I am more than happy to follow-up if you would like.

Sincerely,
Please don't put up a modern high bridge we would like option 7/A. A style closer to what's there now is just more fitting with the architecture of the two towns. Please save a great bridge design that is disappearing from our country.

Thank you.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 200
Hello,

Please see count my support for the 7a option for the oceanic bridge. I currently drive, run and bike over it and paddle board under it. The current location is ideal and frames the area very well. The proposed design is in line with the aesthetic of the area, that has been well preserved in the area.

Thank you
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

PIC COMMENT # 201
The Navesink River is one of the most beautiful rivers anywhere. Please do not change the look or flavor of our magnificent river or the mostly residential communities on both sides of the Bridge.

My preference is to keep Bridge in same location, raise to 30'-35'.
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study

PIC COMMENT # 202
Oceanic Bridge

Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 9:31 AM

To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Based on the options for new bridge ... my choices are as follows:

1. Replace exactly what's there ... going up 10 feet not big deal if needed

2. Build 55 foot fixed. I believe no height greater than 45 to 50 is necessary based on boat demand of that size
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 203
Hello, I am a middletown new jersey resident and I hope that the new oceanic bridge will be true to the draw bridge design. I have worked and lived in Highlands and the impact that the new bridge into sandy hook was large and unpleasant for many of the residents. A drawbridge is the more humanitarian option.

Why we like Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design:

- Closest to existing bridge in form and function
- The 22-foot height is a safer configuration for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists and motorists
- Cleaner and quieter than high, fixed-span alternatives
- The 22-foot profile is an historic design connecting two Historic Districts
PIC COMMENT # 204
Hello,

I attended the Tuesday, June 20, 2017 Presentation at Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School. It was informative and the people involved were very helpful in understanding the drawings and schematics. I grew up in Fair Haven and have driven over the Oceanic Bridge hundreds of times and I appreciate the opportunity to have my voice heard.

**My choice is 7A, the 22' ft clearance bascule bridge. Protect our scenic view!! Protect and strengthen our communities!!**

**First, the 55' or 70' high Fixed bridge is a NO!! Absolutely the wrong choice for this area**
- viewed from any of the locations shown in the presentation, it interferes with the vista across the river and the character of the beautiful landscape is completely lost; it is an eyesore
- it is totally out of scale with the surroundings and not appropriate for the pastoral nature of either Middletown or Rumson
- As a 67 old person who walks and bikes the current Oceanic bridge, I would find the high bridge very difficult to either walk or ride a bike over

**7A East Alignment, 22' ft clearance - YES!!**
- Enhances the view of the area; when I am driving home from the Middletown side to Rumson side, I look forward to the view as I make the left and approach the bridge on the curve. The river reveals itself and I anticipate the view everytime (I've been driving for 50 years). While engineers may not care about the underpinning emotions, this is what ties me to the Rumson/Middletown area and makes me feel like I am coming home...and this is my place. Please keep it this way. It is an essential viewshed of this area
- A majority of boats can already pass under the bridge as it is
- The eastern alignment will allow traffic to use the current bridge while the new one is being built for the majority of time, so less disruption
- I can walk my dog over the bridge or ride my bike and not feel like it I'm going to fall off or out of breath

Thank you,
PIC COMMENT # 205
Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
I support option 7A with a Low Draw Bridge.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 206
Hello -
I have lived in the area for over 50 years and strongly advocate for the proposed 7A/22 replacement. 
Please call or email if you have any questions!
PIC COMMENT # 207
To Whom It May Concern:

I support the alternative 7A/22 Feet Bridge Design. I have lived at [redacted] since 1983. I am an avid athlete, fisherman, and a true enthusiast/lover of the Jersey Shore. I also own a residence in the Lavallette Area. Going over the Oceanic Bridge has always given me enjoyment because it fits the surrounding landscape so naturally. I visit Sandy Hook, Hartshorne and Huber Woods almost weekly, and more often in the Summer months, a larger/taller structure would be an eyesore and take away that Shore feeling, it would be obtrusive and stand out like the proverbial sore thumb. The beauty of the current structure is the feel of gliding over the water while driving and seeing the sparkle of the the Navesink with the sun's rays hitting the water. It is conducive to running, walking and cycling and it gives everyone the opportunity to enjoy the nature that abounds along the river. Unlike the bridges going over the Shrewsbury, Shark and Manasquan Rivers, the Navesink has relatively light boat traffic that impacts the opening and closing of the bridge. Your decision will be affecting the area for the next generation, something my grandson will be seeing as he grows up...do the right thing! Keep the structure at it's current height or as close as possible.

