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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #1
I support ALTERNATIVE 7-A with up to 45' high water clearance drawbridge.
Commenter #2
I think it's important to emphasize safe cyclist and pedestrian access. I'm also in favor of keeping the bridge at a height of 45 ft. Thank you for hearing me out!
Commenter #3
10/6/2020

I use the existing bridge to commute to the ferry and jog or bike to Hartshorne. A 5% grade bridge will make the jog/bike not feasible for me and this grade may be dangerous in ice/snow. I also believe the 80' bridge height will be an eye sore.

A bridge that can support a majority of the water craft that is also moveable for the larger boats is desirable.
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Commenter #4
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

PLEASE consider this my OPPOSITION to the fixed-height bridge as proposed at 81 feet high!

It would only increase noise pollution; be LESS aesthetic than a 45-foot high water clearance draw bridge; and discourage walkers, bikers and joggers.

As a Monmouth County resident, and frequently active in the bridge area, I prefer and encourage a 45-foot high water clearance drawbridge!!!!

THANK YOU!!
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Commenter #5
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Proposal.

Date: 10/16/2020, 11:13 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello,

My name is [REDACTED] and my wife and I own a home [REDACTED] on the Navesink River. We are writing this email to express our concerns over the new proposal for a 65' bridge to replace the existing Oceanic Bridge.

A bridge of that size and scale would be completely out of character for the surrounding areas. It would negatively impact the beauty of the natural views surrounding the Navesink River. Our attention would be drawn to a large man made bridge as opposed to the beautiful bluffs, water, homes, birds and nature. Additionally, a bridge that high would encourage more boat traffic in larger vessels which will ultimately have a negative impact on the quality of the water and area.

We fully support the reconstruction of the Oceanic Bridge but in the same or similar form to what is in place today. It should remain the height it is and have a draw bridge for larger boat access when needed. There is the opportunity to enhance the look and feel for the community with this reconstruction. Let’s get it right and keep with the size, scale and beauty of our natural environment. I would bet most local residents share our perspective.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #6
Hello,

I wanted to register my opposition to the fixed-span alternative. The existing low-level span is in harmony with the surrounding landscape and does not overpower the surrounding topography. A fixed, high-level span would diminish the visual impact of the Navesink Highlands and mar one of the most beautiful (and unique) corners of New Jersey.

The existing bridge is attractive and appropriate to its setting, with its warm, sandy concrete; green paint that compliments the water and hills; art deco / Streamline Moderne architectural details; and gradual, low-slung approaches. If at all possible, the existing bridge should be repaired. If not feasible, a replacement should be as close to the existing bridge (in terms of design, elevation, and alignment) as possible.

Separately, I think it would be a shame to adopt the Alternative 4A alignment - the existing alignment on the Middletown side offers a sweeping curve with beautiful views of the Navesink, and it would be unfortunate to have a new, straight alignment plow directly through the hillside to Navesink River Road.

The Navesink River and the Navesink Highlands are a unique landscape that should be protected - it's a landscape that's been immortalized by great American artists (e.g., "View of the Shrewsbury River, New Jersey" by John F Kensett). Hiking through Hartshorne Woods and viewing the river, it's not difficult to imagine the same vistas as they were hundreds of years ago. Marring that with a Florida-style fixed span would be a deep loss.

Thanks for your consideration.
Commenter #7
Subject: Comment

Date: 10/19/2020, 1:29 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

As a Middletown resident for many decades and a long-time participant in boating and sailing on the Navesink from Red Bank, Rumson to Sea Bright, I've had a great deal of exposure and use of, the Oceanic Bridge. I would like to emphasize the delicate aesthetic nature of this particular geographical area. It is not Highlands, nor does it have the topographical variations of Highlands to Sea Bright which in their case, have helped minimize the visual impact of that structure. The key arguments and 'features' of the raised fixed-bridge 'preferred plan', are minimizing, even over-riding this importance of the bridge's surrounding location and the importance of being visually-appropriate. It must not be overlooked or down-played, how obtrusive, invasive and aesthetically compromising such a structure would be to this location. If cost of construction and operation is a paramount issue for replacement of the location-appropriate drawbridge, further ideas for funding should be explored with the participation, involvement and even contributions of the locals who most protest the fixed bridge option.

In these times, it has recently proven difficult, and now outright discouraged, for citizens and decisive bodies to meet, discuss and have fair exchange of ideas under the limitations of the pandemic. For this reason, any push for conclusions, let alone construction plans should be postponed for the time being. Efforts to go forwards should revert to further maintenance until things settle down. In other words, the participation of residents and their representatives can not be what it should be for such a large project at this time. We need organized involvement which requires social interaction; and many other key elements, most of which are not possible during this pandemic. We also don't want to feel that proponents of the fixed bridge will capitalize on the opposition's inability to effectively participate and be as attentive as is necessary for us to correctly address this issue. No one wants to look back in history and comment that "they pushed this bridge through during the pandemic, while were all distracted".

Any advancement of this decision process should be delayed for a reasonable period, in respect of these times.
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10/19/2020

As a Middletown resident for many decades and a long-time participant in boating and sailing on the Navesink from Red Bank, Rumson to Sea Bright, I've had a great deal of exposure and use of, the Oceanic Bridge. I would like to emphasize the delicate aesthetic nature of this particular geographical area. It is not Highlands, nor does it have the topographical variations of Highlands to Sea Bright which in their case, have helped minimize the visual impact of that structure. The key arguments and features of the raised fixed-bridge 'preferred plan', are minimizing, even over-riding this importance of the bridge's surrounding location and the importance of being visually-appropriate. It must not be overlooked or downplayed, how obtrusive, invasive and aesthetically compromising such a structure would be to this location. If cost of construction and operation is a paramount issue for replacement of the location-appropriate drawbridge, further ideas for funding should be explored with the participation, involvement and even contributions of the locals who most protest the fixed bridge option.

In these times, it has recently proven difficult, and now outright discouraged, for citizens and decisive bodies to meet, discuss and have fair exchange of ideas under the limitations of the pandemic. For this reason, any push for conclusions, let alone construction plans should be postponed for the time being. Efforts to go forwards should revert to further maintenance until things settle down. In other words, the participation of residents and their representatives can not be what it should be for such a large project at this time. We need organized involvement which requires social interaction; and many other key elements, most of which are not possible during this pandemic. We also don't want to feel that proponents of the fixed bridge will capitalize on the oppositions inability to effectively participate and be as attentive as is necessary for us to correctly address this issue.

No one wants to look back in history and comment that 'they pushed this bridge through during the pandemic, while were all distracted'.

Any advancement of this decision process should be delayed for a reasonable period, in respect of these times.
Subject: Re: Comment
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 9:38 PM

Hello,

Thank you for your comments. Monmouth County must comply under the Federal guidelines for the Bridge Study that involves a funding schedule deadline. In order for the Bridge Study tasks to be completed within the FHWA timing requirement and to adhere to restrictions on large gatherings due to COVID-19, this PIC Meeting No. 3 (rescheduled from March 19th) was held online instead of in person. Due to the COVID-19 restrictions of gatherings in large numbers, the Project Team decided to host the online public meeting using online engagement software that could accommodate a large number of attendees, according to New Jersey public meeting guidelines.

Please note, the PIC comment period was extended from the standard 30-day comment period to 45 days to provide additional opportunities for the public to view the project presentation and handouts on the website, which was through Friday, October 16, 2020. Once the comments have personal information redacted, the written comments received will be posted to the project website for viewing.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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Commenter #8
I'm one of many who feel the 65' fixed bridge is too high. Overwhelming visually for the locale. I realize that maintenance & operations are a large portion of the life cycle costs for movable options, but my feeling is that the 45' high movable option would reduce the "highway" feel and yet need only open for sail boats. There are not all that many larger sail boats in the Navesink, and the 45' option would allow even the largest motorboats to pass under the bridge without opening.
Subject: Sea Bright Bridge

Date: 8/27/2020, 6:03 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Obviously, the Sea Bright Bridge replacement cannot be 65' high. Why is the Oceanic Bridge being compared to the Highlands Bridge and not Sea Bright?

According to the survey done on boat traffic, the 45' option would need opening much less. The 65' height doesn’t offer that much of a benefit in terms of interruption to traffic/car pollution between Middletown & Rumson.
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development -
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 11:17 AM

Morning

Thank you for your question and comment. We respectfully provide the following response:
During the presentation, the Oceanic Bridge was compared to the Highlands Bridge because the vertical under clearance of the Highlands Bridge establishes the maximum height of vessels that can access the Navesink River from the ocean. Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's determination that the Preliminary Preferred Alternative is supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable."

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Commenter #9
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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10/11/2020

Please do not replace the existing bridge with an 80’ high bridge. I understand there is 45’ high option.. please approve that plan. It will be more suitable for our area.
Commenter #10
Hi,
We would like a low bridge. The present bridge is 20 feet above the water. We do not want a 65 foot bridge. That would be three times higher. The present bridge is below the tree line, therefore is is inconspicuous, in our opinion. The bridge is in our view and we look at all day, every day.

Thanks,
Hi,

We would like a low bridge. The present bridge is 20 feet above the water. We could allow a 25 foot bridge. We do not want a 65 foot bridge, that would be three times taller than today's bridge. The present bridge is "below the tree-line". And it is practically invisible. The present bridge is "in our view", yet it is inconspicuous.

Thanks for considering our opinion.
Commenter #11
Reflecting upon the 3 hr presentation about a month ago, I am questioning the selection of the fixed 65' bridge. Clearly, the residents of Rumson and across the bridge in Middletown prefer the 45' alternative bridge - given the questionable financial future of the Federal transportation budgets and funding quite possibly to change this election, why not take a few more months to solidify this VERY-LONG-IN-THE-DESIGN decision?
Hello

Thank you for your comments and question. Monmouth County must comply under the Federal guidelines for the Bridge Study that involves a funding schedule deadline. In order for the Bridge Study tasks to be completed within the FHWA timing requirement, the project is currently scheduled to be completed by the end of 2020.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #12
Thank for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Oceanic Bridge project. The need for a replacement bridge for vehicle traffic is obvious, however the need to construct a bridge to accommodate the very largest marine vessels on a very short stretch of river is not. The need for federal funding is guiding a decision into a one size fits all solution, one that is not appropriate or rational. The height of the bridge should be based upon the majority of the traffic utilizing it, which seems to be in the 30-35’ range. Vessels with antennae and outriggers that can be lowered should not be included in the count. Some larger vessels may ultimately need to be moored and stored elsewhere. Building a larger bridge will be more costly to build and maintain; more paving, concrete, rebar, fixtures etc... A fixed span bridge of an intermediate height would be a win-win for all parties involved.

The Navesink River is a sensitive ecological area that is already challenged by development in the area, the bridge project should consider these and it should help improve current conditions. Maintaining the natural shoreline, protecting and creating habitat for the diverse marine, mammal and bird life and creating quality recreational opportunities should all be required outcomes of this project. So many sensitive and progressive projects are built in the US and throughout the world, this should be one of them!

Respectfully,
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River
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Commenter #13
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10/14/2020

I prefer the 45" high Drawbridge of Alternative 7A and oppose the 80.96' fixed bridge. Thank you.
Commenter #14
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 9/14/2020, 6:11 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I feel strongly the bridge should be replaced with a new bridge high enough to not have to open, something similar to the Highlands bridge.
I know a number of options have been presented, any one of them that does not allow the bridge to open is fine with me.
The current bridge is dangerously in need of repair and I think a panoramic bridge as you cross the gorgeous Navesink is practical as well as aesthetically beautiful.
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Commenter #15
I favor the 45’ profile of the proposed new bridge as being more consonant with the unique local landscape.
Commenter #16
Please DO NOT replace the Oceanic Bridge with a high bridge of 65' clearance. I vote for the 45' clearance moveable option. It is more in keeping with the residential and natural feel of the area and still lets most boats pass. I don't mind waiting a little bit if a really tall boat needs to be let through. It gives me time to appreciate the beauty of where I live. Please do not build a very high bridge that will be more difficult to cross on foot or on bicycle.

I do like the idea of coming our from the bank under Navesink River Road - that area could be used for recreation.

Thank you.
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Commenter #17
Subject: STOP
Date: 10/3/2020, 2:38 PM
To: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com

I have lived here for more than 20 years, and absolutely love going over this bridge daily!!
I am also a [REDACTED] in Monmouth County, and love taking my Clients over this bridge, as it is, to show them how beautiful it is.
No one I know, many many people, want to change it to that higher Monsterous Ugly Bridge?
Whose idea was this anyway?
Not good, so please leave it the way it is!
Thanks.
I am sure no one wants this bridge!
Hey again. I sent you an email a couple of weeks ago. I am against doing anything to this bridge. I am a [REDACTED] and like to take my clients over the bridge. They love the charm. Anything taller would be an eyesore for our area! Thanks. [REDACTED]
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and question. Monmouth County applied for federal funding to study the Oceanic Bridge that is in constant need of repairs and maintenance which have become too costly for the County. The Bridge Study Federal process requires that the Project Team examine a range of conceptual alternatives for bridge improvements. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) was developed as one of the many conceptual alternatives that were presented at the online Public Information Center (PIC) meeting and analyzed with other alternatives in the comparison of alternatives matrix. Also noted in the online PIC meeting, the U.S. Coast Guard determines the height of a fixed bridge. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states, "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's recommendation as the PPA, supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable."

The aesthetics features of the bridge have not yet been determined. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be developed in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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Commenter #18
I would favor keeping the original design and that height. If that is not a viable option the 45’ high option would be the next best thing. Being local residents, we walk & bike over the bridge on a daily basis. 80’ is not acceptable for many reasons.
Commenter #19
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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10/12/2020

I prefer the lowest bridge possible to be built that will uphold the beauty of the area without increasing noise pollution.
Commenter #20
Subject: bridge comments

Date: 10/16/2020, 2:31 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To Whom It May Concern,
As a Rumson resident, I urge you to construct a bridge that is similar in height to the current bridge. We move to this area for many reasons, one of which is how the town looks and feels aesthetically. Building a bridge that towers above area homes and businesses will look awful and doesn't need to be done.

With concern,
Commenter #21
I'm writing to say that I oppose the construction of the 65' bridge. I have been a resident of this area for most of my life, and I can count on my hands the number of times I've had to wait for the draw bridge to let a boat through. I can't see the taller bridge adding much convenience from that perspective. From the renderings I can see that it would greatly change one of the most spectacular views of the area, and dramatically alter the pedestrian usage of the bridge at a steeper angle. There is no doubt that the bridge needs replacing, badly. I have no objection to a newer, updated draw bridge, but I oppose the 65' option.
Subject: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge Suggestions

Date: 10/17/2020, 11:27 AM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Engineering Team,

I hope that you have all remained well during this pandemic and thank you for taking your time to present the current available options to us. As I have been a Monmouth County resident all my life, more specifically in the [redacted] area of Middletown, I used to cross this bridge everyday to get to school from grades PreK through 8th grade. Even throughout the years after, I still frequented that bridge as a means to travel to my grandparents home in [redacted] or to pick up my younger siblings from our school. [redacted]

With that being said, the traffic in-flows and outflows of this area during the summer are usually heavily crowded and this bridge serves as a means of 'bridging' that gap of traffic between Route 36 and Ocean Ave.. It provides us ‘citizens’ who live here permanently, a way to travel to the coastal areas without dealing with heavy, bumper-to-bumper traffic. This bridge also serves as a historical landmark for the area.

My worries and concerns for the other proposals lie within the unfair treatment of eminent domain through purchasing and lowballing others on fair market values of real estate. My other concern, which is related to traffic flows, is also very important. After reading some of the proposals put forward by your group, I became increasingly concerned about the high-rising bridge with the draw-bridge feature. For the funding of the bridge, I am aware that it is expensive to maintain workers, who operate the draw-bridge, therefore I am proposing some form of a ‘toll’ similar to that of the NJTP or NJGSP, that tolls oversized-boats from entering into the Red Bank area of the Navesink and vice-versa.

I would prefer selection 2, which provides a major overhaul of the bridge to prevent an irrevocable destruction of environment, lowballing and excessive eminent domain, and to reduce and noise and potential air impacts. I have had some recent health issues and that is why my email finds you this morning slightly after the deadline. Thank you for your understanding during these times.

Selection 2. Rehabilitation.

Best,

[redacted]
Subject: Re: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge Suggestions
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 9:37 PM
CC: undisclosed recipients <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello,

Thank you for your comments and suggestion. The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens, who determines such actions, and the charging of an opening fee are determined by the U.S. Coast Guard. Monmouth County does not charge vessels to open the bridge, and it is our understanding that the U.S. Coast Guard does not allow a fee to open a bridge. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commerter #23
I would like to see sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. During the Covid-19 pandemic, it has been difficult to distance while walking across the bridge; I walk across every day, as do many others. We need bike lanes, to keep bikes off the sidewalks. Many people fish off the bridge; we need a fishing pier built in to the design. I am in favor of a fixed bridge (not drawbridge); this should save taxpayer money to operate the bridge and prevent traffic delays encountered when the bridge is open. I like the design of the Highlands Bridge, and as a pedestrian, I don't mind having a higher bridge to walk across. The bridge is very decrepit; there is a hole on the sidewalk that is covered with a piece of plywood!
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Commenter #24
To all Involved in the reconstruction and fabrication of the Rumson-Navesink Bridge (Oceanic),

I am writing to you to implore your prudent and cautious re-engineering of the Oceanic Bridge that spans the Navesink River. As a long time resident of Little Silver, and a lifetime resident of New Jersey, it is imperative that we are understanding in the connectivity of all things when we look to redesign and improve a project of this nature. The enormous new bridges that have recently been constructed to span our waterways (like the bridge at Sandy Hook), do not take into consideration many ecological, environmental and aesthetic values as much as they weigh the immediate gratification in construction, transportation and accessibility. This is unacceptable. We need to more intuitively involve all eco-systems to prevent the degradation of our beautiful coastal waterways. The current plan does not include how we will protect (and not destroy) the wetlands and living shorelines at the base of the bridge project. Nor does it discuss how the lighting will be designed so as to protect the many bird species in the area, including several threatened and endangered species. Additionally, the size and scope of the bridge is in stark contrast to the simple beautiful shorelines we currently enjoy and is an eye sore and destroys the small, quaint coastal community that we are here in the peninsula of Two Rivers.

I am making this my official protest to your current plan, and believe you need to go back to the proverbial drawing board to recreate a more appealing and ecologically friendly design. It is not during a pandemic that you make these type of important decisions with out the weight and involvement of the people who live and love this beautiful part of New Jersey.

Thank you.
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Commenter #25
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10/18/2020

Please keep the bridge similar to its present height to maintain the history and beauty of the area.
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Commenter #26
Hello - I prefer a Modified Rehabilitation (Alternative 2B) to retain the aesthetics, charm and relative ease of biking/walking of the current bridge.

Regards,

Rumson resident
Commenter #27
My parents moved to Fair Haven in 1951. This bridge has always represented what makes the Two Rivers area so special. I truly believe that a fixed span will forever damage the beauty that makes this area so memorable. The views in all directions will be destroyed. This is not just for the land owners who live nearby but for the people who live and work in this area and are able to enjoy the inherent beauty of this area while riding only feet above the water. Do we really want to put up another Highlands bridge? I would encourage all of those considering the replacement of this span to continue this legacy of beauty and put in another draw-bridge.
Commenter #28
As a [redacted] generation Rumson resident, I have known that bridge my entire life. It's forever been a staple in my travels. I caught my first fish from there and a reliable resource for blue claw crabs. It's a vital, convenient lifeline to cross the river, something people take for granted. Without it, we'd be stuck. I have fortunately also seen both sides, the salt water has done it's inevitable damage. When erected, it was probably state of the art technology for it's time and was a needed improvement to the then outdated original bridge. I'm sure there were many probably local detractors when that bridge was in it's planning stages too, history often repeats itself. This new bridge proposal is very well thought out. The existing bridge is very brittle and an expensive tax liability every year. It's akin to putting band aids on a major wound. I am very much in favor of this proposal. Thank you for finally addressing this issue and moving forward. The Highlands bridge span speaks for itself, it is magnificent and has done wonders for the traffic flow. I have spent many a afternoon waiting on an open Oceanic Bridge that will not close properly. People spend a hundred thousand on a car to drive on 100 year old narrow, bumpy overcrowded roads. This is a no brainer. I am confident that when erected, the new bridge will look great and will settle into the improved landscape.
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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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #29
I support the preliminary preferred alternative. A few locals do not represent everyone for a bridge that will affect thousands of people a day that is being paid by the whole county and a federal grant. Most residents don’t have time to attend meetings. A movable span would cost too much money over the long term and be too much of a safety delay for emergency vehicles over an erroneously-assigned “historic” labeling to a decrepit draw bridge with no meaningful history other than being old.

One suggestion is to add a buffered bicycle lane in the shoulder, painted green according to national standards because drivers go too fast on bridges and need to see the lane. 12 ft lanes are also far too wide for this bridge. I would prefer a 10 ft lane with double center reflectors and rumble strips or white side reflectors to avoid people leaving the lane on the wide curve. Please implement traffic calming, a speed limit sign will not work. You can’t fix bad designs with signs.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #30
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Public Comment
Date: 10/16/2020, 3:10 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Hello, I am submitting an opinion paper. It is an opinion piece based on supporting evidence. It is in support of a bascule bridge replacement for the Oceanic Bridge. Please find the paper attached.

Thank you,

— Attachments: —
Oceanic Bridge.docx  2.8 MB
Replacing the Oceanic Bridge Over the Navesink River with a New Bascule Bridge

Date: April 25, 2017
Abstract

The Oceanic Bridge which crosses the Navesink River between Rumson, New Jersey and Middletown, New Jersey has reached a point where regular maintenance is unable to prevent continued degradation of the bridge substructure and superstructure. The bridge was built in 1939 as part of the Works Public Administration under the New Deal enacted by then president Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Civil engineering technology has come a long way over the last 78 years making the current bascule bridge over the Navesink obsolete. Considering the technology available in the 1930s the bridge has held up remarkably well over the last eight decades. However, saltwater intrusion in the form of chlorides has forced rust pockets into the substructure, superstructure, and deck of the bridge. In addition, the metal deck of the bascule section of the bridge has completely lost its paint system which was intended to protect it from rusting. The metal deck has now degraded to a point where it can no longer be salvaged. In addition, the control systems of the double leaf bascule span are technologically obsolete as well as functionally obsolete. The safety systems of the bridge do not meet today’s standards and must be updated.

The continued cost of maintaining the bridge would far outweigh the cost of replacing the bridge with a new one. The steel reinforcements of the bridge would only continue to rust due to chloride intrusion into the surrounding concrete. This means that any patch put into place to shore up the bridge will only be temporary in nature. Eventually, entire sections of the bridge would need to be replaced. The best solution is to replace the bridge with an entirely new one along a new alignment.

Normally, the Federal Highway Administration prefers funding fixed span replacement bridges in crossings of this nature. The fixed span bridge is preferred due to low operating costs. However, in this case there are community concerns to be considered in the planning of the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge. The Oceanic Bridge has become a historical landmark in the Middletown and Rumson communities. In addition, a bascule bridge is lower in height than a fixed span bridge. This means the highly aesthetic view enjoyed by residents who live along the Navesink River will not be intruded upon by a bascule bridge. The fixed span bridge plan would obstruct views and effect property value of those living along the Navesink River. In the neighboring community of the Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey and Sea Bright, New Jersey, residents suffered a loss of aesthetic value to their properties after a bascule bridge was replaced with a fixed span bridge. Also, a fixed span bridge has longer lead ramps in its inherent design. This means a loss of property usage on either side of the bridge by residents and commercial businesses alike. The goal of this proposal is to convince the New Jersey Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration of not only the need to replace the Oceanic Bridge, but to replace it with a bascule bridge which will address the concerns of the surrounding community. An additional goal of this proposal, is to convince the Federal Highway Administration the differences in operating cost can be mitigated by new infrastructure technology available today.
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Introduction

The Oceanic Bridge that crosses the Navesink River between Middletown, New Jersey and Rumson, New Jersey is the longest bridge in Monmouth County New Jersey. It is a vital thoroughfare along the New Jersey Shore community. It services or has a significant impact on the traffic patterns of the towns of Rumson, Middletown, Sea Bright, Red Bank, Atlantic Highlands, Fair Haven, and Highlands Borough. This is a significant portion of the population of Monmouth County. The combined population of these towns is 102,559 people according to the 2010 United States Census. In addition, the bridge serves as a major coastal evacuation route away from the New Jersey Shore into the upper regions of New Jersey.

The Oceanic Bridge was built in 1939 as part of the Works Public Administration which was part of the New Deal under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In 78 years, the bridge has held up remarkably well considering the marine environment in which it exists. However, the passage of time and the elements have taken its toll on the structure and it needs to be replaced. The following evidence will illuminate the reasons the bridge needs to be replaced and the concerns which need to be addressed by those planning the rebuild.

Functional Obsolescence of the Current Oceanic Bridge

In September of 2011, a group of consultants put together a scoping report for Monmouth County. The subject of the scoping report was the Oceanic Bridge over the Navesink River. The consultants involved in this scoping report were Maguire Group Inc., Lichtenstein Consulting Engineers, H2L2 Architects/Planners, ARCH2, Inc., and Hunter Research Inc. The scoping report they presented to the New Jersey Department of Transportation depicted a bridge which had come to the end of its functional obsolescence (Monmouth County S-31, 2011).

Substructure

The consulting engineers on the project started their analysis on the substructure of the bridge. First, they found the concrete abutments which are part of the lead up ramps of the bridge, were in poor condition. Many of the abutments had widespread fine and medium sized cracks. Many also showed evidence of efflorescence (Monmouth County S-31, 2011). Efflorescence is the process by which salt leeches out of a porous material. In this case the salt was leeching out of the concrete of the Oceanic Bridge and forming a coating on the surface of the concrete abutments. In addition to the efflorescence, the engineering team found hollow sounding concrete. The hollow concrete is due to pockets where rust build up causes the concrete to be forced out of its original volume. The excess space created fills with air and creates a hollow sound. Often, a bridge’s structural integrity can be assessed by searching for these air pockets using acoustic technology. Finally, the bridge abutments showed signs of spalling and delamination. Spalling is a term used to describe the chipping or flaking away of the surface layer of the concrete. It often occurs when there is too much moisture present in the concrete. Delamination is the process which occurs at the interface of the steel reinforcing bars and the concrete. Normally, steel bars do not rust within reinforced concrete, however, when in a marine environment, saltwater can leech into less permeable concrete (especially the concrete used in
the 1930s) bringing with it chloride ions. The chloride ions act like a dipole catalyzing the formation of rust on the steel even without the presence of oxygen. In essence, the chlorides oxidize the steel, stripping it of electrons and causing material loss. The rust builds up and occupies a greater volume than the surrounding concrete forcing it outward and thus delamination occurs (Corrosion Control Plan for Bridges, 2012).

The next part of the substructure to be examined were the concrete pile bents. The pile bents support the concrete beams of the bridge. The concrete pile bents were found to be in serious condition. There was advance column spalling found on them and the cap beams were cracked in many places. In addition, the cap beams did not meet current standards set forth by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). This specifically refers to HS-25 design loading which is related to HL93 truck load and is defined as being 20% higher than the HS-20 design truck load (Balakumaran, 2014).

Finally, the engineers examined the concrete piers of the substructure of the bridge and found them to be in serious condition. The concrete piers support the steel portion of the bridge which are the bascule leaves and the lead ups to them. The engineers found serious deterioration of the footings of the bridge and the timber piles which had meant to shore up the footings had been reduced in material by 50% by marine borers. The piers also did not qualify for HS-25 design loading (Monmouth County S-31, 2011).

**Superstructure**

After the substructure, the engineering team moved on to the superstructure of the bridge. The concrete t-beams of the bridge (which support the deck) were in poor condition. The team found large spalls and exposed reinforcing bar. On the steel deck girders (which support the steel deck), the paint system which had been put into place to prevent rust had failed. Many of the bearings which had meant to accommodate regular shifting of the bridge had frozen. The bridge is no longer capable of accommodating tension and compression forces which normally occur due to thermal expansion or movement created by winds and tidal flow. The steel members of the bridge also show signs of widespread material loss due to oxidation. As before, the steel members did not meet the HIS-25 design loading for current bridge capacity. The last part of the superstructure to be examined was the bascule span. As before, they found the paint system had failed and widespread oxidation had taken hold. More alarmingly they found holes in steel members which jeopardize the structural integrity of the bascule span. In addition, the steel girders and stringers of the bascule span did not meet HS-25 loading (Monmouth County S-31, 2011).

**Deck**

The deck of the bridge was evaluated by SWK Pavement Engineering, Inc. and unlike the rest of the bridge, it was found to be in fair condition. This is due to the fact that the bridge had been repaved at various points in its service life (most recently in 2009) (Monmouth County S-31, 2011). However, chloride contamination was found in both lanes. The Northbound Lane had 84% contamination and the Southbound Lane had 94% contamination. These levels denote a
“Category 1-Extensive Active Corrosion” according to the New Jersey Department of Transportation Bridge Design Manual (Monmouth County S-31, 2011).

Mechanical and Electrical Systems

The engineers’ assessment of the mechanical and electrical systems of the bridge illuminated their functional as well as technological obsolescence. On the mechanical systems, the bearings, rack and pinion gearing, speed reducers, and trunnion assemblies all showed signs of extensive corrosion. The couplings of the mechanical system are a now obsolete design and the span motors do not meet current AASHTO design standards. The span motors are drastically underpowered for the load they are required to carry (Monmouth County S-31, 2011).

The electrical system of the bridge is also in critical condition. The liquid filled transformers are showing signs of leaking and are a possible environmental hazard. The power distribution and control setup is eight decades old and is a danger to its operators. The brakes of the bridge are obsolete and parts for them are no longer available. Finally, the control desk of the bridge is being utilized with inoperable and unreliable components.

Safety Features

The last physical aspect of the bridge to be examined by the engineering consultants were the safety features of the bridge. The bridge railings are insufficient for meeting today’s standards. They are inadequate for stopping vehicular traffic and they are insufficient in height for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The traffic gates and light of the bridge are operational but are severely antiquated. Lastly, the resistance barriers of the bridge need to be operated manually necessitating the need for an additional operator on the bridge.

Concerns of the Surrounding Community

The community surrounding the vicinity of the Oceanic Bridge prefer a bascule span replacement as opposed to a fixed span governed by the Federal Highway Administration funding source. The bridge lies in an aesthetically beautiful portion of the Navesink River. Residents are concerned that a fixed span bridge will obstruct line of sight from their respective properties and this will ultimately lead to degradation of property value (Crabbe, 2015). Residents of Sea Bright saw this occur when their views of the Manhattan skyline was obstructed by a high fixed span replacement of the Route 36 bascule bridge which runs between the Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey and Sea Bright, New Jersey (Salsa, 2010).

The raised elevation of the new Route 36 Bridge also had an impact on Sandy Hook National Park and Twin Lights National Park. The Oceanic Bridge lies within the vicinity of 8 historic landmarks in Middletown and Rumson. On the Middletown side, these historic resources include Huber Woods Park, Locust Historic District, 220 Hartshorne Road and 17 Wigwam Road. On the Rumson side of the bridge, the historic resources are the Borden Carriage House, 82 West River Road, the First Presbyterian Church and Bingham Hall.

Additional concerns, come in the form of logistic and economic concerns of local business and residents within the community. The longer lead up ramps of the bridge will hinder the flow of
traffic into business along Bingham Avenue or County 8A on which the road lies. This could cause loss of revenue due to traffic being routed further down the road. Figure 1 depicts the rendering for the Rumson side of the fixed span plan and how the lead ups will be extended from their previous point.

Figure 1:

(Monmouth County S-31, 2011)

On the upper side of the rendering is a commercial property which will be affected by a fixed span plan and on the lower side is access to a residential neighborhood which will be difficult to reroute without significant use of eminent domain which could tie up the approval process in court.

In addition, the Middletown side of the bridge has long been a popular fishing spot in Monmouth County due to tidal flow. The fixed span lead up ramps would eliminate parking for the fishing area and make landing fish impossible with the new elevation of the bridge. Figure 2 depicts the Middletown shore rendering for the lead up ramp of the fixed span plan.

Figure 2:

(Monmouth County S-31, 2011)
Final concerns over the fixed span solution come in the form of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The increased grade of the high fixed span bridge would make transit of the bridge difficult for bicyclist who utilize the bridge to gain access to the challenging foothills of the Navesink region of Middletown. In addition, loss of foot traffic over the bridge would put a damper on local businesses in downtown Rumson.

**Current Political Trends**

The administration of the 45th President of the United States, Donald J. Trump has stated an interest in reinvesting on our nation’s infrastructure. However, the administration’s most recent budget proposal reallocates funding from the Transportation Trust Fund upon which the Federal Highway Administration draws funding and reallocates it to the building of a wall on the U.S. Mexico border. Despite this murkiness in possible funding, there is a silver lining in the form of Governor Chris Christie who recently signed a bill allocating $400 million dollars to transportation spending in New Jersey.

**Literature Review**

The need to replace the Oceanic Bridge which will meet the structural and aesthetic needs of the community have been discussed. The following will illuminate instances where material technology has successfully reduced the cost and increased the durable life span of bridges. Also, instances of preservation of historic character through bascule bridge rebuilds will be demonstrated.

**Preserving Historic Character Through Bascule Bridge Rebuilds**

The Oceanic Bridge is not the only water crossing to have faced the pressures to modernize. The Bridge of the Lions is a rolling lift bascule bridge in St Augustine, Florida. It crosses the Matanzas River linking Anastasia Island and historic downtown St. Augustine. The bridge which was built in 1927 has become an iconic part of the St. Augustine skyline. In the late 1970s, the bridge had reached a point of severe degradation from usage and exposure to the marine environment. The Florida Department of Transportation began exploring the possibility of replacing the bridge with a taller fixed span bridge. However, several coalitions in St Augustine came forward to champion for the replacement of the bridge to also be a bascule bridge. In addition, these coalitions wished to preserve the historic character of the bridge which is prevalent in the country’s oldest city. Although much of the bridge was replaced, the original arched girders were refurbished, preserving the most distinctive feature of the Bridge of the Lions (Haynes, 2011).

Tianjin, China houses another example of an old bascule bridge which managed to preserve its historic character on a heavily trafficked road. The 80-year-old Jiefang Bridge was designed by the Scherzer Rolling Lift Bridge Company of the USA (Liu, 2013). This bridge had become so badly corroded that its movable span had not been opened in 30 years. The bridge crosses the Haihe River, a busy waterfront in Tianjin. The section of the river around the bridge has a large amount of yacht traffic. The yachts made a fixed span bridge replacement undesirable. In order to preserve the cultural environment and yacht activity, it was decided the crossing would remain bascule in structure (Liu, 2013)
The next example of a bascule replacement project is the Wilson Bridge on the busy Interstate 495. This particular bascule bridge links Oxon Hill, Maryland and Alexandria, Virginia. “After years of deliberation and several lawsuits, a moveable bridge was selected to minimize impact on historic resources in Alexandria and on other resources in the region” (Crabbe, 2015). Like the Jiefang Bridge, the Wilson Bridge was heavily trafficked and yet the decision was made to maintain the structures as bascule types due to historical considerations. The figures from the Monmouth County scoping report show significantly less traffic crossing the Oceanic Bridge (2011). Also, in the case of the Wilson Bridge, “the new spans are somewhat higher than the old spans, so that fewer openings will be needed” (Crabbe, 2015).

The Morrison Bridge over the Williamette River in Portland Oregon was a 54 year old double leaf bascule bridge which existed in a harsh Oregon marine environment. The city planners of Portland decided to keep the replacement bridge as a double leaf bascule and make several upgrades such as a pre-engineered fiber reinforced polymer deck. This allowed corrosive de-icing runoff to be channeled away from vital members of the bridge.

Finally, closer to home and a project which you may be familiar with is the Route 35 Bridge which connects Monmouth and Ocean County. In this case, the NJDOT’s office of community relations met with leaders in Point Pleasant and Brielle to address concerns over maintaining the distinctive culture bascule bridges bring to shore towns (Fisher, 2009). The Route 35 Bridge paralleled the Oceanic Bridge in possible environmental contamination to the surrounding community. The contamination came in the form of lead based paint which had to be carefully removed and also warranted remediation of the soil surrounding the bridge’s footings. The Route 35 Bridge is a prominent example of the NJDOT working with community leaders to maintain the distinctive “Jersey Shore” culture promulgated by bascule bridges.

The Morrison, Wilson, Bridge of the Lions, Jiefang and Route 35 bridges exemplify success in preserving the historical heritage structures such as bascule bridges bring to waterfront communities. Parallels to the Oceanic Bridge can be drawn from each instance. The Wilson Bridge and the Bridge of the Lions have rich historical heritage in the communities surrounding the bridge as does the Oceanic Bridge. The Jiefang Bridge has a vibrant waterfront economy in its vicinity as does the Oceanic Bridge. Finally, both the Route 35 Bridge and the Oceanic Bridge are distinctive bascule bridges on the “Jersey shore.”

**Reducing Maintenance and Operating Costs with Updated Building Techniques**

A primary concern of the Federal Highway Administration is the operating costs associated with operating moveable span bridges. However, these costs can be mitigated by usage of updated building technology. In addition, the bridge itself can be automated which would all but negate yearly operating costs.

For the substructure of the bridge, impermeable concrete and stainless steel reinforcement can be used to prevent saltwater intrusion into the concrete and rusting of the steel reinforcements of the piers and abutments (Darwin, 2014). Impermeable concrete is denser than regular porous concrete and is essential for modern bridge building in marine environments. Stainless steel is
more resistant to rusting than untreated steel. The coupling of stainless steel and impermeable concrete will ensure the service life of the substructure for a century or more. In addition, usage of fiber reinforced plastic wrapping of the bridges support piers and abutments will further prevent chloride intrusion into the substructure of the bridge (Yao, 2016).

For the superstructure of the bridge, a similar method to the substructure can be used but without the need for the fiber wrapping. The impermeable concrete can also be supplemented with fiber reinforcement due to the increased shearing forces encountered by concrete members in the superstructure of the bridge. This was effective in preventing superstructure cracking in bridge design according to a study conducted by Chinese engineers (Li, 2011).

The deck of the bridge is the component where the most new building technology can be utilized. From the top down, a lightweight epoxy asphalt mixture can be used for the bridge pavement. This material is extremely durable to bending load and resists saltwater intrusion from the marine environment and de-icing salts used during inclement weather. Resistance to bending is especially important when considering the movement of the bascule section of bascule bridges. In addition, the impermeability of the epoxy asphalt allows corrosive liquids to be channeled away from vital members of the bridge (Qian, 2011). Figure 3 below shows a sample of an epoxy asphalt mixture.

Figure 3  

(Qian, 2011)

Below the asphalt, fiber reinforced composites can be used in the deck to increase its loading capacity. The high strength and excellent corrosion resistance of composites are desirable in bridge applications especially for decks (Bin, 2006). An FRP deck weighs approximately 80% less than a concrete deck (Bin, 2006). Another innovative technique for bridge deck construction is the usage of stay in place forms. The stay in pace forms can be pre-tensioned which increase
the structural loading capacity of lateral deck members (Balakumaran, 2014). Figure 4 demonstrates the pre-tensioning process.

Figure 4

(Balakumaran, 2014)

In the pre-tensioning process, the reinforcing steel is placed under tensile force and then concrete is poured over the tensile steel. After the concrete cures, the tensile force is removed from the reinforcing steel compressing the concrete and strengthening its load carrying capacity.

The final bridge design advancement which can be implemented in the final design of the Oceanic Bridge comes from a team working in bridge automation in India. The team from Malla Reddy College of Engineering have proposed bridge automation which can be powered by solar and wind energy (Spandanu, 2015). The site of the Oceanic Bridge has an abundant supply of sunlight and wind which can be harnessed to power the movement of a bascule bridge. The bridge can be remotely operated using a combination of sensors, radio operated relays, and video cameras. It is possible this automation can become the new paradigm for bridge operation on the New Jersey Shore or wherever there exists a moveable span bridge throughout the United States. It would diminish the operating costs which are of concern to the Federal Highway administration.

Plan

Foremost in the plan to rebuild the Oceanic Bridge is convincing the New Jersey Department of Transportation of the need to allocate funds from the Federal Highway Administration to rebuild the Oceanic Bridge on a new alignment. The new alignment plan fits better with the needs of the community because it will only require closing of the current thoroughfare for 6 months as opposed to 30 months if the bridge was rebuilt on the same alignment (Monmouth County S-31, 2011). Figure 5 demonstrates the Cost of Maintenance versus Condition of Structure curve. The curve is used to demonstrate typical bridge condition as a function of time.
(Balakumaran, 2016)
The graph demonstrates once a bridge is considered in poor condition (as with the Oceanic Bridge), maintenance costs increase at an ever increasing rate. Thus, the most viable plan for the Oceanic Bridge is not rehabilitation but replacement before serious failure occurs.

**Bascule Plan Fits the Needs of the Community**

The Federal Highway administration will need to examine the needs of the community before deciding on a fixed span or bascule span. Beyond traditional costs, they must examine the costs of the damage done to a historic vista and neighborhood. In addition, the degradation to residential and commercial property value must be taken into consideration. The effective paradigms of bridges retaining their historic character will be given as example of past successes in satisfying all parties concerned in bridge rebuilds. These examples include the Bridge of the Lions in St. Augustine and the Route 35 Bridge in the Point Pleasant, New Jersey.

**Implement Updated Infrastructure Technology Into Bridge Design**

As was discussed earlier, the costs of maintenance and operation for the new Oceanic Bridge can be mitigated by utilization of updated bridge building techniques and automation of bridge operations. New material from the substructure to the deck will be utilized to prolong the service life of the Oceanic Bridge and make its regular maintenance less costly. The combination of impermeable concrete, fiber reinforced wrapping, and stainless steel reinforcing bars will protect the substructure of the bridge from chloride degradation. The addition of fiber reinforcement to
the impermeable concrete will allow the superstructure of the bridge to resist corrosion and maintain an edge on changing design load capacity as vehicular traffic evolves. Lightweight epoxy asphalt mixtures will enable the bridge to deter the harshest of de-icing chemical from corroding the deck and support members of the bridge. Lastly, a centrally controlled automatic bascule section can be implemented to reduce operating costs. In addition, power for the new bascule design can be garnished from clean renewable energy which is in ready abundance at the site of the new Oceanic Bridge rebuild.

**Budget**

The budget was determined from figures detailed in the scoping report put together by the engineering team discussed earlier. Figure 6 is the budget for each proposed plan for the Oceanic Bridge rebuild.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>I: No Build</th>
<th>IIA: Rehabilitation</th>
<th>IIB: Rehabilitate (Replaces Bascule Span)</th>
<th>IIA: Replace Existing Bridge (High Level Fixed)</th>
<th>IIB: Replace Existing Bridge (Low Level Fixed)</th>
<th>IVB: Replace Bridge (High Level Fixed)</th>
<th>IVB: Replace Bridge (Low Level Fixed)</th>
<th>V: Remove Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Project Need</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Mitigation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal (Temporary)</td>
<td>Minimal (Temporary)</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minimal (Temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Takedings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,500,000</td>
<td>$38,000,000</td>
<td>$34,500,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$34,500,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Cycle Cost</td>
<td>$46,000,000</td>
<td>$29,500,000</td>
<td>$27,500,000</td>
<td>$34,500,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$34,500,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,650,000</td>
<td>$10,650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$77,500,000</td>
<td>$77,000,000</td>
<td>$44,500,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$49,500,000</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detours (Months)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12: Closed</td>
<td>12: Closed</td>
<td>30: Closed</td>
<td>30: Closed</td>
<td>6: Closed</td>
<td>6: Closed</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Duration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 1/2 years</td>
<td>2 1/2 years</td>
<td>2 1/2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 1/2 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Monmouth County S-31, 2011)

According to these figures, the difference in costs over the lifespan of the two most viable options (IVA and IVB) is $8.15 million dollars. Life cycle cost and operating cost make the moveable span more costly but as stated in the plan of action these costs can be mitigated through the usage of available bridge building technique and technology. In addition, these costs are not borne by the Federal Highway administration but by the State of New Jersey in the operating budget of Monmouth County.
Discussion

The presented evidence regarding the rebuilding of a new moveable bridge over the Navesink River must be examined. A comparison of the two most viable rebuild options must be taken into account. Those involved in the decision making process must consider the following in making the decision.

First, does the bridge need to be rebuilt? Is the Oceanic Bridge corroded to the point of ever increasing maintenance cost? Is the current bridge safe for its current vehicular traffic load? Are the safety features of the bridge adequate to allow pedestrians and bicyclists across? The evidence presented by consulting engineers, suggests the bridge is currently unsafe for all types of traffic. The consulting engineers also rated the bridge as being in mostly poor to serious condition which translates to ever increasing maintenance costs.

Next, does the proposed bridge rebuild satisfy the desires of the community which it serves? The Federal Highway Administration desires the implementation of a raised fixed-span replacement for bridge rebuilds. However, the residents and business in the surrounding area are concerned about adverse costs they will bear if a more elevated bridge is built to cross the Navesink River. The Federal Highway Administration should examine instances where a moveable span rebuild benefited the community by protecting historic resources and view shed resources. These instance include the Wilson Bridge in Virginia and the Morrison Bridge in Oregon. In addition, the Route 36 Bridge on the New Jersey coast should be examined as an instance where community and historical concerns were not fully addressed.

Finally, bridge building has made many advancements since the original Oceanic Bridge was built almost 80 years ago. These new techniques and technology can be implemented to make the Oceanic Bridge rebuild a paradigm for successful bascule bridge rebuilds in a state which has been given a “D” grade for its bridge infrastructure by the American Society of Civil Engineers. New Jersey can become the leader in a country where crumbling infrastructure has become a major issue.
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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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #31
For the Oceanic Bridge, I prefer the 45' high drawbridge of alternative 7-A. I oppose the fixed height bridge of 80.96 feet. Thank you.
Commenter #32
I object to the county plan of having a fixed height bridge of 80.96 feet high. I support Alternative 7-A with up to a 45' high water clearance drawbridge. 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #33
The PPA for the Oceanic Bridge replacement seems good to me. I like that it is a raised span so the silly idea of a drawbridge is avoided. My input - move ahead with what is best for all of Monmouth County. I'm tired of waiting at the drawbridge.
Commenter #34
I do not want a vaulting bridge over the Navesink River. There is not enough significant boat traffic to qualify a bridge that is 80’ tall. The character of this community matters and the needs of its residents need to be considered in this decision. The bridge is a practical recreational facility for the local residents of all ages from mothers with strollers, to fitness walkers and joggers and those who simply stroll over to appreciate the view and salt air. Be reasonable in your evaluation of what is “needed” & what will serve best the overall communities you are connecting. I vote for a 45 FOOT DRAWBRIDGE, option 7A.
Commenter #35
If complete replacement is deemed the best alternative, please consider keeping it low to the water and operate as a drawbridge. This would be an imperative to preserve the local character and scenic nature of the area.
Commenter #36
Hi there,

Please do not put up an enormous, awful bridge over the Navesink. This will ruin the entire aesthetic of our communities. It is a terrible option and not fitting with our towns.

We want to process with the 45 FOOT DRAWBRIDGE, option 7A

Sincerely,
Commenter #37
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

I do believe that bridge replacement is the best strategy for our town. That said, there is no reason for the bridge to be 65 feet high. A moveable bridge at 25 feet is much more suitable. We are a small town and a bridge that is 65 feet high is not to scale. I am also very concerned with the projection of sound that a bridge this tall will cast over our town. As a resident of downtown Rumson we should not have our environment disturbed. Our neighborhood is very quiet and we would like to keep it that way.

If you live on either end of the bridge you know that crossing the existing Oceanic Bridge gives you a sense of being home. The feeling you get as you cross the Navesink River into town is hard to explain but its very serene and calming, its truly part of the Rumson identity. There is a need for a new bridge but there is no need/reason to build it so high and change the landscape of our town.

Regards,

[Signature]
Commenter #38
To whom it may concern:

I believe that the proposed 65' high fixed bridge would be an aesthetic and cultural disaster for the area, and implore the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority and Monmouth County Engineer’s Office to adopt the alternative proposal of a replacement 22' movable structure bridge, or failing that, a 45' fixed bridge.

First and foremost, a 65' plus high fixed bridge would completely degrade the recreational experience of the many walkers, joggers, and cyclists, making it impossible for many.

Second, it would seriously intrude upon the natural environment of the area and clash with the architecturally low key built environments of historic Rumson and Locust (Middletown).

Third, a high fixed span bridge would pose a safety issue for vehicles during inclement weather.

Please respect the will of the people affected by this project who overwhelmingly oppose a 65' fixed bridge.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #39
We don't need the larger bridge...a 45' drawbridge is more than enough to serve the boating community and retain both the view and the ambiance of our shore towns. A monster span that is 80' high is more appropriate for an interstate, not a quiet stretch of local roadway!
Commenter #40
9/14/2020

looking at the diagrams I see two proposed yellow lines running thru existing neighborhoods to build a new bridge. Why disturb existing neighborhoods, NO that is not a good idea. I also see two red lines for the new bridge. One would require land taking along a stretch of Bingham Road. Again why disturb an existing neighborhood? NO not a good idea. I see the second red line where the existing bridge is located today, YES the new bridge should remain in the existing location.

  * Less disturbance to existing neighborhoods.
  * Maintains the existing curve to the road as you exit the bridge on the Middletown side, a natural slow down to traffic to take the curve.

Height of Bridge
  * To remain the same with a draw bridge, or a very slight increase in height to allow for the next class of boat height to pass under without an opening. That would suggest a possible 5' or 7' increase, if possible while maintaining the existing location of the bridge.

This is an Historic area and the character of the new bridge should respect the nature of this historic area.
Subject: Navisink River Bridge

Date: 10/15/2020, 10:09 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

A proposal for a 60’+ stationery bridge over the Navisink River is a gross overdevelopment for this area. Any decision you make now will impact us forever.
1) the Navisink River ends in Red Bank. The Rout 35 bridge prohibits any travel beyond that point for large boats.
2) the Navisink River has great tidal shifts. At low tide any large boat must stay in the channel.

So why would you create a massive 60’+ stationary bridge for large boats that don’t even frequent passage on the Navisink River?

A 60’+ stationary bridge is a gross overdevelopment for this area. NO NO NO to a 60’+ stationary Bridge on the Navisink River. NO NO NO

I strongly urge and request we maintain a draw bridge which fits the character of this neighborhood much better. Do not make a poor decision which ruins this landscape forever.

Thank you

Sent from my iPhone
The fact that there is actually a proposal being considered for a bridge greater than 60 feet in height over the Navesink River is incomprehensible.
1) The Navesink River leads to nowhere as you head towards Red Bank.
2) The River has such a large tidal shift and becomes un navigable to large boats and sailboats at low tide if you stray out of the channel. A 60 foot bridge would be a gross overdevelopment in this case.

I respectfully urge and request that the final height design does not ruin the historic characteristic of the Locust/Rumson area. Ideally the new bridge would only be slightly higher than the existing drawbridge. Do not ruin this area with a grossly overdeveloped stationary bridge. The decisions made now will leave a negative lasting effect with any stationary bridge option. NO NO NO to a 60+ high stationary bridge NO NO NO
Hello [name]

Thank you for your comments and question. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." This letter can be found on the project website at the following address: [http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf](http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf). Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #41
Hi,

As a lifelong resident of Monmouth County (born in Red Bank, Graduate of [redacted] year resident of Sea Bright) I strongly favor the 45’ Drawbridge option. I am strongly opposed to all of the fixed height options.
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: 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:

We prefer to see Alternative 7-A modified with a 45' high draw bridge.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

RECEIVED
SEP 14 2020
ENGINEERING DEPT
Fred P. 3 21

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 3/19/20
Commenter #43
Thanks for the chance to comment. No objection to the 65' clearance bridge. To the extent possible, access from the north side should follow the existing roadway.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #44
A fixed bridge means no waiting for boats to go by when you're in a hurry and the feds pay for it.
The new bridge MUST be a fixed span like the Highlands bridge which is beautiful. This has happened: Both the Oceanic and Sea Bright were not working. Traffic on the Red Bank/Twy 35 was so backed up it took over 1/2 an hour to cross. As a result I missed a dear friend's funeral. On another time I had grandchildren to pick up from school and could not get to them. The current bridge is not only inconvenient but potentially dangerous.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 8/30/2020, 3:44 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Your presentation was excellent.
I am delighted with PPA you presented - it is way past time to replace the bridge with a high fixed span built so that the existing bridge can be used while the new bridge is under construction.
Thank you all for your extensive work.