Thanks!
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown
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PIC COMMENT # 208
Q1: Contact Information
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
I LIKE THE BRIDGE AS IT IS NOW. I PREFER ALTERNATIVE 7A. IT IS INTERESTING THAT THE THOMPSON FAMILY BUSINESS WAS BRIDGE BUILDING. MOST OF THE COUNTY BRIDGES WERE BUILT BY S.S. THOMPSON OR A.P. THOMPSON MANY YEARS AGO.
PIC COMMENT # 209
Hello,

My name is [redacted]. I am currently living in [redacted] but was born and raised in Monmouth County and continue to travel there most weekends to visit family and friends and enjoy the wonderful amenities that our beautiful area has to offer. One of those wonderful and aesthetically pleasing historic landmarks in Monmouth County is the Oceanic Bridge. That is why it is so imperative that we as a community come together and make the right choice for the new Oceanic Bridge design. The Alternative 7A with a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge is that choice. This would be the most similar design to the existing bridge with a bridge height that would cause the least amount of safety issues for all bridge users. This design would also help to preserve the historic layout of the current bridge and would not disrupt any of the gorgeous surrounding views. I urge all citizens of Monmouth County to advocate for the same choice. Let's help preserve history for the future generations and citizens of Monmouth County.

Thank you,
PIC COMMENT # 210
Q1: Contact Information
Name: 
Address: 
Email: 
Phone number: 

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
In an attempt to maintain the aesthetic tradition of our beautiful town, I consider alternative 7A with a low draw bridge to be the most suitable alternative. Thank you very much.
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PIC COMMENT # 211
#8

**Collector:** Embedded Survey 1 (Website Survey)

**Started:** Tuesday, July 11, 2017 8:51:19 PM

**Last Modified:** Tuesday, July 11, 2017 8:53:54 PM

**Time Spent:** 00:02:36

**IP Address:** 100.35.138.211

---

**PAGE 1: General Comment Form**

**Q1: Contact Information**

Name: 
Address: 
Email: 
Phone number: 

**Q2: Comments/Suggestions:**

I support 7A. I would like the bridge to be 45 feet.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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PIC COMMENT # 212

Commenter provided 3 comments during the comment period.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):
Name:
Mailing Address:
Email:
Comments/Suggestions:

I feel that Alternative 7A is the best option to date with a 32' high clearance bascule draw bridge.
This is close to the historic existing bridge as proposed.
This alternative also will not change the viewshed that exists today and will not detract from the viewshed of all the surrounding properties.
Also with this plan the traffic noise will be absorbed by the existing roadway close to the Locust Bluffs.

Rather than being placed east of the land, I believe the standard curves will help slow the traffic.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to: Comm. North}\nThe Bridge.
Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 9/20/17
Inkyung and to whom it may concern-

As you know, I have been a Local resident for over 60 years. I have been involved with the Oceanic Bridge Project since 2004. As the President of the Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, I have attended numerous meetings with NJDOT, Monmouth County Engineers, NJ State Senators and other Federally elected Officials, and the NJTPA.

Please see my attached comments on what Alternative replacement I support and why. This bridge is a piece of our local History and should be preserved as best we can.. (It's like a 1939 Packard Convertible... a US Classic...)

I look forward to seeing the results of their Public comment Survey and the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix when compiled later this year.
I support the proposed Alternative 7A with a 22' high clearance Bascule Bridge with an Art Moderne design for these reasons:

1. This alternative is the closest to the existing bridge in location and we feel will have the least impact on the view shed, Historic districts, and adjacent properties.

2. By keeping the ‘Sub-standard Curves’ on the Locust/Middletown side of the bridge the noise from the traffic will be dissipated by the hillside plants & trees and it will slow down the traffic therefore cutting down on potential accidents with autos, bicycles, joggers, and pedestrians.

3. The Oceanic Bridge is also heavily used as a recreational thoroughfare and a higher bridge would add difficulty to it’s use for that purpose, as well as increase the possibility of traffic accidents in icy weather.

4. This alignment also keeps the best view shed of the river looking East from the Locust/Middletown side of the bridge.

I also believe that the new design only needs 1 sidewalk (on the Eastern side of the bridge, as it is now... I feel that 1 sidewalk will accommodate the pedestrian traffic with the new added bike/breakdown lanes on each side.

OTHER IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Construction should be done 7 days a week, (except National Holidays) until the project completed.
2. The bridge needs to remain OPEN AT ALL TIMES DURING CONSTRUCTION IN AT LEAST ONE DIRECTION. Possibly changing the direct to flow with the commuter traffic during the day. (This could be done with a simple set of red lights at each end of the bridge)
3. There should be an early completion Bonus, as well as a Late finish Penalty for completing the project.
Inkyung & to Whom it may concern-

I wanted to advise you that I have been in contact with the Rumson Historic Preservation Commission and spoke with it's Chairman, Charlie Shay. Mr. Shay advised me that their Commission does NOT MEET DURING THE SUMMER. Their next meeting is scheduled for Sept. 21, 2017. Mr. Shay has assured me that the Oceanic Bridge Project is on their Agenda for that upcoming meeting. I would hope for you to receive some comment from this Historic Preservation Commission soon after this meeting.

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter.

Respectfully-

[Name Redacted]
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown
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PIC COMMENT # 213
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 12:01 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

Please submit comment for Oceanic Bridge
Inkyung Englehart, Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765

Dear Inkyung,

As a current resident of Locust Point Road, in Locust, NJ, I would like to register my comment to replace the Oceanic Bridge with a similar low bascule draw bridge. We would like to maintain the beauty of the Navesink and the historic nature of the area.