Sent from my iPhone
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #46
Subject: Attention: Fred Passeggio, P.E.

Date: 10/13/2020, 9:22 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

I would appreciate if you could call my husband [redacted] on his cell [redacted]. He left a voice mail today on your work extension.

We are concerned that your bridge concept shows the road approach to the bridge on the Middletown side with [redacted] highlighted yellow along with the new road proposal on drawing 7A. We are not sure why [redacted] is colored along with the proposed road. We would appreciate if you could please give us a call to explain what that proposal entails.

My e-mail is [redacted] if you would rather email us the explanation.

Regards,
October 15, 2020

Fred Passegio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Sent Via Federal Express
Fax 732-431-77655
Email monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge connecting Middletown to Rumson, NJ

Dear Mr. Passegio,

[Redacted]
My husband & I have gone to great lengths to maintain the integrity and historic values of the house and property. [Redacted] is on the bend connecting the bridge to the intersection at Navesink River Road & Locust Point Road. This bend area is popular for fisherman and citizens simply enjoying the beauty of the area. About 20 years ago in an effort to improve this area of state owned land which was littered and neglected, a group of local residents landscaped and planted shrubs. [Redacted] installed a sprinkler system and to this day maintain same for all to enjoy as they drive past and recreate in the area.

Regarding the Oceanic Bridge replacement, we are shocked and dismayed that an 80 foot tall, commercial type bridge is even being considered for this beautiful historic area. A bridge of that size is completely out of character with the historic districts on both the Middletown & Rumson sides. With a 5% incline, it would be unsafe to cross during snow and ice storms. Local residents are accustomed to walking and biking over the bridge for exercise, yet even during nice weather only the most fit among us will be able to tolerate that steep pitch. Not to mention that 65 foot clearance under bridge is totally unnecessary given that the vast majority of boat traffic on the Navesink is recreational in nature and does not need anywhere near that height to pass under. The water depth is very shallow which limits the size of boats utilizing the river and prohibits commercial boat traffic. An 80 foot tall bridge would bring noise pollution as well as dominate the view shed of the entire area. Please give due consideration to maintaining the natural beauty of the area. As you are undoubtedly aware, home owners in this area pay very high property taxes. An 80 foot tall bridge would dramatically lower the value of homes.
Our preference would be a replacement bascule bridge at the same height and design as the existing bridge. Although even if a mid-level bridge were built it also can be designed to maintain appropriate historic aesthetics as evidenced by the Coopers Bridge on Route 35 and the Senator Kyrillos Bridge, both connecting Middletown to Red Bank.

Aside from the design of bridge, we are very concerned with the location of a replacement bridge. Alternate 7A East concept plan shows [redacted] highlighted in yellow which appears to indicate it as part of bridge plan. I have attached a close-up of this area on plan as well as photos of [redacted] in the same location. You will see a system of flood gates we installed at great expense after Hurricane Sandy. Needless to say, [redacted] is crucial to [redacted]. We've been unsuccessful in reaching you by phone and email to clarify why [redacted] is included in plan. Because of this encroachment to [redacted] which would destroy the value of [redacted] we are 100 percent against the location of Alternate 7A East.

Alternate 4B West concept would follow much of the same road as it is now, it would not impinge on any residential properties on either side of the river and would be the least offensive of proposed concepts to homes on both sides of the river. Therefore, we support a mid level bridge utilizing Alternate 4B West alignment.

Best Regards,

[redacted]

Cc: Middletown Mayor [redacted]
    Rumson Mayor [redacted]
Fax to: Mr Fred Passeggio  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety  
732-431-7765

RE: Oceanic Bridge

3 pages to follow this cover letter
October 15, 2020

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Sent Via Federal Express
Fax 732-431-7765
Email monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge connecting Middletown to Rumson, NJ

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

My husband & I have gone to great lengths to maintain the integrity and historic values of the house and property. is on the bend connecting the bridge to the intersection at Navesink River Road & Locust Point Road. This bend area is popular for fisherman and citizens simply enjoying the beauty of the area. About 20 years ago in an effort to improve this area of state owned land which was littered and neglected, a group of local residents landscaped and planted shrubs. installed a sprinkler system and to this day maintain same for all to enjoy as they drive past and recreate in the area.

Regarding the Oceanic Bridge replacement, we are shocked and dismayed that an 80 foot tall, commercial type bridge is even being considered for this beautiful historic area. A bridge of that size is completely out of character with the historic districts on both the Middletown & Rumson sides. With a 5% incline, it would be unsafe to cross during snow and ice storms. Local residents are accustomed to walking and biking over the bridge for exercise, yet even during nice weather only the most fit among us will be able to tolerate that steep pitch. Not to mention that 65 foot clearance under bridge is totally unnecessary given that the vast majority of boat traffic on the Navesink is recreational in nature and does not need anywhere near that height to pass under. The water depth is very shallow which limits the size of boats utilizing the river and prohibits commercial boat traffic. An 80 foot tall bridge would bring noise pollution as well as dominate the view shed of the entire area. Please give due consideration to maintaining the natural beauty of the area. As you are undoubtedly aware, homeowners in this area pay very high property taxes. An 80 foot tall bridge would dramatically lower the value of homes.
Our preference would be a replacement bascule bridge at the same height and design as the existing bridge. Although even if a mid-level bridge were built it also can be designed to maintain appropriate historic aesthetics as evidenced by the Coopers Bridge on Route 35 and the Senator Kyrillos Bridge, both connecting Middletown to Red Bank.

Aside from the design of bridge, we are very concerned with the location of a replacement bridge. Alternate 7A East concept plan shows [redacted] highlighted in yellow which appears to indicate it as part of bridge plan. I have attached a close-up of this area on plan as well as photos of [redacted] in the same location. You will see a system of flood gates we installed at great expense after Hurricane Sandy. Needless to say, [redacted] is crucial to [redacted]. We’ve been unsuccessful in reaching you by phone and email to clarify why [redacted] is included in plan. Because of this encroachment to [redacted] which would destroy the value of [redacted] we are 100 percent against the location of Alternate 7A East.

Alternate 4B West concept would follow much of the same road as it is now, it would not impinge on any residential properties on either side of the river and would be the least offensive of proposed concepts to homes on both sides of the river. Therefore, we support a mid level bridge utilizing Alternate 4B West alignment.

Best Regards,

[redacted]

Cc: Middletown Mayor [redacted]
    Rumson Mayor [redacted]
October 15, 2020

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Sent Via Federal Express
Fax 732-431-776
Email monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge connecting Middletown to Rumson, NJ

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

My husband & I have gone to great lengths to maintain the integrity and historic values of the house and property. The bend connecting the bridge to the intersection at Navesink River Road & Locust Point Road. This bend area is popular for fisherman and citizens simply enjoying the beauty of the area. About 20 years ago in an effort to improve this area of state owned land which was littered and neglected, a group of local residents landscaped and planted shrubs. Installed a sprinkler system and to this day maintain same for all to enjoy as they drive past and recreate in the area.

Regarding the Oceanic Bridge replacement, we are shocked and dismayed that an 80 foot tall, commercial type bridge is even being considered for this beautiful historic area. A bridge of that size is completely out of character with the historic districts on both the Middletown & Rumson sides. With a 5% incline, it would be unsafe to cross during snow and ice storms. Local residents are accustomed to walking and biking over the bridge for exercise, yet even during nice weather only the most fit among us will be able to tolerate that steep pitch. Not to mention that 65 foot clearance under bridge is totally unnecessary given that the vast majority of boat traffic on the Navesink is recreational in nature and does not need anywhere near that height to pass under. The water depth is very shallow which limits the size of boats utilizing the river and prohibits commercial boat traffic. An 80 foot tall bridge would bring noise pollution as well as dominate the view shed of the entire area. Please give due consideration to maintaining the natural beauty of the area. As you are undoubtedly aware, home owners in this area pay very high property taxes. An 80 foot tall bridge would dramatically lower the value of homes.
Our preference would be a replacement bascule bridge at the same height and design as the existing bridge. Although even if a mid-level bridge were built it also can be designed to maintain appropriate historic aesthetics as evidenced by the Coopers Bridge on Route 35 and the Senator Kyrillos Bridge, both connecting Middletown to Red Bank.

Aside from the design of bridge, we are very concerned with the location of a replacement bridge. Alternate 7A East concept plan shows [redacted] highlighted in yellow which appears to indicate it as part of bridge plan. I have attached a close-up of this area on plan as well as photos of [redacted] in the same location. You will see a system of flood gates we installed at great expense after Hurricane Sandy. Needless to say, [redacted] is crucial to [redacted]. We've been unsuccessful in reaching you by phone and email to clarify why [redacted] is included in plan. Because of this encroachment to [redacted] which would destroy the value of [redacted], we are 100 percent against the location of Alternate 7A East.

Alternate 4B West concept would follow much of the same road as it is now, it would not impinge on any residential properties on either side of the river and would be the least offensive of proposed concepts to homes on both sides of the river. Therefore, we support a mid level bridge utilizing Alternate 4B West alignment.

Best Regards,

[Redacted]

Cc: Middletown Mayor [Redacted]
Rumson Mayor [Redacted]
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and questions. The yellow highlights that you referred to are from an old plan for Alternative 7A. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) can be found at the following link:

The proposed roadway of the currently recommended PPA is not anticipated to Please note that the current design will be further refined in the Local Preliminary Engineering phase.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #47
October 13, 2020

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety  
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor  
1 East Main Street  
Freehold, NJ 07728

Via Fax 732-431-7765  
Via Email monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

We are writing to voice our opinion regarding design of the proposed replacement for the Oceanic Bridge spanning the Navesink River between Middletown and Rumson, New Jersey. Having lived for many years in the Locust section of Middletown and raising a family in Rumson, it would be an understatement to say that we rely on the Oceanic Bridge in our daily lives. We, our children, family and friends traverse the Oceanic Bridge day and night not only by car, by foot and bicycle as well. As such, we realize that the bridge is in poor condition and requires replacement. Naturally, a replacement bridge in keeping with current height and design would be preferred by all, however it is our understanding that the only options being considered are a 45 foot tall Drawbridge and 80 foot tall fixed span bridge.

For several reasons we are vehemently opposed to a bridge height of 80 foot. First and foremost being safety. Secondly, diminished property values and aesthetics.

1. Safety First. We urge you to consider the safety ramifications that a steep slope of 80 foot tall bridge brings. During inclement weather, in event of emergency and for patients needing regular access to Riverview Hospital for chemo, radiation, dialysis etc., snow, ice and high winds will make a steep bridge unsafe to cross. The alternate route is Navesink River Road which in those conditions, is always unsafe to travel, which we see many days each Winter. Without the ability to safely cross the bridge during inclement weather, Middletown residents will be cut off from doctors, businesses, banks & houses of worship in Rumson, Fair Haven and Red Bank. Another safety concern is for school buses carrying children to school, field trips, sporting events and practices. Additionally, many Middletown residents are served by and rely on the Rumson Post Office for daily mail delivery. Not to mention that even in the nicest weather conditions walking and biking over bridge with 5% incline would be prohibited to all but the most physically fit.
2. Diminished Property Values and Aesthetics. Both sides of the Oceanic Bridge are rooted in historic areas. Not only is an 80 foot tall bridge not in keeping with the area, it is frankly unnecessary. As any local boater can attest, even at the current bridge height, very few boats on the Navesink River are large enough to require bridge opening. Over the past 40 years of boating in this area, we have seen this river go through many changes. Fortunately the water is now cleaner, however the river has become prohibitively shallow. Due to the water depth in this area, larger boats simply are unable to navigate the western portion of the Navesink. We understand the State of New Jersey is trending away from manned bridges moving forward, but in some cases a Drawbridge is the logical choice. If a 45 foot tall Drawbridge were built, there are very few boats on the Navesink that would ever require an opening. It would be reasonable for these large boats to wait for scheduled openings rather than openings on demand. This would eliminate full time bridge tender.

We understand that several of the replacement concept designs are no longer being considered. Of those that are still under consideration, Alternates 8 Outer East & 7B East would create an eyesore that would undoubtedly diminish property values. Alternate 7A East would adversely impact residences on both sides of the bridge and restrict use of the Northeast side recreation area cherished by Fisherman, Photographers and Nature Lovers. To the contrary, Option 4B West maintains the Locust parking area along the water, pedestrian access as well as the scenic riverside meandering approach to bridge without sacrificing any residential property, it would not affect the boat traffic to the nor interfere with dock and dining at

In conclusion, in the absence of replacing the Oceanic Bridge at its current height, we support the 45 foot tall Drawbridge utilizing the Alternate 4B West Alignment proposed plan. We believe this plan is best suited for this area based on safety, the least obtrusive design, and the least likely to negatively affect property values and quality of life for area residents.

Respectfully, Respectfully,
October 13, 2020

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Via Fax 732-431-7765
Via Email monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

We are writing to voice our opinion regarding design of the proposed replacement for the Oceanic Bridge spanning the Navesink River between Middletown and Rumson, New Jersey. Having lived for many years in the Locust section of Middletown and raising a family in Rumson, it would be an understatement to say that we rely on the Oceanic Bridge in our daily lives. We, our children, family and friends traverse the Oceanic Bridge day and night not only by car, by foot and bicycle as well. As such, we realize that the bridge is in poor condition and requires replacement. Naturally, a replacement bridge in keeping with current height and design would be preferred by all, however it is our understanding that the only options being considered are a 45 foot tall Drawbridge and 80 foot tall fixed span bridge.

For several reasons we are vehemently opposed to a bridge height of 80 foot. First and foremost being safety. Secondly, diminished property values and aesthetics.

1. Safety First. We urge you to consider the safety ramifications that a steep slope of 80 foot tall bridge brings. During inclement weather, in event of emergency and for patients needing regular access to Riverview Hospital for chemo, radiation, dialysis etc., snow, ice and high winds will make a steep bridge unsafe to cross. The alternate route is Navesink River Road which in those conditions, is always unsafe to travel, which we see many days each Winter. Without the ability to safely cross the bridge during inclement weather, Middletown residents will be cut off from doctors, businesses, banks & houses of worship in Rumson, Fair Haven and Red Bank. Another safety concern is for school buses carrying children to school, field trips, sporting events and practices. Additionally, many Middletown residents are served by and rely on the Rumson Post Office for daily mail delivery. Not to mention that even in the nicest weather conditions walking and biking over bridge with 5% incline would be prohibited to all but the most physically fit.
2. Diminished Property Values and Aesthetics. Both sides of the Oceanic Bridge are rooted in historic areas. Not only is an 80 foot tall bridge not in keeping with the area, it is frankly unnecessary. As any local boater can attest, even at the current bridge height, very few boats on the Navesink River are large enough to require bridge opening. Over the past 40 years of boating in this area, we have seen this river go through many changes. Fortunately the water is now cleaner, however the river has become prohibitively shallow. Due to the water depth in this area, larger boats simply are unable to navigate the western portion of the Navesink. We understand the State of New Jersey is trending away from manned bridges moving forward, but in some cases a Drawbridge is the logical choice. If a 45 foot tall Drawbridge were built, there are very few boats on the Navesink that would ever require an opening. It would be reasonable for these large boats to wait for scheduled openings rather than openings on demand. This would eliminate full time bridge tender.

We understand that several of the replacement concept designs are no longer being considered. Of those that are still under consideration, Alternates 8 Outer East & 7B East would create an eyesore that would undoubtedly diminish property values. Alternate 7A East would adversely impact residences on both sides of the bridge and restrict use of the Northeast side recreation area cherished by Fisherman, Photographers and Nature Lovers. To the contrary, Option 4B West maintains the Locust parking area along the water, pedestrian access as well as the scenic riverside meandering approach to bridge without sacrificing any residential property, it would not affect the boat traffic to the extent nor interfere with dock and dining at...

In conclusion, in the absence of replacing the Oceanic Bridge at its current height, we support the 45 foot tall Drawbridge utilizing the Alternate 4B West Alignment proposed plan. We believe this plan is best suited for this area based on safety, the least obtrusive design, and the least likely to negatively affect property values and quality of life for area residents.

Respectfully,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #48
As a lifelong resident of Rumson, and my family, have long enjoyed the beauty of this wonderful town and county. The Navesink River has been one of our personal favorites. It offers all who walk, bike, jog, row, swim, scull, sail, boat, water ski, fish, crab, hunt and sit, its beauty and breathe taking views. It has been a haven for many of us who enjoy nature and its wonders.

It is my personal observation, that the Oceanic Bridge rarely has occasion to open. In effect, we are discussing the desecration of a community for the benefit of less than a handful! That is shameful! Impeding on the beauty of our community by constructing a ridiculously high bridge that is neither needed or an improvement is a poor plan.

I vote against the higher bridge and encourage the decision makers to consider a minimally intrusive bridge, so that the next generation too may enjoy the gifts the Navesink River area offers.
Commenter #49
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

Thank you for your well examined and thoughtful study of the bridge. Since day 1 of the project, I have been very concerned that the final design would be a bridge that would have a negative impact on my business. I own a [ ] on the Navesink River, west of the bridge. A good portion of my customers [ ] on an annual basis. In addition, we get service work [ ]

I am very happy to see a design that will construct a fixed bridge with a 65 foot clearance. This design will allow us to continue our business plan as it has been for decades. Powerboats and sailboats that will not be restricted from having full access to the Navesink River and all the [ ] services located on this body of water. I fully endorse this design and hope the project will be approved.

Thank you.
Commenter #50
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

9/26/2020

Looks awfully steep, no?
Hello [Redacted]

Thank you for your question. In order to obtain a vertical underclearance of 65 feet at the navigational channel and limit impacts near the shoreline, a 5% slope is required. This 5% slope is American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passegio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

--

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #51
I am in favor of a 45 foot high water clearance draw bridge across the Navesink River for several reasons. The most important one for me is safety. I fear that if the 80 foot bridge is erected, it can be used for people with psychological problems to attempt to jump off the bridge with dire results. I have seen this happen when a bridge was replaced between Perth Amboy and Sayreville in Middlesex County.

A 45 foot high bridge will be more than adequate to allow for most boat traffic to pass through. This will also allow pedestrian traffic to make use of the bridge as well as bikers and joggers without much difficulty.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #52
Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety

Fred,

My name is [Redacted] and I reside at [Redacted], Rumson NJ. The purpose of this email is to enter my comments regarding the Oceanic Bridge Concept Study into the public record. I have lived on the banks of the Navesink River for 26 years and have a direct view of the Oceanic Bridge from my home. I am in favor of the fixed bridge replacement alternative which I believe was listed as option 8a in the materials that were distributed during public meeting #3.

Regards,

[Redacted]
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 10/10/2020, 9:21 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

As a home owner who resides on the Navesink River, I wanted to submit my comments regarding the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge into the public record. After reviewing the project plan and considering the options provided, I am in favor of the fixed bridge replacement option.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #53
I respectfully request that County officials select the 45' drawbridge rather than the fixed span to replace the aging Oceanic Bridge for a variety of reasons. The river is a precious resource, please respect the aesthetics of the area and choose the drawbridge option. It will serve as a lasting legacy of the foresight we exercised now to provide a better bridge while protecting the communities surrounding the span.

Thank you.
Commenter #54
The current bridge is a beautiful structure which, at the time of its construction, received many awards for design.

While I understand the need for it to be repaired or replaced, we absolutely do not need an 81 foot monolith connecting our small towns. It would be a shame to mar our landscape with such a monstrosity when a 45' high structure would serve us just as well.

I hope that calm heads prevail and that good, common sense is used when making final decisions on the construction of our new bridge.
I would favor the middle alternative bridge - 45 feet and not requiring it to open unless boat was exceptionally tall. Still safe for walkers and joggers and maintaining the beauty of our present 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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #56
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

8/27/2020

Under recommendation 7A modified. Where will the footprint of the bridge be on the Rumson side. Bingham and hunt? Bingham and River? or some other location?
Hello,

Thank you for your question. On the Rumson side, the bridge abutment will be very close to the existing abutment. The roadway at this location will be approximately 4.8 feet higher than the existing roadway, but will transition down to the existing grade just prior to the Salt Creek Grille driveway and Oak Tree Lane.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

**Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for**
**Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)**
**Email:** MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
**Website:** www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #57
To whom it may concern,

I would see or cross the Oceanic Bridge almost every day. I became involved almost 10 years ago and remained active. Although I recognize the need for this project, it has been limping along for years—so long that initial public feedback that resulted in government support for a low bascule bridge was simply discarded and the reset button hit on the process. I continue to support community members who advocate in favor of a 22 foot high moveable bascule bridge for the following reasons:

1. The navigation channel is almost entirely for pleasure boating. There is not a tremendous amount of traffic and almost no traffic other than summer. High bridges should be favored mostly where they have an effect on commerce. A moveable bridge has no measurable effect on commerce in this instance.

2. The view shed effect a 65 foot high bridge is significant and out of place—it is like placing a superhighway down the middle of residential road.

3. The bridge is adjacent to several designated historic districts and will have an adverse effect on those districts. This has been sufficient in several other instances to make a preferred alternative a moveable bridge.
Subject: Re: Comment
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 7:18 PM

Hello

Thank you for your comments. Please be assured that previous feedback has not been discarded. As discussed, the US Coast Guard had jurisdiction over the navigation channel and early coordination resulted in the determination that a 65' above mean high water structure is required. We're aware of the historic districts in the project study area and the required Section 106, Section 4(f) and NEPA studies and coordination will be conducted, expanding on the information developed in Local Concept Development, to evaluate the feasibility of maintaining a movable bridge at this location.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #58
Please do not build an 81ft bridge, please keep it at the 45ft height which is more in harmony with the traditional aesthetic of historic Rumson community and surrounding areas.
Commenter #59
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

Please do not build an 81ft high bridge. Please keep it at the 45ft height which is more in harmony with the traditional aesthetic of Rumson and the surrounding areas.
Commenter #60
Please do not build an 81ft bridge, please keep it at the 45ft height which is more in harmony with the traditional aesthetic of Rumson and the surrounding communities.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #61
10/15/2020

Please do not construct an 80ft bridge in Rumson. Keep it at the proposed 45ft height which is more inline with the traditional aesthetic of the local surrounding communities. Thank you for your consideration.
Commenter #62
10/16/2020

Please do not build an 81ft bridge, please keep it at the 45ft height which is more in harmony with the traditional aesthetic of the historic Rumson and the surrounding communities.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #63
September 18, 2020

Dear [Name],

I am not in favor of the Oceanic Bridge being replaced with a high span fixed bridge, as shown in the Alternative 7A Modified plan.

I feel that the alternative 45' drawbridge plan is much more representative of the community of Rumson.

Thank you.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #64
The proposed 81 foot peak bridge is not in keeping with the historic character of the area and the Oceanic Bridge.

The bridge today is of a residential scale appropriate to modest speed, local use.

The waterway beneath the bridge is of limited depth and the bridge above it has no need to encourage large masted boat traffic.

If rising water levels are of concern over the full useful life of the new bridge there is no doubt that a peak height of 81 feet is unnecessary to address the rise.

A bridge of this scale will require regular and costly patrols to dissuade the depressed from jumping to their deaths.

What a shame it would be when the new bridge's grossly inappropriate height claims its first life by suicide.

Please undertake a more thoughtful assessment of the area, the river, the history, and the community.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #65
To: Mr. Fred Passeggio,

Attached is a word document with a question and a comment about the design of the new proposed Oceanic Bridge.

I will look forward to your answers and thoughts,

Sincerely,
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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

RE: Oceanic Bridge Replacement August 25, 2020

Dear Mr. Passeggio

Early on around 2006-2009 a conceptual design of a proposed high fixed bridge along with a proposed slightly higher, (then the present bridge), bascule bridge was shown at one of the LCD meetings. At the meeting question if the engineering department has performed a NPV “net present value” study on the two conceptual designs. told they had and even though a bascule bridge required bridgetenders and would have higher maintenance costs, the much higher construction cost of the high fixed bridge was enough to make its net present value greater.

My question is whether you have preformed a net present value study on the two latest design concepts and what were the results? I would also be interested in the assumptions you have made in doing the calculations. i.e.: interest rate, maintenance cost, useful life of each etc. Since the time of the original LCD meeting the US Core of Engineers has increased the height requirements. One would think that the difference of the net present values would be even greater.

A second question or maybe more an observation is that the increased incline of a higher fixed bridge will inhibit pedestrians from using the bridge as they do now. My wife and I cross the Oceanic Bridge at least once a day and many days more often. I’m always amazed at how many people use the bridge for exercise, walking dogs, fishing or just sightseeing. Myself enjoy walking across it on a weekly basis. The volume of pedestrians was always great but in the last 3 months, it has increased sufficiently. On the other hand, the Highlands/Sea Bright Bridge does not seem to have nearly the same amount of foot traffic. It certainly has a greater incline on the Eastern side and I wonder if that would happen to the Oceanic Bridge if the higher fixed design were chosen?

Sincerely yours and thank you for addressing my questions.
Hello,

Thank you for your questions and comments. The Project Team has performed a net present value study on each of the alternatives presented in the form of a 100-year life cycle cost analysis, which translates all future costs in terms of current year dollars. Those life cycle costs can be found in the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix on row number 41, located on the PIC handouts webpage, found here: http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/online-pic-handouts/

The following assumptions were used during the 100-year life cycle cost analysis:
- First deck replacement is after 25 years.
- Second deck replacement is after 50 years.
- Third deck replacement is after 75 years.
- Miscellaneous routine repairs are not accounted for in the life cycle cost analysis.
- Inflation rate, and discount rate are assumed to be 3% and 4% respectively.

With regard to height requirements, a preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." This letter can be found on the project website at the following address: http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf

With regard to your comment about pedestrian activity, sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network. The sidewalk width on both sides of the bridge will be six feet, and the 5% grade of the sidewalk will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #66
Fred and Mayor(s)-

The Oceanic Bridge is a Historical piece of our community. Changing the look of the bridge with a structure in excess of 65’ will have a significant impact on our community. Keep the following in mind while you help determine the outcome of the new bridge.

- It’s hard enough to preserve the architectural history of the area on private properties. Why would we put a tall modern Segmental bridge on public property? Every day our history is chipped away at. Let’s not accelerate the historical decline with construction of a monster bridge.

- Our views from all directions will be impeded by such a large structure. It’s hard to imagine seeing such an eyesore from our homes while being on the river.

- Our river is already flooded with boaters. Inviting more large boat traffic is not the answer. We do not need to make it easier for larger boats to have unimpeded access. Large boat wakes are completely disturbing to the tranquility of the Navesink River “sanctuary”. Below I have included a picture of my grandfather father, father and uncle fishing by one of the Oceanic Bridge piers in 1950. I always think how amazing it when I see boaters in in similar size boats fishing/crabbing by the bridge. Having a 65’ high bridge will invite boaters of all size to run through a larger area outside the channel. This will be completely disturbing to those coming out on smaller vessels. Boater safety will be negatively affected.

- Changing the alignment of the bridge is a big mistake. 48 seems to be the best plan to move forward with for alignment. It helps to best stick with the historical value of the existing structure layout while having less of an impact on adjacent properties and approaches.

- Sacrificing so much to cut cost is not worth it. Doing away with the operation of a draw bridge in our community is not where we should start chipping away at our excessive Local, County and State government waste.

I already pay ridiculously high property taxes living on the river in Fair Haven. I own a 62’ sport fishing boat that would benefit from having the fixed clearance. I have every reason to want what is being proposed. With this all being said I am all for keeping the historical bridge layout. Let’s Keep the draw bridge, let’s keep our views, let’s keep the tranquil river, let’s keep our town’s history!

The Highlands Bridge reconstruction is not a parallel situation. We don’t have a bottleneck at the Oceanic. Generations for years to come will be affected by the outcome of this decision. Having your names on the approval of a 65’ high bridge between Locust and Rumson will not go down well in history.

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

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #67
I am in support of the [Redacted]. An intermediate drawbridge with a 45' clearance is the most realistic choice and will preserve and maintain the quality and essence of the area and the Navesink River.
The high bridge is the best option; the drawbridge is the worst option. The high bridge will allow vehicular and boat traffic to flow freely. The high bridge will not get stuck in the open position on hot days. The high bridge will not incur the high expense of Tenders and Engineers to operate the span. Finally, I believe the high bridge will qualify for Federal funding where the drawbridge will not.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #69
September 16, 2020

Dear [Name],

I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposed Oceanic Bridge replacement plan, **Alternative 7-A Modified, 65' fixed span**.

The [City] views of the Oceanic Bridge are a significant part of the pleasant experience of the restaurant. We feel that a high span, fixed bridge will considerably diminish the signature atmosphere of the [City] in addition to affecting the community of Rumson itself.

Therefore, I request that the committee select the **Alternative 7-A modified, 45' high drawbridge** as the replacement option.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #70
We oppose the design of a 65 foot bridge in a historic and residential neighborhood. Narrow local roads cannot handle higher volumes of traffic. The accompanying noise and pollution will benefit no one.

Thank you for your time and attention,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #71
To: M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Cc: fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us <fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>; skahlon@njtpa.org <skahlon@njtpa.org>
Sent: Fri, Oct 9, 2020 4:58 pm
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge S-31 LCD Study - Reminder Public Comment Period Ends 10/16/20

Please do not build a new 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #72
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Proposal

Date: 10/16/2020, 4:36 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I am opposed to the fixed height bridge that has been proposed as the replacement for the existing Oceanic bridge. The size and height of the fixed span is totally out of character with the Navesink River at that point in size and scope. I prefer the more modest and lower 45’ high draw-bridge that provides a significant upgrade for pedestrian, boating, and vehicular traffic, without adversely affecting traffic patterns and the scenic nature of the Navesink River.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone
10/16/2020

I am opposed to the fixed height bridge that has been proposed as the replacement for the existing Oceanic bridge. The size and height of the fixed span is totally out of character with the Navesink River at that point in size and scope.
I prefer the more modest and lower 45' high draw-bridge that provides a significant upgrade for pedestrian, boating, and vehicular traffic, without adversely affecting traffic patterns and the scenic nature of the Navesink River.
Sincerely,
Commenter #73
I support a new drawbridge bridge of the current height or the proposed 45ft. It should not look like a highway overpass and not be 80ft high. I would like to see design submissions that reflect the bridge’s current aesthetic or something very modern.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #74
For the Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) replacement, I believe that the fixed-span bridge being proposed that is over 80 ft. high at the peak is the right solution. This is a better solution than another bridge that includes a drawbridge. I believe the fixed-span bridge would save taxpayers's dollars and eliminate the halting of bridge traffic that occurs when the drawbridge is used to allow boats to pass underneath the bridge. I also believe the taller fixed-span bridge would be more attractive than a lower bridge that includes the drawbridge mechanism. The fixed-span bridge that is the Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) would also allow emergency vehicles both on the bridge road or on the water (e.g., Coast Guard or marine police) to operate at any time, unimpeded by a drawbridge.
Commenter #75
Subject: questions

Date: 8/27/2020, 5:39 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Why do you need two shoulders?
I have seen maybe two cars become disabled on the bridge in the 28 years I have been here.

Why do you need two side walks?
At 65 feet the number of people that will actually walk the bridge will be greatly reduced.
Climbing that height by walking or biking will be greatly reduced.
Thank you for your questions and comments. We respectfully provide the following response:
Shoulders are proposed on both sides of the new bridge to provide bicycle compatibility and also to provide an area for vehicles to pull over in case of an emergency. As cyclists are required to travel in the direction of traffic, shoulders are required on both sides of the bridge. Sidewalks are also proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
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Commenter #76
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

81 ft bridge no draw
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
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Commenter #77
The bridge height should remain the same and it should remain a drawbridge. The aesthetically pleasing contours of the current bridge profile would be ruined by a higher span. It has always been a pleasure for me and my family to pause for a few minutes while the drawbridge is lifted so we can truly capture the beauty of the surrounding area. Well worth any additional tax dollars that we may have to spend for a bridge tender.
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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Commenter #78
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, New Jersey 

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

9/4/2020

This was a thorough study, including cosg estimated. It included clever thinking on the improved 
routing of the primary alternative. I agree and support the preferred solution. 
As a boater in the Navesink I can attest to the deteriorated condition of 
the current bridge. Rehab is a money pit. We should never go there. 
While a few homeowners on the East Rumson side of the bridge, may feel their sunset views may 
not be as pretty, The sunset will be even more visible right to the horizon underneath the new 
bridge. Just check out the highlands bridge which has its own new grace. 
I imagine that some people will object that the higher rise will make jogging and bicycling more 
difficult, but others might like the added effort. Your point about safer bicycling with the grating 
removed is a good one. 

Did you include in the credits for the 65 foot span that there would no longer be a cost for bridge 
keepers? That would include salaries, benefits, retirements. There would also be no need for 
radios, and probably radar in this day and age, etc. 

While the most interested stakeholders will be persons and businesses near the bridge, 
automobile drivers are also stakeholders and taxpayers and far more numerous. They may not 
have attended meetings, but I would suspect they would like the fixed bridge option. 

Great job!!
Hello


Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

**Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for**
**Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)**
**Email:** MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
**Website:** www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #79
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: 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. Highly Prefer a Low Level, Draw Bridge, similar to existing structure

2. Pathway for walkers/Runners bikers

3. Opposed to a high, fixed span bridge

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
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Commenter #80
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/14/2020

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Having lived in the Rumson/Locust community for almost 20 years, I have never felt stronger about the negative impact the proposed “fixed” span bridge would affect our beautiful and historic community. I strongly support the lower span bridge design for many reasons and some of them are not purely aesthetic. For one, the bridge is a wonderful and useful place to walk, run or ride a bike. The proposed fixed span would be difficult for many to cross easily. There just is NO NEED for a bridge that high in our river! It does not relate to the Highlands bridge in any way. There is a reason the area is called “Two River” and the rivers define our community and that pertains to the bridges as well. There is not a more important part of the aesthetics and functionality of the crossing of the Navesink than the Oceanic Bridge and the current proposal would be a tragic loss to Monmouth County. I truly hope that your committee will rethink the design and move forward with a lower span bridge. This is too important to all of us.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #81
My property looks right out at the Oceanic Bridge. While I understand the aversion to drawbridge replacement, the proposed “fixed” structure bridge is not satisfactory. It will damage the views, property values and beauty of this unique and historic area. Furthermore, the fixed bridge will make it more difficult for outdoor enthusiasts to run/walk/bike across everyday. The bridge is also utilized by avid fishermen who like to enjoy the beauty of our coastal area. This debate has been going on for the last 15 years and the compromise should include a more satisfactory solution than the massive fixed structure that is being proposed. Thank you.
Commenter #82
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

It has come to my attention that you wish to commence construction on the oceanic bridge. As such I've decided to provide my two cents. It seems you must raise the bridge to 22' minimum should any construction occur. Anything above would be superfluous and a pimple on the landscape of the Navesink river. Visuals matter, they affect mentality of the people and whomever may pass through. We don't want to look like uncouth New Jerseyans back at it again. As a lover of history and this area I prefer 2b where we keep the elements that made this bridge special. The plan which keeps the bridge but puts a new bridge in an alternative location creates a whole slew of new problems regarding traffic. The option you prefer 7a gets rid of a large area where people currently fish. Apparently you only care for the yacht owners and not the humble fisherman.

On the topic of lanes. It's too much, we do not need that much space. Cut the extra sidewalk, cut the extremely large shoulders in half. Perhaps on the side without the sidewalk the shoulder can be made into a bike lane. Other than that I see no reason for widening the bridge as much as you have proposed.

If 2b is not an option loved by all, and you must go forward with construction of a bridge; half on half off at 22' is preferred, along with keeping the historical elements, though I've noticed you've not made that an option for some reason. You should. We are New Jersey not the trash heap others claim us to be, let's at least maintain some dignity shall we.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
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Commenter #83
10/9/2020

I have grown up driving over the Oceanic Bridge, kayaking underneath the bridge, and being a passenger on small boats that pass through. I have also been in the car when the bridge is drawn. Part of the charm of this area is that it is not overdeveloped. I have looked through the graphs and charts of proposed bridges, as well as the images of the bridges that seem to be the most preferred. What I have noticed is these bridges are fixed bridges, thus a higher distance from the mean high water and no drawbridge. I understand that frustration people feel when the get stuck at the bridge, I have been those people. With that in mind, I would take a beautiful drawbridge that adds to the value of this area than an overdeveloped eyesore that distracts from the beauty of this area. I understand this is a long and tedious comment to read and I appreciate you reading it, but my opinion is simple: a drawbridge should replace the one there.
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Commenter #84
Subject: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge
Date: 10/16/2020, 2:35 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
CC:

Dear Fred,
I live and own properties on [redacted] in Rumson [redacted] and so have a keen interest in the final resolution of the issues you and your team face with the Oceanic Bridge replacement....

First of all, I could not be more impressed with the research done and the level of detail shown by you and your team while developing the Local Concept Development Study...It's a tough process and requires accurate reporting of all the issues WE and YOU face as you contemplate solutions!

My comment relates to the apparent decision to settle on a 60 foot+ fixed span while the overwhelming recommendation from the community (as you reported in the most recent meeting) was for a 43 foot (?) fixed bridge. Seems like solicitation of input was largely ceremonial if financing interests were going to FAR out weigh our community's needs and uses.
Do we have recourse? Clearly we need and want a new fully functional bridge that will service a generation to come. I doubt that our family is not alone in registering our concern and disappointment in this "recommendation"....you and your team have done great work to date: let's build a bridge that reflects the CONSENSUS of the community not just a handful of users.

We are looking forward to the next step in our discussions with you and your team!

Regards,
Thank you for your comments and question. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) will be presented to the local officials of Rumson and Middletown to request resolutions of support for the PPA. The LCD Bridge Study and findings will then be presented to the Interagency Review Committee, which includes NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA, to concur on the PPA. If concurrence is reached, Monmouth County could then apply for federal funding to advance bridge improvements to the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase. More information on the Local Capital Delivery Process for transportation improvement projects can be found on the project website (www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com) or the NJTPA website (www.njtpa.org).

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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Commenter #85
As a lifelong resident of Middletown and Atlantic Highlands and a boat owner I agree that a replacement for the Oceanic Bridge is long overdue. What I do not agree with would be the Monmouth County tax payer having to pay for a 65 foot high span so that a handful of wealthy boat owners would require such a high span in order to keep their yachts and sport fishing boats further up the Navesink river. I would not be opposed to a smaller scale fixed span bridge for that location but 65 feet tall just seems ridiculous to me. Please keep the Monmouth County residents/tax payers in mind when making a decision and not the wealthy Navesink River Road residents. Thank you!
Commenter #86
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
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Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/5/2020

It should stay a drawbridge in order to ensure that the new bridge doesn't ruin the character of the area.
Commenter #87
Hello -

I am writing with regards to the proposed Oceanic Bridge changes. While I fully appreciate the need for and am supportive of improvements to the bridge, I am very concerned with the proposal to increase the height of the bridge to 65ft. This is a very big difference from the current bridge and will greatly impact the residents living near the bridge. As a resident living close to the bridge, we walk, run and bike across the bridge almost daily and enjoy seeing the many, many others doing the same. The bridge is rarely without pedestrian traffic. While the improvements do allow for increased pedestrian space, which is much appreciated, the incline necessary to reach the 65ft clearance will make accessing the bridge more challenging and dangerous (as discussed below) which will significantly limit its use. The modifications proposed will strip the bridge of its pedestrian appeal and greatly diminish a valued landmark in the area.

In addition, and more importantly, I have significant concerns about the safety of the proposed changes, particularly on the Rumson side where there is a lot of pedestrian activity at the base of the bridge. Cars already come flying across the bridge and the proposed bridge at this height, which will feel much more like a highway from the motorists' perspective, will only encourage and worsen this behavior. This is the case for the similar bridge from Sea Bright to the Highlands, in which a police officer is now regularly stationed at the base of the bridge in order to attempt to curb speeding coming off the bridge. There are several turns right at the entrance to the Oceanic Bridge on the Rumson side (Oak Street, Oak Tree Lane) and the area is very residential. A bridge at this height with such a steep incline is dangerous and are not appropriate in such residential areas.

Please consider revising the proposed modifications to the bridge for the safety and well-being of the Middletown, Rumson and surrounding area residents.

Best Regards,
Commenter #88
No need for more car lanes / a walking path is essential as many walk the span currently.

What is the cost difference to build a low bridge that opens that requires staff versus a higher fixed span?

How high is high enough?

A span higher than current yet not 75 feet in the air is likely most appropriate yet most expensive as it cost more and still need staff.

Though that would be what best serves the community and the need
Thank you for your comments and questions. As shown in the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix, the difference in total construction cost (Line 38) between a 22 foot movable bridge and a 65 foot fixed span bridge for Alternative 7A - Modified is $29 million. The Comparison of Alternatives Matrix can be found here: [http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2-Alternatives-Matrix.pdf](http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2-Alternatives-Matrix.pdf).

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: [www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com](http://www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com)
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Commenter #89
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10/10/2020

Respectfully, I support the proposed height of 80.96 feet.

Sincerely,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #90
Followup question, will the "handouts" for the meeting be available online.

Also, have they estimated how long the bridge will be completely closed to tie in the old and the new?

Thanks
Thank you for your questions. The handouts that were provided during the meeting are available for download on the project website, located at: http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/public-information-center-pic-3/

With regard to how long the bridge will be closed to traffic while the new bridge is tied into the existing area, it is currently estimated to be six months or less. Efforts will be made in Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design to further reduce this closure time if possible.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Commenter #91
Subject: Oceanic bridge

Date: 10/12/2020, 10:56 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Dear Sir,
I am responding to the request for public comments on the bridge. I have lived in Rumson on and off for the past 63 years. My wife and I walk this bridge 3 to 4 times a week as part of our exercise regimen. I don’t believe there is any question that this bridge needs to be replaced. I also realize that this bridge is one of the most beautiful expanses that I have been on in my life. The financial realities of the state of New Jersey are not lost on me. I understand the reality that we need to reduce payroll for bridge tenders who work very little during the course of their workday. I also realize that putting a bridge 65 feet in the air will totally destroy the beauty of this area. My understanding is that to eliminate the need for bridge tenders we need to create a bridge this tall for the purposes of the very few people who have boats that require that clearance. Somethings should be worked out with the small portion of boating community that will allow this bridge to not be increased beyond 45 feet and to continue to use bridge tenders on some type of controlled basis. I want to go on the record that I am totally opposed to a bridge structure that exceeds 45 feet in height. I am hoping that the good people that run Monmouth County will in their wisdom come to the compromise the residents of this area seek in conjunction with the large boat owners using this portion of the Navesink.
I look forward to seeing how the rest of the community feel that live in this area.

Sent from my iPad
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Commenter #92
I would prefer a lower bridge or a drawbridge similar to what we have now.
Commenter #93
I would vote for a non opening structure.
Monmouth County
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Commenter #94
I would prefer the 45' high drawbridge for Alternative 7A.

I oppose the fixed-height bridge.

Thank you.
Commenter #95
As someone who travels over the bridge dozens of times a week, I would like to see a raised, non-opening drawbridge. The inconvenience of the constant bridge openings completely ruin job schedules and commute time. The drivers using the bridge should have their opinions weighed to higher importance than those who just don't want their “view” changed.
Commenter #96
I have some questions in regard to the current proposed design. The designs I am looking at are too high for our area. I believe we should be designing a bridge to be accommodate boaters as well as be pleasant to the eye. I am a local [REDACTED] and have lived in Rumson for over 40 years. We do NOT have demand for large boats on the Navesink River and should not be designing a bridge for that purpose! A 65' height for a new bridge is not pleasant to look at nor is it necessary to build. I am not in favor of a bridge at this height.
Please advise if I am looking at the right proposed bridge design. Thank you.
Thank you for your comments and question. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) is Alternative 7A - Modified, which is a fixed span bridge alternative with a navigational channel underclearance of 65 feet. The plan sheet for the PPA may be found here:


Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passegio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #97
My family and I utilize the Oceanic Bridge for many trips between Middletown and Rumson, many times continuing trips to Little Silver, Fair Haven and Sea Bright. In addition to traveling by car, we take advantage of being able to walk over the bridge to local businesses and riding bikes with the kids to get ice cream.

I am very much opposed to the proposed 65' fixed bridge replacement for many reasons. Aesthetics of the bridge itself and what a bridge that large would do to the beautiful area is one key thing, but my main oppositions have to do with usability and safety. I would no longer utilize that bridge for recreational walks or bike rides as I do not want my kids on something that high. Sadly that would stop us from bringing our business to local restaurants, shops and ice cream nearby. I would also avoid that bridge in any kind of inclement weather as the necessary grading poses unsafe conditions. While I realize it is higher than the proposed 65' I often avoid the Highlands-Sea Bright bridge and take a route through Rumson because the Oceanic provides better driving conditions in different weather.

I instead support a 45' moveable bridge as I believe it still allows for the recreational needs, provides a safer alternative in inclement weather and still provides a good clearance option for the majority of the boats that travel that route. The times the bridge would have to be opened would still be less than now. Even so, I have spent many days driving back and forth on multiple times for my children's activities and rarely was impeded by the opening and closing of the drawbridge even at the current height.

I hope you will consider the better choice of a 45' bridge and keep connection with the Rumson area open.

Thank you.
Commenter #98
I support the erection of a 45' moveable bridge. As a cyclist who uses the bridge this lower bridge will be beneficial to me personally. It will still allow much more boat traffic underneath than the current bridge and will not obstruct views of the Navesink. Again, a 45' moveable bridge is recommended.

Thank you,
Monmouth County
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
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Commenter #99
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10/6/2020

Please rehab the bridge that already exists. It would be a crime to create something so new that it would take away this picturesque area’s charm.

I grew up here and then lived in NYC for 20 years. I chose to move back because of the scenic charm of the area. Please don’t make a bridge that looks out of place.

The rehab of Highlands Bridge makes sense. The way you drive up and the scenic views of the ocean and the river that I understand. But to create something like that where the overlook bridge is, well that would be a crime.

I hope you take these thoughts into consideration.

Thank you.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #100
Definitely go with the raised version. No need for bridge tenders, much less maintenance, no delays crossing it. Go under it in a boat and you will understand the urgency, concrete is constantly falling from it. No one liked the Highlands bridge either, now they love it. Also it’s the only way we get the money from the Fed gov. we don’t want to lose that!!
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Commenter #101
10/14/2020

I totally object to the plan for a high-rise bridge over our scenic Navesink River. It would be completely out of character for the area and the ongoing and future needs of the waterway and the adjoining communities. A real eyesore. Please maintain the proper scale for this historic area.
Commenter #102
Subject: Oceanic Bridge comments

Date: 10/16/2020, 6:11 PM
To: fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us, monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Please see attached letter with my comments for the record on the proposed bridge.

Middletown

--- Attachments: ---

Oceanic Bridge written comments for October 16, 2020.docx 27 bytes
16 October 2020

To: Fred Passeggio  
Monmouth County Project Manager  
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us  
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

RE: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge Comments

As a local property owner and resident, I want to make clear that I do not support the proposed changes to the Oceanic Bridge. Thank you for the opportunity to express my objections, which are many. Having listened to the entire August 27 information meeting, it is clear that those in charge do not care about the opinions of local residents, but I want to add mine to the many other residents who find the proposed bridge totally inappropriate in scale and design for our neighborhoods. The bridge serves as a link between two very low-scale communities, Rumson and Middletown. Why insert a bridge that is so out of proportion to the scale of the surrounding neighborhoods?

At the August 27 meeting, it was stated repeatedly by those running the webinar that all public commentary about aesthetics, sensitivity to the context of the area, and historic significance have been, and will be, ignored, deemed “subjective.” Only “quantifiable” comments are considered. How was it decided that “quantifiable” objections are more important than “subjective” objections? Subjective concerns are quality-of-life issues, one of which is surely the appearance and oversized scale of a bridge that we either look at or drive over every day.

Given this bias against subjective comments, I found it inconsistent that one of the engineers at the meeting said no one could object to such a “beautiful” bridge. Is that not a subjective comment, his personal opinion? Many of us who actually live here do not find the design beautiful in this context, but overwhelming in size and urban in style, totally unsuited to this narrow span of river. What might be beautiful in a large city over a wide span of water is not beautiful in this low-scale residential neighborhood. The proposed bridge will overpower the views of the river and its shorelines. Ruin might be a more appropriate word. The current 1939 bridge is unobtrusive, and so should the new bridge be. It should not look like a roller-coaster at an amusement park.

Not only is the proposed bridge insensitive to the location in its size, design, and materials, and insensitive to the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in its grade. The increase in grade will make it impossible for seniors or the less able-bodied, who frequently walk over the bridge, to continue to have access. Is this not quantifiable? People with acrophobia will not be able to use the bridge, further lessening its usefulness. There are many drivers, walkers, and cyclists who cannot tolerate extreme heights, and their needs are not being considered.
Also not considered is the increase in noise the surface of the new bridge will bring to the area. We are fortunate to live in an area where noise pollution is minimal. Why build a bridge that will change that? Surely that is a quantifiable issue, as is the predictable drop in riverside property values when this monstrosity looms in front of windows, blocking views and changing the character from natural to industrial.

On both sides of the river where the bridge will connect with the shore, irreparable and unnecessary damage will be done. It was asked by a resident at the webinar whether there would still be parking for those who fish on the bridge or on the Middletown side of the shore, and the answer was that it hadn’t yet been figured out. Why, if something this important to residents has not yet been factored into the design, are we rushing forward?

My preference, of the three allowable heights outlined in the Coast Guard letter, is for a 22-foot movable bridge. This would be the most fitting for the location. During the webinar, we learned that a fixed span bridge, when feasible, was preferred, but NOT mandated. Just because it is “feasible” to make the high fixed bridge certainly does not mean it is desirable. Years ago the feds said they would consider a lower bridge, even though the high fixed bridge is feasible, but it seems this was not pursued as an option. Why not? Funding?

Also, at the August 27 meeting, I was shocked to hear that up to 97% of the boats that use the river could fit under the 45-foot fixed option. It seems absurd to make the whole neighborhood suffer for that other 3% of boats. Why are boaters, who pass under the bridge either regularly or on occasion, favored over other property owners in the area? Why choose the lease desirable of the three heights? If that 3% of huge boats is the driver, why not at least choose the 45-foot movable option?

It seems clear that those in charge of making decisions for our community and designing the bridge, none of whom live near or on this stretch of the river, simply don’t care what the people they are supposed to represent want. In addition, after so many years of study and planning, why does this decision have to be made NOW, with all the difficulties of meeting and voicing opinions because of COVID-19?

I fervently hope that the decision about this bridge can be revisited, with the opinions of local property owners taken into consideration.

Thank you,
Thank you for your comments and questions. As stated in the Public Information Center meeting, our goal is to meet the Purpose & Need and Objective of the proposed project assessing the social, economic and environmental impacts/mitigation of the project. We also have to comply with current design standards and obtain approval from FHWA and permitting agencies. Subjective objections such as quality of life issues were not able to be quantified by the Project Team. Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's determination that the PPA is supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable." The currently recommended PPA is therefore eligible for federal funding. Because a fixed bridge is practicable to construct, movable bridge alternatives would not be eligible for federal funds. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network. The sidewalk will be 6 feet wide and in compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Noise impacts during and after construction will be examined later in the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase as part of environmental studies.

The provision of parking for recreational activities on the Middletown side of the bridge has not yet been designed, but will be evaluated in the next design phase, Local Preliminary Engineering. Further engineering evaluations that occur in Local Preliminary Engineering are needed before the recreational provisions are finalized.

Due to the COVID-19 restrictions of gatherings in large numbers and the unknown timeline of when these restrictions would be lifted, the Project Team decided to host the online public meeting using online engagement software that could accommodate a large number of attendees, according to New Jersey public meeting guidelines. Additionally, the PIC comment period was extended from the standard 30-day comment period to 45 days to allow ample opportunity for the public to view the project presentation and handouts on the website.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #103
As a Middletown resident of 25 years and a lifelong resident in this area having grown up in Oceanport I feel I have a few things to say in regard to the proposed bridge plans.

I understand the financial difference between a lower structure and the higher more favored by the committee.

Several issues come to mind at least for myself and I know others share these opinions.