There is no need for a larger bridge to facilitate a traffic pattern that is mainly residential and 25 mph speed limits.

Regards,
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 214
Subject: Alternative 7a
Date: Sunday, July 16, 2017 7:25 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: Alternative 7a

Please support alternative 7a to preserve the precious historical look of our area.
PIC COMMENT # 215
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and the transmitted documents contain private, privileged and confidential information belonging to the sender. The information therein is solely for the use of the addressee. If your receipt of this transmission has occurred as the result of an error, please immediately notify us so we can arrange for the return of the documents. In such circumstances, you are advised that you may not disclose, copy, distribute or take any other action in reliance on the information transmitted.
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:  
Mailing Address:  
Email:  
Comments/Suggestions:

Please keep the current location or size of the bridge.

A replacement of current bridge would be best.

Although the new bridge is not the most conventional,
on maybe not the most cost effective, the style & charm
of the bridge are worth it.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 14, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7785
Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 216
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us

© Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 8/20/17
Mr. Inkyung Englehart: Oceanic Bridge

We strongly feel the bridge should be kept as a drawbridge which is in keeping with the area surrounding it.

When people move to our area, they should expect to wait for the bridge as well as the train and if they do not like it, then do not come here.

A bridge like the one between Highlands and Sea Bright would be an eyesore and ruin the character of Middletown and Rumson! As well as our property values!

Please let us remain as a wonderful place to live.
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Comments/Suggestions:

7A is preferred: It will allow all boats without restrictions.

The historic value to our area is very important (this can not be ignored). Only 1 sidewalk is needed (6' wide to the east similar to the placement of the existing. The 2 sub standard turns on the Middletown side is not a problem, the cars have the time to slow going to the stop. Thank you.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
linkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
PIC COMMENT # 218
-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 22, 2017 8:11 AM
To: Englehart, Inkyung
Subject: I am voting for Alternative 7A

Please let me know if you need anything more.
PIC COMMENT # 219
Subject: Oceanic Bridge
Date: Thursday, August 3, 2017 8:47 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Oceanic Bridge

I suggest building a new bridge and utilizing the old one as a park (similar to the High Line in NYC) for walking/running, bicycling, picnic, etc.

--
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 220
Subject: Question about bridge traffic studies
Date: Thursday, July 27, 2017 11:52 AM
From: [Redacted]
To: <MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com>
Conversation: Question about bridge traffic studies

Have any studies been done on traffic crossing the bridge to determine the origin and destination of vehicles trips that cross the bridge? If so, how may I obtain a copy? If not, why not? It seems to me that if realignment is a consideration then planners need to know where the traffic is coming from and where it is going in greater detail than just "from one side of the bridge to the other", "from Rumson to Middletown", or some other such thought. Vehicle origin/destination data will give insights that may inform new options for realignment.

Thanks,

[Redacted]
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
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PIC COMMENT # 221
Q1: Contact Information
Name:
Address:
Email:
Phone number:

Q2: Comments/Suggestions:
low draw bridge please!
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 222
Subject: bridge comments
Date: Thursday, August 3, 2017 1:42 PM
From: [Redacted]
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com"
<monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>, "linkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us"
<linkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Conversation: bridge comments

I am fully supportive of either alternative that is higher than the current drawbridge. If the mid-level alternative is significantly costlier than the higher bridge, I would be supportive of the higher bridge. We spend hours of our lives waiting for the drawbridge to go up and down. It sometimes makes it difficult to get to work on time – this week, the bridge opened at 5:35am, which nearly caused me (and many others) to miss the 6a ferry. The bridge was opening for a single large boat. That doesn't make sense to me.

I am supportive of the option that a) limits downtime on the existing bridge, and b) is most similar in terms of pathway. All of the alternatives moving westward would seem to be poor options in my mind. I see this as being alternative 7a. I understand that people are concerned about the look of the new bridge, but think that unless private funds are being raised for the excess cost, we should be focused on building the safest, most durable, most practical bridge we can.

Thanks

The information transmitted herein is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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PIC COMMENT # 223
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Comments/Suggestions:

I live over the access road.
My view is to the east northeast.
I prefer 7A Low Level

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 August 4, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
linkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 224
I'm voting for The 7A replacement bridge for the old Oceanic Bridge because it's the most similar to the Oceanic Bridge which is beautiful and was quite functional. It is such a beautiful ride down the bridge with great views and also seems safer for pedestrians.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting – June 20, 2017

PIC COMMENT # 225
Hello,
Writing in to voice my opinion in favor of the 7A design for the Oceanic bridge. I run or bike over that bridge a few times a week...many times with my children as well. The 7A design would keep the bridge a safe & wonderful highlight for the area.
Thank you.
PIC COMMENT # 226
Conceptual Alternatives: Public Comments & Suggestions

Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

The same suggestion I made to the Rumson-Seabridge redo, is what I recommend for the Oceanic Span also...

That we should build two (2) separate spans, this will allow maintenance/rebuild to one system while the other is still passable, in an emergency, if one draw was not working, the other would still allow traffic to flow across the River.

The beauty aspect should remain similar to the existing structure.

Thank You.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, July 21, 2017 to:

Inkyung Englehart
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us