1. The existing structure does not obstruct anyone’s view. The higher structure would. The proposed drawbridge would be the better choice and inline with what people have come to expect of the view from the Oceanic Bridge.
2. The existing structure has always had 1 sidewalk. Imagine, if you will, the miles covered by the people who walk or run the bridge. I myself love walking the bridge. The higher structure you propose would limit physical healthy activities for numerous amounts of people. How do you propose the older generations are going to get up the incline of the higher structure? A home health aide pushing a wheelchair bound person? How are bike riders to get up there dragging their bikes? One sidewalk has worked for a very long time why change something if it works?
3. 2 Bicycle lanes?!?! Bicycles should be walked over the bridge as it should be. Example being the bridge that connects Lambertville, NJ to New Hope, PA. you must walk your bike over the bridge. There is no need for one bike lane let alone 2!!
4. Overall aesthetics – water, boats, people fishing, walkers, etc. Rumson and Middletown. The look should be in line with the community as a whole. The higher structure just does not fit the image and feel of our community.
5. I am no engineer but I do worry about the land that would be consumed for the bigger structure.

All things considered the drawbridge with 1 sidewalk and no bike lane is the my preferred option. The width and ridiculous height of the higher structure is beyond ridiculous for this stretch of water.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion. I am sure I will think of several points and when I do I will be sure to let you know.
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 2:57 PM
CC: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Afternoon,

Thank you for your questions and comments. Shoulders are proposed on both sides of the new bridge to provide bicycle compatibility and also to provide an area for vehicles to pull over in case of an emergency. As cyclists are required to travel in the direction of traffic, shoulders are required on both sides of the bridge. Sidewalks are also proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network. The sidewalk will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant allowing pedestrian mobility. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
The current bridge is an architectural form of grace and beauty which reflects the natural forms of the topography surrounding it. To eradicate this elegant bridge and replace it with the proposed plan would be a major disappointment and eyesore. The current style bridge is pedestrian-friendly and easy to maneuver during inclement weather. A replacement in a similar style and height would certainly preserve this spectacular view and still serve the public very well. Thank you.
Commenter #105
10/13/2020

I would prefer to see a lower elevation of the bridge. With modern technology, a human bridge tender is no longer necessary, and the use of transponders would allow for a tax on the opening of the bridge for very tall masts only. I mentioned in my earlier letter that I think it should include removable and replaceable road sections.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #106
I DO NOT want to see this charming bridge replaced with this high monstrosity. Keep the drawbridge. Have residents pay a small toll to offset the cost of the drawbridge operators. Let those people keep their jobs.
Commenter #107
Subject: Local concern

Date: 9/30/2020, 6:59 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I’m a resident of Locust for 21yrs. I’m in the Historic area. That is a big reason why residents on both sides reside here, the historic charm of the area. This new bridge would destroy that. Majority of the local residents are against it. The current bridge is a way of life locally. Many many people take their walks and runs over the bridge. Bird watchers, fisherman, crabbers all spend time on the bridge. It’s the route for mountain bikers to Huber and Hartshorne parks... all of this will go away with the new proposal. The state was at fault for not maintaining the bridge, not punish the locals who live here.. it’s our Historic areas on both sides don’t ruin it!!

Sent from my iPhone
Subject: The bridge

Date: 10/14/2020, 12:42 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

As a 21 year resident of the historic district, Locust, I am deeply concerned about the new bridge proposal. There is a reason residents bought homes in the historic district... and pay the extremely high property taxes. It’s to keep things historic. This bridge is used by many for many activities. Running, walking, fishing, gateway to Huber and Hartshorn parks just to name a few. The new proposal would halt those activities.

The state’s negligence on maintaining the bridge should not penalize the local residents. I don’t know one "Local" resident that wants this new bridge. I don’t know one local person on the committee that makes this decision??

This should come as a local vote not a government takeover !!

Sent from my iPhone
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #108
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/6/2020

With regards to the building of the new oceanic bridge I would like to see the original size I am not in favor of a fixed bridge. I enjoy my walks and don’t want to climb hills at my age. Thank you and please do the right thing.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #109
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

Please add our names to the list of residents in favor of a 22-foot high bascule draw bridge for the new Oceanic Bridge design. We live in Locust and both of us were employed on Sandy Hook for many years and we crossed from Highlands to Sandy Hook on the old draw bridge as well as the new higher fixed span bridge. Based on our observations the elevation of the high fixed span Highlands Bridge increases risks for pedestrians, joggers, cyclists, and motorists. The higher elevation leads to higher speeds where control becomes an issue.

We fear cars traveling North to the Middletown side of the Oceanic Bridge will be accelerating into a potentially dangerous curve because of the steep grade. Traffic headed South into Rumson will be affected in the same manner, as the cars will be headed into a residential and business neighborhood. The issue of safety due to the increased height becomes exacerbated in inclement weather particularly when bridge surfaces freeze.

An additional issue is increased noise due to concrete surfaces and higher speeds. The noise from the fixed span bridge can cause a reduction in property values as well as having a negative effect on the wildlife that currently resides on this portion of the river.

Lastly, the proposed height of the fixed span nearly equals the height of the surrounding area on the North side of the bridge and detracts from the aesthetic beauty of the entire area. That also will have a negative effect on home values and perhaps influence migratory patterns of wildlife.

As residents of Locust for 40 years we cross the Oceanic Bridge regularly. We have always been satisfied with its operation and do not feel that the openings are an inconvenience. As boat owners docked in a marina just West of the bridge, we are very aware of boat traffic transiting the bridge. The amount of boat traffic requiring the bridge opening is minimal. The openings generally occur during the summer and they are handled quickly and efficiently. The number of cars affected is mostly negligible perhaps a dozen at most. When we are stopped on the bridge it gives us a brief opportunity to enjoy the view of the river and surrounding area. We strongly feel that the current bridge design complements the river area and preserves its unique character. Changing the design to a high elevation fixed span would only detract from splendor of the area.

Sincerely, [Names Redacted]
Commenter #110
What if we went a different route and petitioned to have boats of certain sizes, etc, prohibited from being on the fair haven side? Wouldn't it be tens of thousands of non boat owners or average size boat owners to idk 50?
Commenter #111
10/17/2020

Please don’t raise the bridge height! The current height of the bridge adds to the small town charm of our area.
I support a low bridge 45 feet or lower. Don’t ruin the natural landscape with a large intrusive structure!
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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Commenter #113
10/16/2020

I support the building of the 45 foot high Alternative 7A Oceanic 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #114
I am writing to request that there be an additional OPEN PUBLIC FORUM MEETING held where the community is able to openly and properly discuss the proposed bridge plans.

In the last meeting, we could only send a question or comment to you via text in the GoTo chat.

**Without an open meeting where all participants can HEAR the questions directly from a community member (not read by someone from the community perspective), it seems inconclusive to judge how well the respondents answered the concerns of the questioner.**

An OPEN MEETING can be done easily and securely with many of the video platforms available today; it can even be done via dial-in to the video call.

Without such direct input from the community, there is a large margin of error in assuming the responses were acceptable during the Public Information Center (PIC) meeting regarding the Oceanic Bridge plans.

The responses that were given to the following were incomplete or inconclusive:

- Accessibility for seniors,
- Coast Guard requirements on bridge characteristics,
- Conservation concerns regarding the Locust side,
- Sufficient parking and access on the Rumson side and,
- Year-around economic necessity for a 65’ bridge

It actually seems egregious during these particular times to have used the type of forum that did not allow for an even more open forum than usual, and considering the critical nature of the project, it seems to have even taken advantage of this existing COVID environment to specifically limit the public response.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
A 65 foot fixed span bridge is an insulting disservice to our entire local community.

Not a single person wants such an eyesore.

In addition, it's my understanding from the "forum" that it is truly NOT the only option, but simply a suggested one that federal funds will help finance.

This is unacceptable logic.

I am imploring you to conduct further community forums in which the community can have a REAL discussion.

The entire community is owed such a service rather than trying to push through a highway during the worst time in our recent history.

Thank you.
At least a couple of waterfront properties along River Rd have big signs up showing the two different spans.

I don't know where the local community's head is at. It just feels like the worst possible time for the county to be even discussing this given the virus distractions, and that if it weren't for all of these, the public voice would be much louder - enough to be making a real
At least a couple of waterfront properties along River Rd have big signs up showing the two spans. I don't know where the local community's head is at. It just feels like the worst possible time for the county to be even discussing this given the virus distractions, and that if it weren't for all of these, the public voice would be much louder - enough to be making a real difference.
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

At least a couple of waterfront properties along River Rd have big signs up showing the two spans. I don't know where the local community's head is at. It just feels like the worst possible time for the county to be even discussing this given the virus distractions, and that if it weren't for all of these, the public voice would be much louder - enough to be making a real difference.
Thank you for your comments. Due to the COVID-19 restrictions of gatherings in large numbers, the Project Team decided to host the online public meeting using software that could accommodate a large number of attendees with secure access, according to New Jersey public meeting guidelines. All attendees were welcome to type in questions, and have the Project Team responded to in an orderly manner within the meeting time frame.

For those questions the Project Team did not have time to answer, attendees were encouraged to submit their questions and comments to the County Project Manager. All members of the public whether able to attend the meeting or not, are welcome to submit written comments on the proposed bridge improvements and the Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA). You are welcome to have or hold discussions in a public forum on the bridge study and submit written comments and questions, which the Project Team will respond to in writing or if preferred can be contacted by telephone to discuss.

Please note, the PIC comment period was extended from the standard 30-day comment period to 45 days to allow the opportunity for the public to view the project presentation and handouts on the website through Friday, October 16, 2020. Once the comments have personal information redacted, the written comments received and responses will be posted to the project website for viewing.

If there were specific responses during the PIC meeting that were unacceptable, please submit such comments in writing for the Project Team to respond to. Could you please provide in a follow-up email or letter, the specific reasons, concerns or questions you have regarding accessibility of seniors, US Coast Guard requirements on bridge characteristics, conservation regarding the Locust side, sufficient parking and access on the Rumson side and the year-round economic necessity for a 65’ bridge, so the Project Team may provide what information is incomplete or inconclusive as it relates to the topics you noted.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #115
10/8/2020

I had the rare pleasure of living on the banks of the Navesink on the Locust side with a view straight over the Oceanic to Sea Bright in 1995 - 96. It was a source of constant delight. Sadly that delight will be denied all future residents if this 85' monstrosity goes forward. I vehemently object and plea that you keep the height down to the more reasonable height given the undeniable need to replace the existing bridge.
Commenter #116
To Whom it May Concern,

Thank you for the very informative presentation. As a resident of Rumson and engineer greatly appreciate the effort that went into producing the study content of the virtual meeting attended. Looking forward to the new bridge being built as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Commenter #117
I know the Bridge needs to be replaced. I would like to keep a movable one as well as a low one. All the pictures I see are like the Highlands Bridge; way too high. I might be able to accept a 7'4" but not 7'8" modified. I would like to keep the road the way it is now coming from Middletown. There is no need to go out over the water. There are very few accidents there now. Please try not to go high. It's such a nice ride going on the bridge now. Love all the sights.
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #118
I think the 81 foot bridge makes sense due to the level of maritime traffic.
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #119
Have they considered having a bridge (low fixed bridge), similar to the existing bridge in appearance. This will be compatible with the aesthetics of the area.

thank you
How much more does it cost (so a handful of vessels) can use a high span bridge.. instead of a lower bridge. Is it really worth ruining the look of our beautiful town.
Date: 9/22/2020, 10:45 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Please DO NOT put in a bridge that is 65ft High. REASONS

1. Will effect the price of homes in the area. I built my house with keeping with the integrity of the river and neighborhood.

2. Will not look aesthetically pleasing (back to point 1). It will look cheesy. The Bridge now is charming and keeps with the integrity of the neighborhood.

3. Having a low bridge that does not open (because of cost) will keep more boats off the river (although there are not that many big boats) This would be a positive for the environment. I look at the bridge from every window in my house. Its very rarely open.

4. I do worry about the steep incline (due to not enough room to go 65ft high) beside looking ridiculous, I feel it is a safety issue especially during times of freezing and ice etc.

thank you,
Thank you for your question. The provision of a low-level fixed bridge is not permitted by the US Coast Guard. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Proposal

Date: 10/16/2020, 3:49 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I am a resident of Rumson. I look at the bridge from every window in my home. It is beautiful. What is being proposed will ruin the integrity of the area.

I would not have bought my home, if there was a 65 ft bridge across the river. It is hideous!!!! This will definitely affect home sale prices.
COMMENTER #120
Thank you for the work you are doing on this project. I have enjoyed meeting some of you at the earlier meetings, one at the Middletown Arts Center, another in Bingham Hall. I am looking forward to the zoom meeting this afternoon.

In anticipation, I posted the meeting announcement on the Rumson Facebook page, and, in a separate posting, gave some thoughts. Here is the link:

https://www.facebook.com/groups/RUMSONNewJersey/?post_id=2415232282110270

The key requests are:

- Please keep the two ends of the old bridge for pedestrian, recreational, and outdoor dining access. We all need more open space.

- In planning for the new bridge, please review travel on Locust Avenue and Locust Point Road, including making Locust Point Road for walkers, runners, and cyclists, and changing the right of way at the Locust Avenue turn to ease traffic delays.

- Please provide walkways on both sides of the new bridge. Pedestrians need to look both East and West.

I will likely have additional comments after today's meeting.

Thank you.
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge (S31) LCD Study - Online Public Mtg3

Date: 9/3/2020, 2:58 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Martine,

Thank you for the Online Meeting last week.

I have a couple of specific questions which I hope the Project Team can answer right away.

1. Earlier I emailed a comment which included a link to a facebook post.

   https://www.facebook.com/groups/RUMSONNewJersey/?post_id=2415232282110270

   As of today, this includes 14 likes, 12 comments and 6 shares.

   Is the entire post entered as a public comment, or should I reassemble it into an email to send to you?

2. The 7A alternative has a height of 82 feet. Can you please explain how to go from 65 feet clearance to 82 feet? Does this include the height of lamp fixtures, which might (per the presentation) be included in the bridge railings?

   (This was a question not answered at the meeting due to lack of time.)

Thank you,
Subject: use of dot exercise results

Date: 9/3/2020, 4:14 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Martine,

To say first, I did appreciate the team's directness and clarity and stamina at the Q&A at the PIC-3 meeting. Thank you.

The dot exercise in PIC Meeting No. 2 addressed separately the horizontal and vertical alignment. Here are the results, taken from pages 25 and 26 of the file "5-PIC #3 Presentation.pdf", and combined across the two flip charts.

**Horizontal alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7A(A)</th>
<th>7A(B)</th>
<th>8(outer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor (green)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe (blue)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so much (yellow)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't support (red)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vertical alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>22'</th>
<th>45'</th>
<th>65'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor (green)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe (blue)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't support (red)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem is that the strong support for a movable bridge mirrors support for alignments 7A/7B. The tepid support for the high option mirrors support for alignment 8. (This is also true in the two flip charts separately.)

Put another way, of course if there were a 22' or even 45' movable bridge it should align with the existing Oceanic Bridge, 7A/B. We like the low bridge in its present alignment.

Given that the replacement will be the 65' bridge, the choice between 7A/B and 8 is not known from the dot exercise.

Likely, and quite possibly, the preference will be for the outer alignment, 8.

Therefore, can Monmouth County please perform a follow up exercise to determine community preference for the alignment, given the 65' bridge -- with the choice between alignment 8 and the modified 7A alignment, which was not included in the dot exercise??

Thank you,
Thank you for your questions. With regard to the Facebook comments you mentioned, if you would like these comments to be entered into the official public record, they must be submitted in writing through the project's email address (monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com) or the project's website: http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/online-pic-comment-form/

With regard to your 82 feet height reference, the height you are referring to is 80.96 feet per the Preliminary Preferred Alternative plan sheet. The 80.96 feet figure that is listed is the height of the deck at the peak elevation. Due to the limited space on the south side of the bridge, in order to reach 65 feet of under clearance using a 5% grade and recognizing that the vertical profile needs transition from 5% to 0%, the peak elevation is not achieved until north of the navigational channel. When you combine the under clearance with the depth of the structure (approximately 10 feet), the height of the deck ends up being 80.96 feet above the mean high water line. The height of the bridge railings and lamp posts would be above 80.96 feet.

With regard to your dot exercise question, that was a preliminary exercise before additional analyses were performed. As the Project Team completed the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix, additional factors supported the recommendation of 7A - Modified as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Mr Passeggio,

Thank you, much appreciated.

I'm reading that if the full 65' clearance is really needed at some time in the future, then dredging to expand or move the navigation channel might be necessary.
Subject: comments on bridge study

Date: 10/14/2020, 9:01 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Fred Passeggio, PE, Project Manager

I enclose written comments collated in a Facebook post at the time of the August 27 PIC meeting.

The identical comments are in .docx and .pdf formats.

Thank you,

Virus-free. www.ayasli.com

Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oceanic oct send.docx</td>
<td>1.6 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oceanic oct send.pdf</td>
<td>1.6 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are a few thoughts, hoping some of it will resonate with others impacted by the Oceanic Bridge development proposals.

14 overall likes, 12 comments, 6 shares; first posted 26 August 2020

From the Facebook post, below are 6 photos each with captions and several with comments. Each photo has several likes. These are followed by a set of overall comments.

(1) A proposal explained at an earlier presentation is to replace the current bridge with a new bridge on a new alignment to the east. This will remove most of the two curves at the Middletown end of the bridge, and minimize the amount of time the bridge must be closed, since new construction can happen alongside the existing bridge.
(2) With the "high" option, the bridge will be fixed, like the Sea Bright - Highlands Bridge. Boats that fit under the Highlands Bridge will likely fit under the new Oceanic Bridge also. With the "low" option, the bridge will raise and lower as it does now. Whether high or low, can the new bridge have walkways on both sides, to allow us to enjoy the spectacular sunsets in the evening, and the sunrise and ocean views also?
(3) PLEASE can much of the old bridge remain? As a place for recreation, and outdoor dining? Vehicular access should be mostly restricted to emergencies. With that limited usage, the existing structure is likely sound for many years. Why demolish it right away? COVID has shown us again the importance of being outside, with a breeze in our faces. What better place than on a bridge with no traffic? The red mark shows an access lane at the Rumson end of the existing bridge.
Good idea

I always roll my window down when I go over-just in case.

I always close my hand bag so if it collapses the contents will all be inside lol

The entire project specs are idiotic. Just shape it like a snake and you will only have to close it for the connection on the Rumson side. Maybe 2-3 months to tie it in.
(4) There's plenty of room for access, recreation at the Middletown end of the old Oceanic Bridge.

Great idea! A pocket park with a place to fish!
(5) Maybe sometime in the future someone will get a license to build a rolling bridge, or operate a passenger ferry, between the two stub ends of the old Oceanic Bridge. How exciting that will be! The rolling bridge in these pictures is in London.
(6) And, lastly for now, please consider improvements to Locust Point Road up to the turn to Locust Ave. The road is narrow, fast, and unsafe for pedestrians, joggers, and bicyclists. And, most vehicles make the turn from Locust Point Road to Locust Avenue and vice versa. We can see that prevailing traffic pattern in the Google maps image. Please can the County work with Middletown to change the lane markings, so that turning into or from Locust Avenue has the right of way? Right now, savvy drivers heading East on 36 turn at Grand Avenue, pass Mike's Big Red Store, and take Locust Point Road all the way to Oceanic Bridge in order to avoid the difficult left turn from Locust Avenue.

the traffic on Bingham is really heavy in summer....I was hoping the speed limit could be reduced to 25 like it is in the Middletown area
Overall comments, abbreviated for length

Thank you for comments and reactions and shares.

Thank you posting this. Lots to think about!

3 years ago they had the public input meetings in several locations over several months. Today they announced the recommended proposal out of about a dozen designs. It calls for a 65 ft. Fixed span, that passes further east on the Middletown side. The current roadway on that side will likely become a park. They also said construction wouldn’t start for 5 years. Amazing that it takes 10 years to design and build a bridge.

There were a lot of people favoring the low option. And it sounds like a genuine effort by Monmouth County to make that happen. But the funding is not available, and in this latest meeting it was very clear that the high option would be the one built.

Yes it really never was considered for a drawbridge

Is that discussion still going on, it been years n years
Subject: oceanic bridge

Date: 10/16/2020, 3:57 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Many residents and visitors enjoy the Oceanic Bridge for recreation as it is now. This includes walkers, cyclists, and people fishing. Publicly accessible recreation areas are particularly important. Most river access is taken by private property; the Oceanic Bridge is a rare exception.

Therefore the plan to include walkways in both directions on the new Oceanic Bridge is particularly good, plus giving room for cycles and perhaps scooters and emergency vehicles, all while limiting regular vehicular traffic to one narrower lane in each direction and a reduced speed. Thank you. The downside, of additional width to the new bridge, is well worth it.

Overall traffic volume is concerning, for example on Bingham Avenue. Thus, the Oceanic Bridge should not become part of an alternative "cutoff" to Route 36, for example from the Bayshore to Long Branch and points south. This might require imposing a 25-mph speed limit on the new bridge and Bingham Avenue. Please make a contingency plan for a lower speed limit, with a specific trigger that can be shared publicly.

A drawback to recreational use of the present Oceanic Bridge is surface noise. For a walker, the vehicle tire noise is loud. Even for vehicle occupants the surface is rough. That will improve with a smooth new surface, but above and beyond please utilize the latest noise-reducing surface materials.
Subject: retain old oceanic bridge

Date: 10/16/2020, 4:00 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Removal of the current Oceanic Bridge is included in the replacement budget. However, this money can be saved by keeping the current bridge for recreation. This will be a considerable community benefit in keeping the bridge for walking, strolling, and fishing.

The bascule, drawbridge, portion of the bridge should be removed or kept open. Some parts of the roadway might be removed, but hopefully all the roadway will be kept.

While the current Oceanic Bridge has exceeded its design life, the bridge is in perfectly adequate condition to support recreational use for many years to come.

One concern is that parts of the underside of the bridge might crumble into the water below, endangering boaters. That is easily remedied with steel mesh.

There will be easy access to the old bridge at the Middletown end, with parking. At the Rumson end, there may be a ramp adjacent to [redacted], hopefully allowing pedestrian, bicycle, and emergency vehicle access.

Looking ahead, food vendors might set up on the bridge. There could be theatrical productions and music performances. There might be a privately-run ferry for foot traffic connecting the two stub ends of the old Oceanic Bridge.

This is a wonderful opportunity for the area which we should not let slip away. There is relatively little upfront cost, and, if after 5 or 10 years the old bridge is not proven useful, then it can be demolished.
Subject: oceanic bridge horizontal alignment

Date: 10/16/2020, 4:25 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

At the public presentation in August, the team signaled that their preferred alignment is 7A—modified. This alignment is parallel and slightly to the east of the existing bridge, and includes 3 curves, one at the Rumson end and two at the Middletown end, an S shape. The alternative, alignment 8, is slightly farther east and does not include the additional curves. It is also budgeted at $1 million less.

The reasons given to prefer alignment 7A over alignment 8 are (1) public input via a dot exercise at a previous meeting, and (2) the presence of a sunken boat of some archaeological significance. Neither reason appears strongly compelling; could you please be more candid about the reasoning to prefer 7A—modified over the less expensive alignment 8?

The dot exercise was formulated to measure the public’s preference for both horizontal alignment and for vertical alignment. The majority opinion was for a low bridge with alignment 7A. (The modification came later.) In fact, these two preferences are strongly correlated, as can be seen checking the separate results for the two groups, shown in the documents distributed at the August meeting.

The majority opinion was that the new bridge should be as like the existing bridge as possible. Of course! However, the new bridge will have a high span. There has been no public input around the question what should be the horizontal alignment of the new high bridge?

Turning to the sunken boat. At the August meeting, there were many audience questions as to what is the archaeological artifact and no complete answer. Has anyone photographed and otherwise identified the wreck? It is not the Pinta or the Santa Maria. Is the claim that it is an artifact from the Revolutionary War? An unidentified boat sunk 20 years ago is not a compelling reason to avoid nearby construction.

Has the planning team considered the impact of the two alignments on the quality of life of the residents at the estate at [redacted] (north of the Oceanic Bridge access) and the house at [redacted] (south of the access)? There should be concern that, at night, the lights from west-bound traffic on the high span of alignment 8 will impinge on [redacted]. The house at [redacted] has higher elevation and will be less impacted by alignment 7A, and the change to 7A—modified helps further. The choice of alignment 7A—modified appears judicious, given the value of the property (over $7 million from Zillow).

Is this speculated impact of headlight, or other related concerns, supported by engineering studies, and is there any remediation short of abandoning alignment 8?

Virus-free: www.evaat.com
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 11:28 AM
CC: undisclosed recipients <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello,

Thank you for your comment and question. Any dredging to expand or move the navigational channel is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and would be a separately funded project. It is not part of this Bridge Study and it is outside the scope of the Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Hello [Redacted]

Thank you for your comments and questions. The Project Team is recommending the horizontal alignment of 7A-Modified due to the NJDOT Subject Matter Experts recommendation to improve sight distance from the conceptual alternative 7A, which did receive strong support from the public at Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 2. Alternative 8 was given consideration, however, due to potential environmental impacts and other criteria on the comparison of alternatives matrix, Alternative 7A-Modified is the recommended PPA. Property values are not one of the criteria on the comparison of alternatives matrix given consideration in the selection of an alternative.

With regard to the potential archeological artifact in the Navesink River, additional information is not available to the Project Team as part of the Local Concept Development (LCD) Study. Only a screening of environmental and cultural resources is completed during the LCD Study Phase.

Additionally, the impact of headlights was not evaluated during the study, but potential mitigation of this impact may be further evaluated in the next design phase, Local Preliminary Engineering.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
I strongly oppose the 80.96 fixed bridge proposal. It is ridiculously high and will change the entire landscape of the area. I don't even think people would enjoy walking, biking or running over the bridge as much as they do now - it's just too high and very steep ascend/descend. Please do not continue with this plan. A more suitable plan would be to construct a 45ft high-water level clearance drawbridge. Most of the boats would be able to pass without opening the bridge, however in emergencies the bridge could open. The 45 ft tall bridge is twice the height of the current 22ft high clearance bridge. And, it keeps with the beauty of the area.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #122
"Excellent presentation and the preferred choice (high bridge) for many reasons, especially cost and traffic issues for local/Rumson residents.

Please keep in mind increasing public access for fishing, etc. and provide it on both sides of the bridge."
Excellent presentation and the preferred choice (high bridge) for many reasons, especially cost and traffic issues for local/Rumson residents. Please keep in mind increasing public access for fishing, etc. and provide it on both sides of the bridge.
The proposed bridge design is excellent and the higher/fixed bridge will be a blessing to the local residents, as it eliminates the traffic backups in the spring, summer and fall. Expanded space should be provided for public access on both sides of the river. Vehicle speed on the new (and existing) bridge should be reduced for safety and aesthetic concerns.
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #123
To: M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Cc: skahlon@njtpa.org <skahlon@njtpa.org>; fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
<fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>; joseph.ettore@co.monmouth.nj.us
<joseph.ettore@co.monmouth.nj.us>; inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us
<inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Sent: Fri, Aug 14, 2020 10:35 am
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge S-31 Online Public Mtg3 - Save the Date 8/27/20 4pm, Must Register

For those neighbors that cannot use GoToMeeting, will you either be streaming the meeting to Youtube Live (its free and everyone can access it without a login) or will you be recording the meeting?
Is there a public forum where the community can discuss all the questions/comments raised during the Aug 27 meeting?

Since the community cannot meet in person due to the pandemic, it would be more effective and useful for all of us.
Due to COVID, during our last meeting, the community was only able to send a question or comment to you via text in the GoTo chat.

Is there a public forum where the community can openly and properly discuss the proposed bridge plans?
Due to the pandemic, there has not been an opportunity to discuss the plans in an open forum with other community members in the audience. There are accessibility and economic issues that are not answered in a public forum, only responses to emails without gauging if the sender of that email was satisfied with the response. Or if the community was satisfied with the response.

I feel the project needs to be suspended until a proper public forum with community discussion can be held. With the lack of a proper public discussion, the needs of the community are not heard thoroughly.
It has been 18 days since I sent my email. I have not received a response.

Without an open meeting where all participants can hear the questions directly from a community member (not read by someone from the community perspective), it seems inconclusive to judge how well the respondents answered the concerns of the questioner. An open meeting can be done easily and securely with many of the video platforms available today; it can even be done via dial-in to the video call. Without such direct input from the community, there is a large margin of error in assuming the responses were acceptable during the Public Information Center (PIC) meeting regarding the Oceanic Bridge plans.

I feel the responses that were given to accessibility for seniors, coast guard requirements on bridge characteristics, conservation concerns regarding the Locust side, sufficient parking and access on the Rumson side and the year-around economic necessity for a 65' bridge were incomplete or inconclusive.

Thank you. I will also post it to your website where it can be viewed by your website software.

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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

9/22/2020

It has been 18 days since I sent my email. I have not received a response. I will also post it to your website where it can be available on your website.

Without an open meeting where all participants can hear the questions directly from a community member (not read by someone else), it seems inconclusive to judge how well the respondents answered the concerns of the questioner. An open meeting can be done easily and securely with many of the video platforms available today; it can even be done via dial-in to the video call.

I feel the responses that were given to accessibility, coast guard comments on fixed bridge characteristics, and the year-around economic necessity for a 65' bridge were incomplete or inconclusive.

Thank you. I would appreciate a response.
Sincerely,

On Thu, Sep 3, 2020 at 11:42 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

Due to COVID, during our last meeting, the community was only able to send a question or comment to you via text in the GoTo chat.

Is there a public forum where the community can openly and properly discuss the proposed bridge plans?
The last meeting (listen-only) was not effective to gauge community opinions about the Oceanic Bridge proposal. The COVID situation made it difficult to hold an in-person meeting, but the replacement format was clearly not viable.

There needs to be another "open" community meeting where the citizens of the township can openly discuss the bridge proposal. The last listen-only (with text chat) meeting was not sufficient to gauge the responses to the text messages. Many of the responses were inconclusive.

We cannot continue the process without a legitimate community forum where citizens express their opinions openly and others can hear their concerns live to gauge how well the responses addressed them. If necessary, the process needs to be suspended until a safe time to hold public meetings.
This meeting was technically flawed. Yes, there were answers, but there was no way the person asking the question could respond. You could not gauge how well you understood the question nor how well the question was answered. I have talked to several attendees afterward and they expressed the same sentiment.

How can the process continue during a pandemic when citizens cannot meet face to face and respond to you in person? The audio was disabled during the last meeting. Without audio, it is impossible to gauge how your response was received by the person asking the question.

The last meeting needs to be redone, either in a F2F meeting (social distancing of course) or using a remote technology where each questioner has the ability to ask verbally and respond to your answers in real-time.
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/11/2020

Without a 3rd meeting with the local community participating in a F2F meeting with all parties in the same room, the bridge proposal has to be suspended.

The last virtual meeting was completely insufficient to gauge the sentiment of the community. Answers were given without an acknowledgment from the person that asked the question. The community couldn’t even respond to those answers either.

Given the current pandemic situation, the process has to be suspended until a more correct community meeting is held.
We are strongly opposed to a 65’ high water (80+ feet total height) fixed bridge. The 65’ high water level clearance bridge will drastically affect the recreational use of the bridge with a 5% grade for all walkers, joggers, and cyclists. The bridge is used daily by many people for recreational use.

A 65’ plus high fixed bridge is completely out of character for the two Historic Districts of Rumson & the Locust section of Middletown that the Oceanic Bridge connects.

A 65’ high water clearance fixed bridge will be over 80’ high overall and will dramatically dominate the views of the entire area.

A high fixed span bridge will substantially increase the noise pollution from vehicular traffic crossing the bridge for a large area around the bridge that has never been an issue before.

A high fixed span bridge with grades of up to 5% has the likelihood of causing safety issues for all vehicles during icy and snowy weather conditions which have never been an issue in the past.

Reasons to support a 45’ high water level clearance movable bridge:

A 45’ high water level clearance bridge will let 79%–97% of all boat traffic pass through it without having to open the bridge.

The midlevel movable bridge will have a grade of 3.69% which will considerably reduce the impact on all people who use the bridge for recreational uses compared to a 5% grade 65’ high bridge.

The midlevel movable bridge can be designed with a similar look as the award-winning & Historic Art Modern design of the 1939 bridge. This will also be more in line with the 2 Historic Districts connecting the bridge.

A 45’ high clearance movable bridge would be almost half as high as the 65’ water level clearance fixed bridge. (48.18’ vs 80.96’) The lower of the 2 bridges will substantially lessen the impact of the new bridge on the spectacular vistas of the surrounding properties for which the area is known.
Without a proper F2F meeting (with social distancing guidelines), the process needs to be suspended until we have one. The video call last time was clearly insufficient to gauge the community's acknowledgement of the responses given. Some answers did not address the questions completely. There was no verbal confirmation from the person asking the question that the response was acceptable.

The technology clearly exists to perform an acceptable mechanism to do this with a government-clearance level of IT security.
Thank you for your patience and understanding in responding to emails received after the Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3. Due to the COVID-19 restrictions of gatherings in large numbers, the Project Team decided to host the online public meeting using online engagement software that could accommodate a large number of attendees, according to New Jersey public meeting guidelines.

For those questions and comments the Project Team did not have time to answer, attendees were encouraged to submit comments and questions in writing. All members of the public whether able to attend the meeting or not, are welcome to submit written comments on the proposed bridge improvements and PPA.

Please note, the PIC comment period has been extended from the standard 30-day comment period to 45 days to allow ample opportunity for the public to view the project presentation and handouts on the website, which is on-going now through Friday, October 16, 2020. After the public comment period closes, and once the comments have personal information redacted, the written comments received will be posted to the project website for viewing.

You are welcome to have or hold discussions in a public forum on the bridge study and submit written comments and questions, which the Project Team will respond to in writing or if preferred can be contacted by telephone to discuss.

If there were specific responses during the PIC meeting that were unacceptable, please submit such comments in writing for the Project Team to respond to. Could you please provide in a follow-up email or letter, the specific reasons, concerns or questions you have regarding accessibility of seniors, US Coast Guard requirements on bridge characteristics, conservation regarding the Locust side, sufficient parking and access on the Rumson side and the year-round economic necessity for a 65’ bridge, so the Project Team may provide what information is incomplete or inconclusive as it relates to the topics you noted.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #124
I am against an overly tall bridge as a replacement. It is extremely wasteful to spend the funds for a fixed-bridge just to have a negligible amount of tall boats travel into the Navesink for a few months of the year. A 45' drawbridge that isn't as high would easily accommodate over 95% of the boat traffic.

When is the last in-person meeting scheduled? We can have a socially-distanced meeting now with everyone wearing masks. A one-way video meeting is insufficient to gauge the community's opinion.
Subject: Oceanic Bridge LCD Study: Response to Your 10/17/20 Public Comment Form  
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>  
Date: 12/2/2020, 10:24 PM  
CC: [removed] <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>  

Hello,  

Thank you for your comments and question. The Project Team does not have any additional public meeting scheduled for the Local Concept Development Phase. Additional public meetings will be held in the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering.  

Regards,  
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team  

Fred Passeggio, P.E.  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering  
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor  
1 East Main Street  
Freehold, NJ 07728  
732-431-7760 x6690

---

**Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for**  
**Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)**  
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com  
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #125
Hi, I understand that the Oceanic Bridge is in need of repair and there are different ideas that have been suggested about what to do: tear down and rebuild, "do nothing", a suspension bridge, a bascule bridge, etc. etc. Whichever plan is chosen, I feel it is extremely important that the environmental impacts of the plan are considered. We need to protect our Living Shorelines and the animals that live both in and around the water. Everything from the material used to construct the bridge to the type of lighting needs to be considered. Thank you.
Commenter #126
I think the bridge should not be raised at all. They should keep is the same height and style and just rehabilitate it so it meets current safety standards. It has historical value and there are little to minimal traffic issues caused when the drawbridge goes up. Anything new will be an eye sore.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #127
I would prefer a complete renovation vs an expansive new bridge. The charm of the area is having the bridge open for boats. A minutes long interlude to the is peaceful.

,however i think “timed” openings such as on the hour during summer months would be helpful

I think any east /west detour to other bridges would be a huge inconvenience and waste fo time and gas.

i look forward to seeing the proposals
Commenter #128
Hello,

I am in favour of the movable option to maintain the aesthetic of the scenery. The fixed option looks like a highway overpass and imposes itself upon the scenery from every viewpoint. A structure visually rising above the hilltops does not appreciate the beauty of the surrounding area. The movable option lies below the tree line visually thus allowing nature to remain the dominant feature of the scene, which I think is a very rare feature in today's world and should be preserved.

Thanks for considering these comments.

P.S. Perhaps we could dig a tunnel! ;)

10/16/2020
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #129
The Rumson Borough Master Plan repeatedly recommends the use of a number of green infrastructure techniques to improve resiliency. These techniques are better at protecting water quality, reducing flood damage and providing necessary habitat for wildlife than the manmade alternatives. The so-called armoring of the shoreline with jetties, seawalls and bulkheads are not only less effective at protecting properties from flood damage and cost significantly more to maintain over time, but they contribute to poor water quality, increased turbidity and reduced habitat and breeding grounds for fish and other marine animals.

As such, we request that the wetlands and living shorelines around the base of the bridge be protected and expanded when possible. We understand that it may be necessary to stabilize portions of the shoreline with retaining walls, but request that living shorelines be established in front of any such walls. There is a unique opportunity on the Middletown side to repurpose the unused road area as a place where kayakers and paddle boarders can access the river safely while establishing a living shoreline that beautifies the area and contributes to improvements in water quality, increased habitat and flood resiliency.

Given the history of struggles with water quality and flood damage in the Navesink River, every effort should be made to utilize proven green infrastructure techniques such as living shorelines to protect our most unique natural resource.
The wetlands and living shorelines are extremely important to water quality, habitat and flood resiliency. Do not replace them with bulkheads which are bad for water quality, habitat, flood resiliency and cost more over time to maintain.

Create a public access for unmotorized boats and paddle boards on the Middletown side where the road with be abandoned. This is a good spot for a living shoreline to be established and perhaps picnic tables.

Use lighting on bridge with minimal effects on wildlife. Use the proper color and brightness as suggested by the Audubon Society and be sure they are facing down and shaded from the sides.

The proposed bridge plan is much too high. It is not necessary for every size boat to get through. The river basically terminates a short distance west and is not navigable beyond that point for larger vessels anyway. According to you study, a 45 foot bridge would be plenty tall to accommodate the vast majority of vessels.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #130
The Rumson Borough Master Plan repeatedly recommends the use of a number of green infrastructure techniques to improve resiliency. These techniques are better at protecting water quality, reducing flood damage and providing necessary habitat for wildlife than the manmade alternatives. The so-called armoring of the shoreline with jetties, seawalls and bulkheads are not only less effective at protecting properties from flood damage and cost significantly more to maintain over time, but they contribute to poor water quality, increased turbidity and reduced habitat and breeding grounds for fish and other marine animals.

As such, we request that the wetlands and living shorelines around the base of the bridge be protected and expanded when possible. We understand that it may be necessary to stabilize portions of the shoreline with retaining walls, but request that living shorelines be established in front of any such walls. There is a unique opportunity on the Middletown side to repurpose the unused road area as a place where kayakers and paddle boarders can access the river safely while establishing a living shoreline that beautifies the area and contributes to improvements in water quality, increased habitat and flood resiliency.

Given the history of struggles with water quality and flood damage in the Navesink River, every effort should be made to utilize proven green infrastructure techniques such as living shorelines to protect our most unique natural resource.
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/14/2020

Intense blue and white lights have a negative effect on a wide variety of fish, birds and marine animals. The light can disorient migratory birds causing them to veer off their path and can perish when they become lost and fatigued. Bright lights can disorient hatching turtles and cause them to leave shore nests at night and waddle into danger. These are just a few examples.

Not only is our area part of the Atlantic Flyway which provides migratory layovers for millions of birds, but the Navesink is home to several species on the endangered or threatened species list including the Osprey, Least Tern, Black Skimmer and the Black-crowned Night Heron as well as the Diamond Back Terrapin.

We request that the lighting on the new bridge utilize yellow or green lights designed with wavelengths less disruptive to wildlife as opposed to white and blue lights. We also request that the final design include down-shielding of the lighting to eliminate horizontal glare and all light directed upward.
I recently became aware that a 5% slope is not a recommended slope for walkers or those in wheelchairs. Since the bridge is used quite often for pedestrian traffic, it is imperative that it remain usable to the bulk of our residents. The mid level bridge is closer to the recommended slope of 3.58%.

According to your studies, the mid level bridge would accommodate the vast majority of vessels that need to pass underneath. However, if you cannot make it a fixed bridge, you should make it a draw bridge and maintain the recommended slope for disabled residents in manual wheelchairs.
The 5% incline of the proposed fixed bridge is much too steep for reasonable use by disabled members of our community. The recommended slope that is manageable for both walking and wheel chairs is 3.58% slope. The bridge is used constantly by pedestrians for running, walking, biking and wheelchairs. The mid level bridge not only provides a much more desirable slope, but if fixed, it also provides adequate access for the vast majority of boaters.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #131
The design is going to look like a monstrosity. It is too big and too ugly. I have a friend in a wheelchair that will not be able to manage the incline. I recommend you make it a little taller as long as it is high enough for regular sized boats and people can easily walk and use their wheelchairs on it.
MONTMOUTH 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #132
Subject: Bravo

Date: 8/27/2020, 5:01 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Just want to say I am happy to see the 65' fixed span bridge was selected. I hope that both Rumson, and Middletown sign off on that, but I expect there will be pushback on that. Personally I want to see construction start tomorrow, but I will accept next year.

Cheers
Commenter #133
To: M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>; M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Cc: fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us <fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>; skahlon@njtpa.org
<skahlon@njtpa.org>; inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us <inkyung.inglehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Sent: Sun, Mar 15, 2020 10:00 pm
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge S-31 Public Meeting - 3/19/20 - POSTPONEMENT

Is it legal to post the preferred alternative alignment for the new bridge online on the date you originally planned to hold meeting and allow online public comment?
Hello,

The Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) was not posted to the project website for review and comment until after the online Public Information Center (PIC) meeting was rescheduled and held on August 27, 2020. Thank you for your interest in this important bridge improvement project.

Regards,

Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #134
The disruption to traffic and the excess pollution caused by that traffic for a boat with some tall fishing rods is insanity. It makes my blood boil every time I have to wait for one of these things to go through. Why don't the powers that be schedule times for the boats to go through, say once on the hour for 5 mins. Let the boaters work around the times. Stop disrupting hundred of people for a few. Then simply repair or replace the current bridge with one similar to what we have now. Makes no sense to build an 80ft bridge. Won't allow for bikers or pedestrians as too steep. As well as change the character of the river.
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and question. The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens and who determines such actions are determined by the US Coast Guard. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passegio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #135
I support the proposal a 45' high bridge which would be only 23' higher than the existing 22' high clearance 1839 bridge, more in harmony with the traditional aesthetic of the historic Rumson, Middletown and Navesink River communities.
Commenter #136
Subject: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Date: 10/2/2020, 4:57 PM
To: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Hope you’re doing well.

I see that on one of the proposal maps for the new Oceanic Bridge between Rumson and Middletown, [redacted] of Rumson at the corner of Bingham Avenue and River Road is part of the “study area.” The [redacted] is a registered historical landmark. Do any of the proposed plans for a replacement bridge require or suggest encroachment or destruction of church property? The church property near Bingham Avenue includes a memorial garden and the manse. I strongly urge you to protect the totality of the church grounds and not allow any encroachment on the property.

Thank you.

Best regards,
Subject: Re: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 11:20 AM

Hello

Thank you for your comments and question. As currently proposed, the recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative of bridge and roadway improvements do not anticipate any major property impact upon the [redacted] of Rumson, located at the corner of Bingham Avenue and River Road. However, minor property easements may be involved and would be presented and discussed during the later phases of Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design. It is anticipated that these easements would not have an adverse effect on the [redacted] of Rumson.

Regards,

Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggi, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #137
I'm looking at the full page ad in the two river times and the 80 foot bridge looks totally nuts. I suppose there must be some logic to this but the energy and emotion of the friends of the oceanic bridge seems sensible and not just nostalgic. Living near the sea bright bridge my impression of Martine and the team is a really good one, hoping there will be some better info and explanations but I wanted put a comment in bc the graphics I'm looking at in 2RT looking very scary, seems to need attention, expressing my concern about that scary red line graphic yikes.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #138
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Comment

Date: 10/12/2020, 10:23 AM
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To whom it may concern:

In this day and age of quick fixes and decisions to make things easier, our environment has taken the biggest toll. Whichever decision is made for the replacement of the Oceanic Bridge, it will impact our community forever. How many areas in New Jersey can boast of scenic and quaint beauty as our area? The Navesink River is one of the last remaining areas that has remained as such and I believe it is our duty as a community to preserve it for future generations.

Ten years ago a study was done on the comparison between a fixed bridge and a draw bridge. At that time it was determined that a draw bridge was less expensive to build. How is it that ten years later this has been completely reversed?? And how can a decision be made based on a handful of boats to build an 80 foot bridge!!?? If in fact a fixed bridge is necessary, why does it have to be so high? Why can’t it be 45 feet high and the handful of boats that are unable to clear it, be moored elsewhere? Does it really make sense to ruin the Navesink area forever in order to accommodate so few?

It is so disheartening that the Monmouth County engineers cannot see the impact that an 80 foot bridge will have on our area. The decision to build the 80 foot bridge in the Highlands made more sense as it accommodates the automobile traffic going into the National park, Sandy Hook. That traffic used to be backed up for miles up Route 36 as people travel a distance in order to visit Sandy Hook. And the boat traffic travelling under this bridge is a culmination of many inlets and rivers...not just one. As sad as it was to see the old bridge taken down, it made sense. However, the Oceanic Bridge does not feed into a National Park and does not service the boat traffic as does the Highlands Bridge.

We have lived on [REDACTED] for over twenty years and travel over the Oceanic Bridge numerous times a day. Our average wait when the bridge is open has been between five and ten minutes. We have never considered it an inconvenience as we’ve only had to wait for the bridge a couple of times a month!! This is not a daily issue!! In our 20+ years, we have only seen a backup on Locust Point Road due to the bridge opening once!

Please consider this impactful decision carefully. Remember to balance the “needs” of a few with the lasting affect it will make on the Navesink area.

Sincerely,
Subject: Outcome of comments

Date: 10/19/2020, 10:35 AM
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To whom it may concern,

Are we going to receive a synopsis of what residents comments were?

Thank you,
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge Comment  
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>  
Date: 12/2/2020, 6:35 PM  
CC:  

Hello  

Thank you for your comments and questions. The construction cost estimates included in the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix were developed using current average bid prices, and it is the Project Team’s assessment that they accurately reflect the anticipated construction costs. Previously developed construction costs prepared during past studies may not have reflected current best practices when constructing movable structures.

With regard to height requirements, a preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." This letter can be found on the project website at the following address: http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,  
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team  

Fred Passeggio, P.E.  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering  
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor  
1 East Main Street  
Freehold, NJ 07728  
732-431-7760 x6690
Subject: Re: Outcome of comments
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 6:37 PM
CC: [redacted]<monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello [redacted]

Thank you for your question. The comment period closed on October 16th and the Project Team is reviewing comments and responding to questions. Once the Project Team has completed the review, a Public Information Center (PIC) summary meeting report and all PIC comments received with responses will post to the project website with personal information redacted for all to view. An email notification will be sent once the report is posted to the project website.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
September 21, 2020

Dear [Name],

My family and I have been residents of Rumson for over 50 years. I was [position] for Rumson for 27 years. [Name] has worked in Rumson her entire life. We are not in favor of a fixed bridge as the replacement for the Oceanic Bridge.

We feel that the alternative 45’ drawbridge plan is much more in keeping with the look and feel of our town.

Thank you.
To: M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Sent: Fri, Oct 9, 2020 4:59 pm
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge S-31 LCD Study - Reminder Public Comment Period Ends 10/16/20

I would like to see a 45 foot high bridge to replace the existing oceanic bridge. I live near the bridge and enjoy walking it with my dog and family which would be more comfortable for us. Also aesthetically it would be so much nicer than a huge 80 ft bridge that will even increase the noise pollution. We want to preserve as best we can the charm and historic style of our current bridge. Thank you for your time and here's hoping I'll see a 45 foot bridge in my lifetime. 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #141
I believe the 45' draw bridge is a good compromise: friendly for recreational biking, walking and jogging; visually in harmony with the riverfronts and accommodating to boat traffic.

Thank you
Commenter #142
I am writing to strongly condemn the idea of a c.80’ fixed span bridge (Alternative 7-A modified) to replace the current Oceanic Bridge. A bridge of this scale will overwhelm the surrounding area and serve virtually none of the boaters, motorists, walkers, cyclists, and runners who use this passage regularly. The c. 45’ drawbridge (Alternative 7-A) is infinitely better for the surrounding area and all the stakeholders.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

A side note: the current bridge has two commemorative plaques from 1939. These should be saved and incorporated into the new 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #143
I'm guessing this project would win the "Snail Award" for project delivery. I've been retired from the practice of Engineering for 16 years and it was being discussed before I left. Besides the bureaucratic/red tape complaint, I would have chosen Alternate 8, eliminating the reverse curves at the Middletown end of the project. Congrats on a very comprehensive study. I'm particularly pleased that the Preferred Alternative is a fixed bridge. Now, if you can speed up the process, I might still get to see its implementation.
Commenter #144
Rumson and the Navesink Highlands are among the most scenic places anywhere. The settlement of Locust took place in the mid-seventeenth century. The Navesink River, which the bridge spans, is a peaceful idyllic location. It hosts sailors, fish and crabbing and recreational boating. It is flanked by residential properties. IT IS NOT THE VERAZANO NARROWS OR NEW YORK HARBOR. THERE ARE NO TANKERS OR CARGO SHIPS PASSING BENEATH. THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT IS NOT SUITABLE FOR THE AREA. IT IS OVERSIZED AND DOES NOT RESPECT THE AESTHETIC LOCATION, HISTORY, BEAUTY OR HOSE OF US WHO SPEND OUR LIVES CROSSING IT.

AS IT IS IT RESPECTS THE BEAUTY, THE CULTURE AND THE POPULATION AND ENVIRONMENT. THE PROPOSED BRIDGE IS AN INSULT TO ALL THESE ASPECTS.

IT IS WORTH WAITING A FEW MINUTES TO RESPECT THE BEAUTY OF THE RIVER AND ITS ENVIRONS.

WE ASK FOR THE SAME BRIDGE AESTHETIC WE HAVE. THE VISUAL INSULT OF THE NEW BRIDGE IS IMPOSSIBLE TO BEAR AND TO PAY WITH OUR TAXES TO BUILD.

THANK YOU,
Commenter #145
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

Please build the 45ft high bridge, NOT the 80ft. The 45ft will be too icy and slippery in winter. It
does not need to be so high. thanks
Commenter #146
I prefer the 45' high drawbridge of Alternative 7A and opposed the fixed-height bridge.
Commenter #147
I've reviewed the materials from the August 2020 meeting and it is not clear in the various drawings whether there will be physical barriers separating vehicular traffic from pedestrians and bicycle traffic. It is widely recognized that physical barriers between vehicles and pedestrians/bicycles are the SAFEST way to reduce accidents and I trust that physical barriers will be an integral part of the eventual bridge.

If this is already included in the basic design criteria I would appreciate confirmation.

Thank you
To: Martine Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Sent: Fri, Oct 9, 2020 3:48 pm
Subject: Oceanic Bridge S-31 LCD Study - Reminder Public Comment Period Ends 10/16/20

Dear Ms Culbertson,

I have submitted an online comment regarding physical separation of cyclists and pedestrians on the bridge but have received no confirmation that my comment has been received.

Does the website acknowledge receipt of comments? Most websites do which is why I am responding to your reminder.

PS. The website is a great and interesting resource and well done. The site builders and maintainers are to be commended.
Subject: Oceanic bridge design - comment

Date: 10/11/2020, 3:57 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I wish to point out that there should physical separation (i.e. a barrier) between pedestrians and cyclists and vehicular traffic. This is best practices for the 21st century and a significant safety measure.

The current bridge designs do not show a physical barrier.

Thank you.
Thank you for your comments and question. Physical separation between the travel lane and the shoulder where bicycles would be riding is not currently proposed. Physical separation to create protected bicycle lanes would reduce the available space for vehicles to pull over in an emergency or would require an even wider future bridge. Protected bicycle lanes also present maintenance challenges during the winter months for Monmouth County.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #148
The fixed span bridge is too high for the surroundings, and is going to be unattractive. Additionally, the slope will keep people from using the bridge for foot traffic. Many people from Rumson and Middletown use the bridge this way. There are few spots that attract residents this way—don't lose this one. I've lived in Rumson since 1988.
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #149
Greetings

You are missing a view from the Rumson side of the bridge (south / east) looking to the (west / north). Opposite (south) of location 3 in your renderings.

half way between the bridge and starvation island on the Rumson side would be an ideal viewing spot.

Contact me to set something up. I am retired and generally available.

Comments on the renderings:

4a  no good
4b  good
5  best option
6a  good
6b  no good
7a  no good
7b  no good
8  no good
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] S-31 Oceanic Bridge
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 10:16 AM
CC: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>, "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Morning

Thank you for your comments and question. The digital representations were prepared to illustrate how the new bridge would look using general views from the north, east, south and west, and not necessarily to be from a specific location.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Fred

The following is a list questions I have concerning the Oceanic Bridge Replacement Project. Please reply directly to me and post the answers on your website. Thank You.

1. How much faster would a new 22 foot moveable bridge cycle from red light to green light than the current bridge?

2. Can the new moveable bridge be operated remotely? If not, will the new 22 foot moveable bridge need need 2 people to operate it?

3. List by month the number of times the bridge is raised? Breakdown between weekdays, weekends, days, and nights.

4. List by month the number of walkers using the bridge? Breakdown between weekdays, weekends, days, and nights.

5. List by month the number of bicycles using the bridge? Breakdown between weekdays, weekends, days, and nights.

6. What is the accident rate involving bicycles on the current bridge?

7. What is the accident rate after bike lanes are added on 5 degree bridges of the same design as the proposed 7A bridge?

8. Explain why you think it's a good idea to put bike lanes on the bridge which connects to Navesink River Rd and Locust Point Rd both of which have ZERO room for bikes and no sidewalks?

9. How many boats docked or moored west of the current bridge require more than the current 22 feet clearance?

10. List the alternate dockage/mooring locations that will support boats needing more than the current 22 foot bridge clearance?

11. Given the generally shallow depth of the river, you should understand that the boats that cause the bridge to open can only safely navigate the river during FULL HIGH TIDE. Besides Federal Funding why do think a 65 foot clearance is needed?

12. As Federal, State, County, and Local taxpayers why can't the local community get the bridge it want's which is a moveable 22 foot bridge in roughly the same location as the current one? Alternates 5 or 6A for example.

13. Assuming you shove the 65 foot bridge down our throats What is the actual height of the new bridge going to be? 80 to 90 feet? Higher?

14. What kind of ugly fence are you going to include to prevent JUMPERS from killing themselves?

15. Given the environmental concerns about the river please explain how you will prevent Brine, Salt, Debris, Oil and Other Pollution from the roadway from entering the water below?

16. How much dredging do you expect and where will the spoils be dumped?

17. How much pounding of pilings do you expect?

18. What will the hours of construction be?

19. Will the bridge be built from barges, from the current bridge, or from itself as it evolves?

20. Detail the kind of lighting that the bridge will have on the road deck and below? Include the height if there on poles.

21. Will you include motion detecting lights that are minimized or turn off at night?

22. Have you considered a tunnel?
If the images did not display correctly in our previous email, please see the attached PDF, which includes our Project Team’s response.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

On Wed, Dec 2, 2020 at 11:46 AM Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for your comments and questions. Below are responses to the questions you asked in the order listed in your email:

1. With new systems, it is anticipated that the bascule span (movable section) opening/closure would take somewhat less time than the current system; however, an investigation was not performed. The length of time required to open and close the bascule span would depend upon the final design of the bascule span, weight of each span, and mechanical/electrical specifications.

2. Although a new movable bridge could operate remotely from a technology perspective, due to the frequency of bridge openings and pedestrian and bicyclist use, the county wishes to maintain at least one operator at all times for safety purposes. Only one person is needed to operate the bridge during each shift.

3. The following graph includes a breakdown of the number of lift openings over the evaluated years of 2011-2015.

A breakdown by hour is not available, but the following is a breakdown by day for 2015 during the peak month of July:
4/5. Yearlong pedestrian and bicycle counts were not conducted as part of this study. Two 12-hour bicycle and pedestrian counts were performed on the bridge during the summer season, one on a weekday (Wednesday July 13, 2016) and one on a weekend (Saturday July 16, 2016), from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM. Light to moderate pedestrian activity was observed on the bridge, with volumes significantly higher during the weekend observation period. Bicyclists are not permitted to ride on the bridge and are directed by signage to walk their bikes across the bridge on the sidewalk; however, the large majority rode their bikes on the roadway instead of walking their bikes on the sidewalk to cross the bridge.

6. Crash data was obtained from the Borough of Rumson Police Department and the Township of Middletown Police Department for a five year period (2011 – 2015). The crash reports indicate that only 1 crash occurred involving a bicyclist, which occurred at the intersection of CR 8A and CR 12A in Middletown.

7. A predictive crash analysis was not performed as part of this study. The proposed 5% roadway grade will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.
8. Shoulders are proposed on both sides of the new bridge to provide bicycle compatibility and also to provide an area for vehicles to pull over in case of an emergency. As cyclists are required to travel in the direction of traffic, shoulders are required on both sides of the bridge. Separately striped bicycle lanes are not proposed at this time, but 8 foot shoulders are required to provide for future connectivity into a larger network as this bridge will be designed for 100 years.

9. Several navigational surveys were conducted that indicated between 46% and 22% of boats require more than 22 feet of clearance.

10. Every marina that was interviewed during the navigational survey has docking slips, ranging from 10 to 154. Storage facilities. A few of the marinas provide additional facilities for members or guests, including restaurants, hotel, and private club. Some marinas report only power boats as resident vessels, while others report “90% sailboats.” Others report a split between the two boat types. Some marinas indicated serving sailboats with an air draft up to 60 feet, while others indicate that one resident sailboat has an air draft approaching 50 feet. Other clubs indicate that their resident vessels typically have maximum air drafts of around 20 or 30 feet. Two marinas report the presence of commercial vessels: a 48-foot sightseeing vessel and a 23-foot Monmouth County owned vessel at the Monmouth County and a 50-foot sightseeing vessel reported at the [name redacted].

11. The fixed height clearance of 65 feet was determined by the U.S. Coast Guard. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states, “If a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water.”

12. Due to the significant construction cost to replace the Oceanic Bridge, Monmouth County is seeking federal funds. Monmouth County is not able to pay for a bridge replacement project of this magnitude solely using county funds. To receive federal funds Monmouth County must follow the NJDOT Project Delivery process, which was adopted by NJTPA and has been approved by the NJ FHWA Division Office. That process has resulted in the identification of the currently recommended PPA.

13. The peak height of the deck (riding surface) of the currently recommended PPA is 80.96 feet. Due to the limited space on the south side of the bridge, in order to reach 65 feet of underclearance using a 5% grade and recognizing that the vertical profile needs to transition from 5% to 0%, the peak elevation is not achieved until north of the navigational channel. When you combine the underclearance with the depth of the structure (approximately 10 feet), the height of the deck ends up being 80.96 feet above the mean high water line. The height of the bridge railings and lamp posts would be above 80.96 feet.

14. A fence is not currently proposed to be added to the bridge parapets.

15. The existing bridge includes scuppers that direct stormwater to the river. The drainage system for the new bridge will be designed during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases and will be in compliance with current New Jersey stormwater management regulations.

16. Any dredging to expand or move the navigational channel is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and would be a separately funded project. Dredging is not part of this Bridge Study and it is outside the scope of the Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study.

17. The means and methods for installing the bridge substructure, along with construction noise impacts will be examined in the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

18. Construction work hours will be determined during Final Design and included in the final specifications.

19. The means and methods for constructing the new bridge, along with detailing any contractual restrictions will be examined in the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases. The contractor will ultimately determine the specific means and methods in accordance with current regulations and permitting agencies.

20. Lighting analysis and the overall design of lighting facilities will be performed during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

21. The installation of motion detecting lights may be evaluated during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.
22. A tunnel was not considered as a viable alternative due to the anticipated impacts and approximate costs. The cost per linear foot for a bored tunnel is between $150K and $200K. With an existing bridge length of over 2,700 feet, a tunnel alternative would cost greater than $405M to $540M.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Thank you for your comments and questions. Below are responses to the questions you asked in the order listed in your email:

1. With new systems, it is anticipated that the bascule span (movable section) opening/closure would take somewhat less time than the current system; however, an investigation was not performed. The length of time required to open and close the bascule span would depend upon the final design of the bascule span, weight of each span, and mechanical/electrical specifications.

2. Although a new movable bridge could operate remotely from a technology perspective, due to the frequency of bridge openings and pedestrian and bicyclist use, the county wishes to maintain at least one operator at all times for safety purposes. Only one person is needed to operate the bridge during each shift.

3. The following graph includes a breakdown of the number of lift openings over the evaluated years of 2011-2015.

![Oceanic Bridge Log (2011 - 2015)](image)

A breakdown by hour is not available, but the following is a breakdown by day for 2015 during the peak month of July:

![July 2015](image)
4/5. Yearlong pedestrian and bicycle counts were not conducted as part of this study. Two 12-hour bicycle and pedestrian counts were performed on the bridge during the summer season, one on a weekday (Wednesday July 13, 2016) and one on a weekend (Saturday July 16, 2016), from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM. Light to moderate pedestrian activity was observed on the bridge, with volumes significantly higher during the weekend observation period. Bicyclists are not permitted to ride on the bridge and are directed by signage to walk their bikes across the bridge on the sidewalk; however, the large majority rode their bikes on the roadway instead of walking their bikes on the sidewalk to cross the bridge.

![Pedestrian Volumes by Time and Day](image1)

![Bicycle Volumes by Time and Day](image2)

6. Crash data was obtained from the Borough of Rumson Police Department and the Township of Middletown Police Department for a five year period (2011 – 2015). The crash reports indicate that only 1 crash occurred involving a bicyclist, which occurred at the intersection of CR 8A and CR 12A in Middletown.
7. A predictive crash analysis was not performed as part of this study. The proposed 5% roadway grade will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

8. Shoulders are proposed on both sides of the new bridge to provide bicycle compatibility and also to provide an area for vehicles to pull over in case of an emergency. As cyclists are required to travel in the direction of traffic, shoulders are required on both sides of the bridge. Separately striped bicycle lanes are not proposed at this time, but 8 foot shoulders are required to provide for future connectivity into a larger network as this bridge will be designed for 100 years.

9. Several navigational surveys were conducted that indicated between 46% and 22% of boats require more than 22 feet of clearance.

10. Every marina that was interviewed during the navigational survey has docking slips, ranging from 10 to 154, and provide mooring locations, and four of the seven marinas provide boat storage facilities. A few of the marinas provide additional facilities for members or guests, including restaurants, hotel, and private club. Only reports only power boats as resident vessels, while reports “90% sailboats.” Others report a split between the two boat types, indicated serving sailboats with an air draft up to 60 feet, while indicates that one resident sailboat has an air draft approaching 50 feet. Other clubs indicate that their resident vessels typically have maximum air drafts of around 20 or 30 feet. Two marinas report the presence of commercial vessels: a 48-foot sightseeing vessel and 23-foot Monmouth County owned vessel at and a 50-foot sightseeing vessel reported at.

11. The fixed height clearance of 65 feet was determined by the U.S. Coast Guard. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states, “if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water.”

12. Due to the significant construction cost to replace the Oceanic Bridge, Monmouth County is seeking federal funds. Monmouth County is not able to pay for a bridge replacement project of this magnitude solely using county funds. To receive federal funds Monmouth County must follow the NJDOT Project Delivery process, which was adopted by NJTPA and has been approved by the NJ FHWA Division Office. That process has resulted in the identification of the currently recommended PPA.

13. The peak height of the deck (riding surface) of the currently recommended PPA is 80.96 feet. Due to the limited space on the south side of the bridge, in order to reach 65 feet of under clearance using a 5% grade and recognizing that the vertical profile needs to transition from 5% to 0%, the peak elevation is not achieved until north of the navigational channel. When you combine the under clearance with the depth of the structure (approximately 10 feet), the height of the deck ends up being 80.96 feet above the mean high water line. The height of the bridge railings and lamp posts would be above 80.96 feet.

14. A fence is not currently proposed to be added to the bridge parapets.
15. The existing bridge includes scuppers that direct stormwater to the river. The drainage system for the new bridge will be designed during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases and will be in compliance with current New Jersey stormwater management regulations.

16. Any dredging to expand or move the navigational channel is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and would be a separately funded project. Dredging is not part of this Bridge Study and it is outside the scope of the Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study.

17. The means and methods for installing the bridge substructure, along with construction noise impacts will be examined in the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

18. Construction work hours will be determined during Final Design and included in the final specifications.

19. The means and methods for constructing the new bridge, along with detailing any contractual restrictions will be examined in the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases. The contractor will ultimately determine the specific means and methods in accordance with current regulations and permitting agencies.

20. Lighting analysis and the overall design of lighting facilities will be performed during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

21. The installation of motion detecting lights may be evaluated during the Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

22. A tunnel was not considered as a viable alternative due to the anticipated impacts and approximate costs. The cost per linear foot for a bored tunnel is between $150K and $200K. With an existing bridge length of over 2,700 feet, a tunnel alternative would cost greater than $405M to $540M.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #150
Subject: My strong objection to high fixed bridge

Date: 10/4/2020, 9:03 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To Whom it may concern:

I have been to meetings, studied your schematics and video simulations and I am firmly convinced that what you have missed is the impact of such a high bridge on the scale of the crossing and the surrounding area. If you realize that the fixed bridge would be 20-25 feet higher than the current span when it is opened and if you then look at the surrounding area you then can get a perspective much superior to the schematics and videos your team produced. I have enclosed some photos for you to see.

— image0.jpeg

— image2.jpeg
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #151
10/16/2020

I have been a lifetime resident of Monmouth County and a resident of Locust Point for 17 years. The bridge is an very important part of my memories going back to early childhood. I was extremely saddened by the installation of a high bridge to replace the drawbridges both in Belmar and on Route 36 between Highlands and Sandy Hook. Those bridges have permanently destroyed the character of those areas and vistas. Installing a high bridge to replace the Oceanic Bridge would be a greater devastation given the scale, vistas and the fact that it is within a residential community.

The residents of this community would not hesitate to subsidize a replacement movable bridge and tolerate the altered traffic patterns during construction. We have endured super storms and hurricanes and took years to rebuild. We have the patience and perseverance to see the Oceanic Bridge replace by a new removable bridge.
Commenter #152
Subject: Comment on Oceanic Bridge Replacement Project

Date: 10/9/2020, 4:31 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Dear Project Manager,
Please consider eliminating the planned left turn lane onto Oak Tree Lane at East side of bridge at Bingham Avenue...at the entrance to restaurant.
It would likely be an impediment to traffic flow traveling east on to Bingham Ave and also invite drivers to turn left and go through a small residential neighborhood (Oak Tree Lane and North Park) in order to “beat the light ahead” at Bingham and East River Rd.

Thank you.
Commenter #153
The new bridge needs to be higher and be a draw bridge. The traffic gets backed up. And if there is a problem when bridge is opening and closing it's hard for big vehicles to back up on the bridge. Also needs sidewalks on both sides. To many people walking and riding bikes, it's dangerous.
Commenter #154
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Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

To whom it may concern:

I believe that the proposed 65’ high fixed bridge would be an aesthetic and cultural disaster for the area, and implore the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority and Monmouth County Engineer’s Office to adopt the alternative proposal of a replacement 22' movable structure bridge, or failing that, a 45’ fixed bridge.

First and foremost, a 65’ plus high fixed bridge would completely degrade the recreational experience of the many walkers, joggers, and cyclists, making it impossible for many.

Second, it would seriously intrude upon the natural environment of the area and clash with the architecturally low key built environments of historic Rumson and Locust (Middletown).

Third, a high fixed span bridge would pose a safety issue for vehicles during inclement weather.

Please respect the will of the people affected by this project who overwhelmingly oppose a 65’ fixed bridge.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
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Commenter #155
10/15/2020

On such a beautiful river, the fixed height bridge would be an unwelcome eyesore! The 45' Drawbridge will be as classy as the River and its residents are. The Navesink deserves class!
As a person who travels over the bridge daily and would like to travel under the bridge, I support the fixed structure option. A fixed span is more efficient than a movable span for travel both over and under the bridge. A fixed-span bridge is generally more visually appealing than a moveable structure and quieter without the warning horns and machinery noise that accompanies moveable structures.
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

I prefer alignments 8 and 7B with fixed structures over the modified 7A alignment. The 7B and 8 alignments provide a greater separation between the bridge and the north shore along which currently runs the access road to the current bridge. People currently fish and crab along this shore. With these alignments, this shoreline will be less overwhelmed by the bridge, so the recreation activities occurring there will be less impacted by the presence of a nearby bridge. Alignment 8 is better from this standpoint. Alignment 8 also provides a more pleasing design, going from point A to point B directly instead of following a meandering path that will look contrived 20 years from now.
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Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

It was mentioned at PIC meeting #3 that the speed limit on the new bridge is proposed to be lowered to 35 MPH. I urge that the speed limit remain at 40 MPH. The roadway plus shoulder is being widened from 15 feet to 20 feet; the width allotted to sidewalks is doubling from 6 feet to 12 feet; the new road surface will be much smoother than the existing surface and the curves at the northern end will have larger radii. A wider roadway, smoother surface and gentler curves might argue for raising the speed limit, but certainly do not present a need to lower the speed limit. If the fixed-structure option is built, the slopes will be steeper than the current slopes, but not excessive. There are numerous Monmouth county roads with much narrower roadways and less room for bicycles and pedestrians that have speed limits of 40 MPH or greater, some with steeper gradients than the fixed-structure option and sharper curves than the preferred option. I have traveled to work daily over the bridge for 39 years and have neither witnessed nor seen evidence of an accident on the bridge. The proposal to lower the speed limit seems capricious and based on a misuse of caution instead of on facts.
When designing the new bridge, strive for beauty. I urge that a concrete-box structure be used, which usually is much more attractive than an I-beam structure, as evidenced by the bridge between Highlands and Sea Bright. Single-column supports are generally much more attractive than double-column supports as evidenced again by comparing the Highlands-Sea Bright bridge to the current Oceanic Bridge. As David P. Billington Jr. points out in "The Tower and the Bridge: The New Art of Structural Engineering", a beautiful structure is usually more economical in material and construction effort than an ugly design. The beauty of the Highlands-Sea Bright bridge is marred by the ugly and pointless pair of columns rising from the parapet at each end and by the angular foot-traffic bridges at the eastern end, which appear to be an afterthought. I urge that such inconsistencies in design be avoided for the new Oceanic Bridge.
When designing the parapet of the new bridge, try to allow the river to be seen by people in cars. The current parapet largely blocks views of the river from passengers in sedans.
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Commenter #157
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 [redacted] Country Club in Middletown and my [redacted] attends school in Rumson so I do use the Oceanic Bridge several times during each school week.

I also am a parishioner at [redacted] Church, so I use the bridge to drive to Church along with driving to school, dining in the area, shopping at [redacted], getting ice cream at [redacted] 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 [redacted] 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
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Rumson and 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,
Commenter #158
10/15/2020

Just because the code says a fixed bridge may be installed where practical does not take into consideration what the public community that lives in and around the proposed bridge thinks is Practical.

1) A new bridge could easily handle most boats entering the river communities with a bridge half the height of proposed bridge.
2) Proposed bridge is too massive in scale for surrounding area that is primarily residential.
Submitted in hopes there will be public hearings
Commenter #159
Subject: Comments on the Oceanic Bridge reconstruction

Date: 10/16/2020, 10:23 AM
To: "Monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <Monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello, my name is [Redacted] I live at [Redacted] Fair Haven NJ. My parents have two homes in Middletown on the Navesink River, one located at [Redacted] and the other [Redacted]. I am writing this email on behalf of myself and my parents to provide comments on the reconstruction of the Ocean Bridge.

Our main concern is that the new bridge will destroy the views of the natural beauty of the surrounding area. A high bridge over 60’ tall, as is proposed, will become THE focus of the landscape when the focus should remain our shorelines, the birds and trees of Hartshorne, the beautiful seashore colonial homes and the gently moving water. The bridge does indeed need to be reconstructed but it should simply replace the existing structure as it is - same height and size but with modern engineering. A bridge the size of the one proposed, over 60’ high, simply does not suit the needs, aesthetics or lifestyle of the surrounding communities. Waiting at the drawbridge is at most a minor inconvenience and for many of us it is a pleasurable moment to stop and enjoy the beautiful natural scenery of the area. This is not for public access to Sandy Hook Gateway, a federally funded national park, traffic does not queue for miles, neither side of the bridge is a densely populated metropolis, there is no reason for such a tall bridge. Any concerns over traffic could be mitigated with simply a faster drawbridge. Additionally, the increase in height will encourage more large boats to enter the river and may foster the development of unknown trends in use which may or may not be welcome.

We truly hope you consider the needs and desires of the local communities using and viewing this bridge on a daily basis, I am certain the majority of us find the height and size of the bridge as it exists suits our needs. Please leave a positive and not detrimental long-lasting influence on the area. You have an opportunity to preserve and possibly even enhance the natural and manmade beauty and charm of the Navesink’s shorelines – the replacement bridge as it is proposed would become the focus of our landscape and impact us all negatively in known and unknown ways for many, many years to come.

Very Truly Yours,

[Redacted]
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Commenter #160
The proposed fixed height of 65' for the Oceanic Bridge is totally out of character for the surrounding area. If it has to be a drawbridge, then it should be rebuilt at the same height as the existing bridge, having no negative impact on the surrounding communities and residents in sight of the bridge, in addition, a substantial construction savings to taxpayers.
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Commenter #161
Subject: Please add me to the Oceanic Bridge Project emailing list
Date: 10/7/2020, 6:05 PM
To: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com

I live in Atlantic Highlands but travel and use both the river and the bridge and am interested in the status of the project.

Thank you.
Subject: Re: Please add me to the Oceanic Bridge Project emailing list
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 11:19 AM
CC: [Redacted] <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello [Redacted]

Thank you for your comments. The project is currently in the Local Concept Development Study Phase. The Preliminary Preferred Alternative for proposed bridge improvements was presented at the online Public Information Center (PIC) meeting on August 27, 2020 and there was a 45 day public comment period through October 16, 2020. For future status of the Bridge Study, please continue to visit the Oceanic Bridge website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com

 Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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Commenter #162
The county has made the correct discussion with the fixed span bridge. They have chosen the best option for the tax payers of Monmouth county. It is the lowest overall cost and will provide the best longevity and traffic flow. This project has already been delayed and costs millions of additional dollars in maintenance on the existing deficient bridge and engineering fees to rehash what was the best option years ago.
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10/15/2020

Do not build an 80+ foot bridge + structure. Keep the general aesthetic of the current bridge &
build a bridge similar to the current bridge.
Commenter #164
Subject: Opposing 65ft oceanic bridge

Date: 10/16/2020, 10:09 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is [redacted] I grew up and have lived in Rumson for over 30 years. I sold my house in Rumson (in which I raised my 1 children) [redacted] now own property in Leonardo (Middletown Township) NJ. I am writing to you today to express my concern and disapproval of the 65ft/82.96 ft fixed bridge proposal to replace the current Oceanic Bridge. I am extremely concerned not only about the environmental issues that the project will cause to the Navesink River, but also the size, grade and magnitude of the proposed fixed bridge. I am concerned for the local residents of Rumson, Locust, Navesink and Middletown Township. Concerned that such a tall and step grade bridge will take away the pleasure and physical fulfilment that the locals seek when strolling across the current Oceanic bridge. Most importantly I am concerned for our elderly and handicap residents who seek to get fresh air, take in the beautiful views/sunsets and get their "steps/stroll" in for the day.

I can't imagine my [redacted] year old handicapped [redacted] (with her walker) and I trying to take a stroll over the proposed 65ft/81ft fixed bridge??? In addition, how would a wheelchair bound resident manage such a mogel, even if they had a caregiver assisting them. What happens when they reach the peak of the bridge? Will the 65ft/81ft fixed bridges grade on the other side intimidate the disabled or pose a danger to them? What about the concerned caregivers trying to navigate the step slope? I ask you will the State see that the 65ft/81ft fixed bridge be ADA Compliant as per the 1990 Civil Rights Law and protect these residents with disabilities. Help protect them and keep them safe so they too can continue to enjoy one of the most beautiful vistas on the peninsula. A vista that has a nostalgic bridge that celebrates the history of the Navesink and its inhabitants (dolphins, birds, fish and our majestic Hartshorne Woods) surrounding them. What about mothers pushing baby carriages? Will they too be intimidated by this monstrosity and no longer be able to walk over the bridge with their children?

I therefore support an alternative 7-A with up to a 45' high water clearance drawbridge. This will allow 79%-97% boat passage without opening the bridge. The 45' drawbridge 3.7% grade vs the steeper 5% grade of the 65'/81ft proposed bridge will reduce the impact on all walkers, joggers and bikers especially the elderly and disabled residents. In addition having a 65ft drawbridge tender will create jobs and keep prior bridge tenders employed.

Something to keep in mind during this Covid-19 unemployment crisis.

I could go on with more reasons on why myself and so many local residents oppose this 65ft/81ft project. I am sure the community has voiced many of their opinions by now. As a former resident of the peninsula the safety, rights of residents and not jeopardizing the integrity of the Navesink River community should be the priority with this project. Working together and meeting in the middle on the size of this project would be in everyone’s best interest. We need to protect the history, environmental aspect, traditions and beauty of the peninsula and keep it alive for future peninsula generations to enjoy.

Best regards,
[redacted]
Commenter #165
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 8/27/2020, 5:57 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I appreciate that the bridge needs to be replaced but at what cost? You will be destroying the aesthetic of the area for a handful of vessels. Why hasn’t a non opening, smaller bridge been considered? It’s better for the environment and less expensive. Most of the residents are opposed to the larger expansion bridge.. who are you building this for?

Thank you,
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 2:47 PM
CC: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Afternoon,

Thank you for your comments and question. The provision of a low-level fixed bridge is not permitted by the US Coast Guard. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
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Commenter #166
In keeping it short and sweet, of the two proposed options, our family supports the 45’ foot movable bridge.
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Commenter #167
As a lifelong resident of the area and one who boated on the Navesink River for many years, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed Oceanic Bridge (S-31) replacement project. It is my belief that the proposed 85 foot fixed span bridge is unwarranted, unnecessary and not in keeping with the surrounding topography. Unlike the nearby Highlands Bridge, where the Sea Bright approach is near sea level and the Highlands approach much more elevated, thereby requiring a much higher vertical height bridge span, the approaches from both the Rumson and Middletown sides of the Oceanic Bridge are near sea level, making an 85 foot vertical clearance (fixed) bridge span inappropriate for the gentle sloping topography of the area. In my opinion, the new bridge should be much more subtle in nature rather than a “showcase” project ill-construed for the area in question.

While I and apparently many others would prefer a lower movable bridge span more in keeping with the current Oceanic Bridge and the surrounding area, I would support a fixed or movable bridge much lower in height (approximately 45 feet), while still providing for at least double the vertical height of the current Oceanic Bridge center span. Such a design would be much less obtrusive to the surrounding area as compared to the current proposal, provide for recreational walking and cycling across the bridge and would be less costly and faster to build - a winner in my book.

In view of the above, I encourage Monmouth County officials to revise their plan accordingly in favor of a much lower bridge span across the Navesink River.

Submitted respectfully,
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #168
The need to replace the bridge is apparent. However, being that it is both a Landmark itself and is situated off of the Locust Historic District, I believe it would be a great disservice to the local fiber of the area to proceed with the 65 ft High Bridge 7A.

We worked hard to preserve the Locust Ave Bridge over Clay Pit Creek in keeping with the Historic nature of the area. We should do the same for the Oceanic. My Family has lived on the same property in a contributing house for over 30 years. We use the bridge to walk and ride bikes frequently and enjoy the proximity to the water when we walk or ride. That would not be possible with the grade and height proposed.

I see the Coast Guard review dated March 2019 States from the public preference survey “The preferred Bridge type selected was a movable bridge with a 22 foot VC (closed)” Seems the Coast Guard supports both options of 7A.

So why are not both options still on the table at this time?

It appears it would be in the public interest to maintain the bridge design wise similar to the Landmark that exists now. Especially since the Stackholders survey 90 to 10 in favor of the low bridge alternative.

Where would the landing of the bridge roadway be on the Middletown side? Would this require an exit ramp to access the propose fishing/kayak area? Would there also then be a Staircase/Ramp similar to Highlands to access from the road walkway?

I strongly oppose a High Bridge and find that just because you are able to push it into the area available does not make it the best option for the population of this Historic and Bucolic area we call the Navesink.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
Thank you for your comments and questions. At the conclusion of the Local Concept Development phase, a single alternative must be identified to advance to the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering. It is the Project Team’s recommendation that Alternative 7A - Modified with a 65 foot underclearance at the navigational channel be advanced as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative.

With regard to access to a recreational area on the Middletown side of the bridge, the specific design and provisions will be determined in the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #169
Hello Fred and all concerned

I listened to the meeting held on August 27th, 2020 and would like to add the below to the record and to the consideration of decision makers on this matter.

I currently live in the ______________ right across from the Oceanic Bridge, and see it every day of my life. I have crossed that Bridge for well over 20 years now, and not once while looking at it or crossing it, have I not thought of how beautiful, scenic, and graceful it is. I have also walked and biked across it countless times. I am familiar with every crack and pot hole. I am fully aware that the bridge needs to be upgraded and modernized. I am fully aware that building a 65 foot tall span bridge/viaduct will be ultimately most cost effective (over 100 years I believe) and allow all boats to go through easily and without halting traffic.

I am fully aware that from a purely budgetary, engineering, transportation, navigation, practicality, and a usefulness standpoint that is what is most desirable. However I urge everyone to stop and think of what is being lost in the process: the beauty, the history, the scenery, and the heritage of the region. I may also add that real estate values and desirability might be lost as well. We will just be another community with a viaduct running through it.

Who wants to look out at the river and see a viaduct that is better suited for an overpass on the NJ Turnpike? ALL designs you presented do NOT compare stylistically to what is there now. **I believe the new bridge should maintain as much as possible of the current design, remain at 22 feet high, maintain its current lines and its current style, and open to boat traffic as needed.** Part of the charm of our area IS the fact that you have to slow down, stop, enjoy the view and the scenery and wait for the boats to pass. Why is this such a bad thing? Why do we have to zoom up and down this hideous new bridge and not even be allowed to enjoy the scenery? Why are the curves and turns on the current bridge substandard? Does everything need to become a super-highway connecting Locust Point Road to the GS Parkway? Will the new speed limit on it be 65MPH? Who will be able to walk up and down that bridge? Who will be able to bike up and down the bridge? Cross-Fit people? Extreme Sports enthusiasts? Who will want to walk their dog on it or jog across it? No one.

I have visitors who have come to see me from NYC and from across the world, and not one of them has ever said anything about the Highlands Bridge (Viaduct) to Sea Bright, however, every single one of them has commented on the Oceanic Bridge. So yes, maybe keeping the new bridge much closer to what it is today may be a little more inconvenient and costly (over 100 years), but ultimately, I believe, it will keep our area more attractive, scenic, and valuable in the long run. I think it is a small price to pay over the life of the project. Please consider this when making a final decision. I would greatly appreciate it.
To Whom It May Concern

I am adamantly opposed to a tall bridge to replace the existing Oceanic Bridge. There is absolutely no reason to replace a beautiful (landmark) bridge with something resembling a viaduct or overpass on the NJ turnpike. The Oceanic Bridge does not connect any big and dynamic hubs of commerce or industry. It connects two sleepy residential areas that are quaint and charming just the way they are. Both maritime and car traffic can wait for the drawbridge to open and close. It is absurd to build an 80 foot bridge on this span. It will ruin the views, the recreational value, and historic aspect of the bridge. The cost of building and maintaining the bridge should NOT be the only reason to chose a design for the bridge. Other things should be taken into consideration as well. Not every bridge and access to it needs to become and on-ramp to a super-highway.

I have crossed the bridge a million times, by car, by foot, by bike, and there is nothing sub-par and sub-standard about it’s design. It is better than anything built today. It needs to be rebuilt as is, or with possibly a slightly higher clearance. Once a new viaduct is built, it will be a total eyesore to this community. I am 100% against it.
On Fri, Oct 23, 2020 at 1:12 PM Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <$\text{monmouthcountyelectricbridge@gmail.com}$> wrote:

Thank you for your questions and comments. The radii of the substandard curves are being increased to improve the sight distance, which improves the safety of the roadway. The posted speed will be 30 miles per hour once the new bridge is constructed.

Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network. The sidewalk will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant allowing pedestrian mobility.

The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x8690
Thank you, much appreciated.
Again, on top of all the improvement detailed in your email, which I clearly understand, please keep the bridge as a low, movable, bridge. I absolutely oppose a tall, non-movable, viaduct over the Navesink River. In no shape or form can the Oceanic Bridge resemble the ugly and hideous Highlands Bridge. It is practical on route 36 with the traffic it carries. The Oceanic Bridge goes from Locust to Oceanic (Rumson), practically nowhere to nowhere.
The nautical traffic underneath is purely leisure and does not warrant a tall permanent span. I LOVE when the bridge opens and forces people to stop for a few minutes, one would hope they would slow down, breathe, and smell the proverbial roses.
I truly hope the decision is made to keep the bridge low and movable.

Best,
Commenter #170
I would offer support for a mid level 45 foot high movable bridge to replace the existing one. This would visually not be as stark of a contrast to the surrounding area and would let most of the boat traffic through.
Thank you.
Commenter #171
As a lifelong resident of Rumson, I am saddened to think that the aesthetics of this charming gateway to our town is going to be changed so radically for the worse. A fixed span bridge 80 feet high has no place on this pretty, quiet stretch of the river, where larger boats seldom travel. I ask that the County consider recommending the smaller of the fixed-span options. Also of great importance, I request that the Living Shorelines of Rumson (included in Rumson’s master plan) be respected during construction, and re-established where necessary after the project is completed.
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Commenter #172
I am a resident of Rumson. I have a view of the Oceanic Bridge from almost every window of my house and from every point of my property. It is beautiful.

What is being proposed will ruin the integrity of the area. It is hideous.

I would not have bought my home had there been a 65 foot bridge across the lovely Navesink River.

This will most definitely affect surrounding home sale prices.
Commenter #173
As a frequent boater on the Navesink, and user of the Oceanic Bridge by foot, bicycle, and car, I welcome the fixed span PPA with pedestrian walkways on both sides, and wide aprons.
Commenter #174
The proposed new bridge elevation must be reconsidered for many reasons, especially the safety of pedestrian “walkers”, cyclists and motorist in general. Aesthetically it is going to harm the charm and beauty of the river area. Another solution must be investigated.
The proposed Oceanic bridge renovation is going to be a complete disaster and waste of taxpayer dollars. The new elevation will be dangerous to walkers, cyclists and motorists. Aesthetically is will cause harm to the beauty and charm of the river area. Another solution must be investigated.
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Commenter #175
Subject: Bridge selection Comments

Date: 10/16/2020, 8:30 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

To the Project Team and County of Monmouth -

Great decision, for two reasons.

Economic - Obviously the choice of a high, fixed bridge will be less costly to the citizens of Monmouth County, both initially and over the life of the bridge.

Environmental - I own a boat, just so you know I’m not opposed to boat owners. From 1987 through 2008 I kept my boat in the __________ Marina in Rumson. So I observed a great deal of boat traffic under the bridge. I have lived in Rumson, Locust and now Atlantic Highlands. Several years ago I was told at one of your presentations that the percentage of boats on the river that sailed through the bridge and requested openings was less than 5%. My observation has been that at least half of those boats would not need opening if they lowered their gear (antennas and outriggers). I find that to be obscene since traffic was stacked up spewing carbon into the atmosphere. I understand that in Florida you can get a ticket if you request an opening that wouldn’t be necessary if you lowered your gear. The high fixed bridge is a great environmental choice.

Thanks for the great choice.
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Commenter #176
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 9/14/2020, 3:22 PM
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Within your document/resource section, I found the Environment Constraints Map, however, I do not see a formal environmental impact study of the proposed project. Specifically regarding the differences in requirements between the fixed span bridge and the “movable” span bridge and the anticipated impact on the river, tidelands and wetlands. This report is needed and must be available for review as part of the comment process.

Best regards,
Additionally, in one of the meetings there is mention that the Army Corp of Engineers favors the fixed bridge span as it is the least costly to build/maintain. Can you provide their financial viability study and assessment to draw that conclusion. Again, this information is not available on the website resource tab.

I also was not able to attend the most recent presentation and would like to see the power point presentation that was made.

Thanks again,
Thank you for your comments and questions. To date, an environmental screening investigation was performed and an Environmental Constraints Map was presented to the public. Impacts to the environmental resources for each alternative was presented in the Comparison of Alternative Matrix, which was also shared with the public. A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, such as a Categorical Exclusion Document, Environmental Assessment, or Environmental Impact Statement has not been prepared to date as the study is only in the Local Concept Development Phase. During the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering, the NEPA document will be prepared. This document will detail the anticipated environmental impacts and mitigation proposed for the project.

With regard to the Army Corps of Engineers, they have not formally endorsed any alternative yet as this project is still in Local Concept Development. As discussed in the Public Information Center meeting, the US Coast Guard determines the height of a fixed bridge. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water. The Project Team will coordinate with both the Army Corps of Engineers and the US Coast Guard in Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design.

If you still need a copy of the presentation, please visit our project website (http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/public-information-center-pic-3/).

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #177
Subject: ADA requirements for Oceanic Bridge

Date: 9/12/2020, 8:04 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

[Redacted] was injured [redacted] and lives his life from his wheelchair. Before his accident, he spent every opportunity he had out in our boat on the Navesink fishing [redacted]. However, his accident has made getting into and riding in our boat impossible. But because he loves the sights, sounds and smell of the river, he and I stroll the bridge almost every morning so he can still feel the positive energy of the water. The current grade of the bridge is challenging for him (to say nothing of the pretty rugged and narrow sidewalk) but he insists on crossing the bridge and returning, just as he used to do during "bridge runs" practices [redacted] and when he would do his own workouts and bridge runs. The incredibly steep height and grade of the new bridge will make crossing the bridge impossible, not just for [redacted] but for anyone in a wheelchair, motorized or self powered. The law requires that any bridge provide a right of way for pedestrians and the Americans With Disabilities Act ensures that [redacted] be afforded those same rights of access. This proposal will limit his - and anyone with limited mobility - ability to access the bridge. For this reason, the proposed bridge should not be built. A drawbridge will allow for a much smaller grade of incline, thereby affording true and absolute access to everyone, and not just able-bodied people and cars!
Before his accident, he spent every opportunity he had out in our boat on the Navesink fishing with his son. However, his accident has made getting into and riding in our boat impossible. But because he loves the sights, sounds and smell of the river, he and I walk the bridge almost every morning so he can still feel the positive energy of the water. The current grade of the bridge is challenging for him (to say nothing of the pretty rugged and narrow sidewalk) but he insists on crossing the bridge and returning, just as he used to do during “bridge runs” practices and when he would do his own workouts and bridge runs. The incredibly steep height and grade of the new bridge will make crossing the bridge impossible, not just for him, but for anyone in a wheelchair, motorized or self powered. The law requires that any bridge provide a right of way for pedestrians and the Americans With Disabilities Act ensures that be afforded those same rights of access. This proposal will limit his - and anyone with limited mobility - ability to access the bridge. For this reason, the proposed bridge should not be built. A drawbridge will allow for a much smaller grade of incline, thereby affording true and absolute access to everyone, and not just able-bodied people and cars!
Thank you for your comments. The Project Team is very sorry to hear about the accident. Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network. The sidewalk width on both sides of the bridge will be six feet, and the 5% grade of the sidewalk will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #178
I am truly disappointed at the design suggestion for the new oceanic bridge in Rumson NJ. Not only would the development of the bridge be destructive to the natural environment, it would demolish the beautiful low level landscape the Navesink environment has. But most importantly the bridge design is not accessible to people of all ability types. Handicapped individuals will not be able to cross the bridge on the pedestrian sidewalk. This is of special importance to my self, my family, and our community, as [REDACTED] was in a life altering accident rendering him quadriplegic. [REDACTED] is restricted to a wheelchair. [REDACTED] connection to his home has allowed him to come out of the accident and back into life. A large part of this is the many ways the shore way of life in Rumson and Seabright is handicap accessible, allowing [REDACTED] to enjoy the things he loves so much, the beach and local restaurants with friends, even as a quadriplegic. But one part of Rumson life he hasn’t been able to regain after his accident is access to the Navesink. He can’t get on a boat, he can’t go down to the Navesink banks and crab like he used too. His only access to the Navesink is the currently, low grade, Navesink River Bridge. At its current grade it takes so much effort for [REDACTED] to help push [REDACTED] up and over the bridge; at the proposed grade it would be impossible. This would not just be a catastrophic loss, the wheelchair bound, those with mobility issues, the elderly, the young, the community would lose this connection. The ‘Bridge walk’, the ‘Bridge Run’ is an embedded piece of Rumson culture. The Navesink River Bridge is a part of Rumson, and it's replacement with a high rise bridge would be a catastrophic loss for the community: do NOT permit its development.
Commenter #179
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Comments

Date: 10/6/2020, 10:00 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Dear Sir/Madam,

After listening to the last webinar I was encouraged with the responses that the North side of the new bridge will have fishing/river access. It is imperative that the public still has access on the North side. Expanded access and parking should be a top priority. The stairway that is currently there should also be built into the new bridge for kayak access.

As for the South side there currently is no access. The new bridge presents an opportunity to remedy this situation. Stairways from the new bridge should be considered. Building a lower level, below the bridge roadway, for fishing is a way to provide access. Please provide a lower level walkway for fishing.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone
Commenter #180
With regard to the Oceanic Bridge project, I prefer the 45' high drawbridge of Alternative 7A, and OPPOSE the fixed - height bridge.

Having been born and raised in Rumson since 1951, and currently a property owner/tax payer (with deceased family members), since 1957, I feel strongly about my OPPOSITION to a proposed bridge over the Navesink River at a height of 80.96 feet.

Aesthetically, the proposed bridge would be totally unappealing.

With regard to traffic flow, a 45' high span would be able to handle the traffic without issues.

The opening of the drawbridge for boats that require it, SHOULD BE MUCH MORE RESTRICTIVE. This will enhance traffic flow. There is no reason why thousands of motorists should be inconvenienced by large boat owners who have no regard for the time of day they elect to start their trips.

Property owners that will be impacted by the size of an 80.96 foot bridge, should be given every possible consideration, after having paid significant sums of money for their beautiful waterfront/waterview properties that line the river.

In addition, the size and scope of the 80.96’ bridge, will have lasting environmental impacts on the river floor, and surrounding areas.

Kindly reconsider the possibly of such a monstrosity being erected accessing our beautiful town.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
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Commenter #181
10/6/2020

Oceanic Bridge Proposal

The proposed 65 foot clearance bridge will be difficult to enjoy via bicycle or walking. It will also be an eyesore and dominate the landscape. A much smaller bridge that opens for large boat traffic would work fine and likely be passable by over 95% of boats. It also will give someone from the area employment and the ability to "look after" the bridge.

The proposal by the [redacted] seems like a thoughtful middle of the road approach and it would be nice for the decision which will take a considerable amount of time and money to be made with design, function and vista in mind and not just functionality for cars and boats.

Thanks,
Commenter #182
Having lived in this area and having enjoyed the waters of the Navesink River with our children since 1997, we vastly prefer the plans for a 45' high drawbridge to the suggested fixed height bridge of 80'. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Commenter #183
The higher fixed bridge is far too large and would unnecessarily negatively impact views. Alternatively, the community has successfully operated with a flexible bridge for decades.
Commenter #184
I think an 80 foot bridge would look ridiculous and destroy the natural beauty of that portion of the Navesink River. I was born in raised in Little Silver and Rumson and my favorite parts of this area are the charm and quaint-ness...an 80 foot bridge would be like building a sky scraper in the most beautiful part of our county. Keep it in line with the current Oceanic Bridge - slightly taller if need be, but still a draw bridge. The bridge near Sandy Hook is hideous and looks so out of place.
Listen to the locals! Nobody wants an 80 foot bridge towering over the beautiful Navesink River. Do we want our town to look like Bayonne? You will destroy the natural, serene look of the town of a gigantic structure is built. It should be kept as a draw bridge!!!
Commenter #185
Good evening,

I have reviewed the drawings of the new proposed Oceanic Bridge and am established at how large and ugly a new fixed spanned bridge would look. My concerns also have to do with weather in regards to winds and extreme cold. That bridge also does not fit the small town landscape in my eyes. I personally am in favor of a lower draw bridge as is there now. My feeling is that we can maintain it in a better state once complete being build to 2024 standards and new technology. To wait for openings has always been a part of life living here three decades. Looking forward to another 60 here as well. Thank you.
Commenter #186
10/13/2020

I would like to express my opinion in reference to the proposed Oceanic bridge. As in the instance of the Highlands bridge that I walked over regularly as a child as my grandparents lived in Highlands and we belonged to [Blacked Out] Beach Club at Sandy Hook the beauty of that bridge is not longer there. The Oceanic bridge needs to maintain its look. I can remember walking to the middle to watch the Fourth of July fireworks and many wonderful views of boats and sunsets. I was a teacher for 30 years at the [Blacked Out] and my extended family lived in Atlantic Highlands, Navesink and Highlands-a bridge at 80 plus feet would take away the bikers and walkers ability to cross and as we know many people bike not only for exercise but also to get to work or shop. And in bad weather a bridge of this height is more difficult to cross.
Please keep the design of the bridge as it was originally built.
Thank you in advance for your attention
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Commenter #187
Many people including myself walk, run and ride over the oceanic everyday. By making the bridge 65' tall this will prevent many people from their daily recreation. I had owned a small boat and kept it at the oceanic marina for about 10 years. I have also lived in the Navesink area for 25 years. In all that time I have never seen a boat larger than 30' tall on the Navesink. If you have a very large boat you are probably be in the Atlantic Highlands Marina. The Navesink is notorious for low tide issues and sandbar hazards.
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Commenter #188
There should be some sort of compromise between the height of the bridge and the boaters. The 81 foot bridge is too high and too ugly and is out of character with the two neighborhoods. The 45 foot bridge is a better solution. And for the boaters, surely there are retractable antennas they can buy if their present ones are too high.
Commenter #189
I would favor anything with a clearance of 45 feet or less. That 65-foot bridge will destroy the character of the surrounding neighborhoods just as it did with the Highlands Bridge. With more-local funding it used to be that towns could build structures that were not only functional but also attractive. It cost more but the results were worth it. Look at some of the older school buildings for example. New Jersey pays more than its share of federal taxes so should be able to take a little more out to get a more suitable bridge instead of simply the cheapest alternative.

Highlands lost and we'll probably lose a bridge that accommodated not only cars but also bicyclists and pedestrians. I was a bicyclist over both bridges for many years. I also rode the Coast-to-Coast benefit in those years over the high, fixed bridges of South Jersey. Nothing like one of those to spoil the ride.

I do not believe that Regulation 650.803 requires a fixed bridge as was claimed in Public Meeting No. 3. That regulation has been around a long time, during which the feds have funded drawbridges where a high, fixed bridge was feasible. One notable example is the Wilson Bridge in Alexandria, Virginia where I grew up. They didn't want and eventually didn't get the monstrosity that was planned for them.

The root cause, I believe, for our not getting a sensible bridge is the Coast Guard, which gives boats priority over cars. The Navesink is a shallow, non-commercial river to nowhere yet a tiny boat with tall fishing poles or antennae can stop dozens of cars for ten minutes. The few sailboats with tall, non-folding masts should be kept in the many marinas downstream of the bridge. Then a 45-foot or lower non-opening bridge could serve.
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Commenter #190
Fred, I agree the 7A proposal is the best solution
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Commenter #191
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Sent: Thu, Aug 27, 2020 9:37 am
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Suggestion

To whom it may concern:

I'd like to propose an idea that will satisfy all concerns with the safety and passage of people, bicycles, vehicles and maritime passing. The ship to continue repairing the bridge has sailed years ago. It's past time to totally replace the bridge for safety, convenience and monetary concerns. To please all, I suggest replacing the bridge with a fixed bridge that resembles the current draw bridge's architect style, simply being a higher bridge. In doing so, the bridge would be paid for with State and/or Federal Funds. This would also allow the group [redacted] to be satisfied with their esthetic stance.

My suggestion will allow maritime traffic to continue without waiting for a request to bridge tenders to lift and lower for their passing. This will also eliminate all types of traffic from backing up on the bridge.

I believe this compromising idea is a win-win solution for both government and everyone's concerns.

Regards,
Thank you for your comments. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
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Commenter #192
Low bridge is a much better option!
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Commenter #193
Hi Fred,

Hope this note finds you well. Please see attached my comment form regarding the Oceanic Bridge Proposals. Let me know if the manner in which provided is acceptable. Thanks and best of luck!

Best regards,

---

Attachments:

Comment Form - Oceanic Bridge.pdf 79.2 KB
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 

Mailing Address: 

Email: 

Comments/Suggestions: I’m in the strong belief that the best option moving forward is the 45’ high drawbridge. There is no need for a 81’ high bridge span. The noise pollution will have a big impact on the area and change the aesthetic of this historical river. Additionally, I frequently jog across that bridge, building the 81’ option will create a worse impact for runners, walkers and bikers. Please do not move forward with the monstrosity of an 81’ bridge.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Commenter #194
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 & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

I would love to see sidewalks on both sides of the bridge.

It would be wonderful if there could be a pull-off on the west side of the bridge, so you can safely pull off to photograph our beautiful sunsets.

Sincerely

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7795
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

RECEIVED
APR 02 2020
#44510
ENGINEERING DEPT

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 3/19/20
Commenter #195
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 & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: ____________________________
Mailing Address: ___________________
Email: ____________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

Darn it all the meetings years ago
Here we go again!
Please have new bridge look
like old one - Now + lovely!

Thank you

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

RECEIVED
APR 15 2020
#44544
ENGINEERING DEPT
Commenter #196
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Replacement

Date: 10/8/2020, 7:44 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Mr. Fred Passeggio, P.E. Project Manager:

I hereby present my comments regarding the Oceanic Bridge Replacement:
I am in favor of Alternative No. 7A Modified, with the fixed high level bridge providing 65’ marine clearance. This is the most economical and practical solution for the replacement of the existing bridge.
Commenter #197
As a lifetime boater in these specific waters I admit nostalgia for the look and operation of the existing bridge. And I can see how a modern bridge can provide wider clearance for boaters in the main channel, and safer diving conditions. However, the look of a 65’ fixed clearance bridge, 81’ overall height, is very poor for this incredibly scenic spot. Poor from a water view and poor for views from land. Sometimes the cheapest alternative is not the right one. I support a manned drawbridge with a maximum 45’ height.
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Commenter #198
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Concept Development Study - RFP

Date: 10/6/2020, 2:10 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Hello,

I am a local [REDACTED] who grew up and lives in Monmouth county. I recently came across this local concept study and became very interested in this project. I was curious if this project will be going out to bid or not for the design stage or if a design consultant has already been approved. I would love the opportunity to work on this project. Feel free to reach out at any point.

Thanks,
Hello,

Thank you for your comment and questions. The project is currently in the Local Concept Development phase. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative will be presented to NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA for approval to advance to the next phase of design, which is Local Preliminary Engineering. Before the project advances to Local Preliminary Engineering, a design consultant will be procured to advance the project through the remaining phases of the project delivery process.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #199
The only acceptable solution is replacing the bridge that is there now with the same type of bridge. The 45' clearance bridge option keeps what this entire area safe from a reduction in property values and income for businesses that benefit the beautiful views which would be ruined by a taller bridge. I drive over the bridge roughly 20 times a week all year round, and I would be fearful to drive over a taller bridge in the ice and snow.
COMMENTER #200
Subject: Oceanic Bridge S-31 Monmouth County

Date: 10/15/2020, 2:15 PM
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To the attention of:

Fred Passeggio, PE

---Attachments:

Oceanic Bridge S-31 Monmouth County.PDF 69.4 KB
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: ____________________________________________
Mailing Address: _______________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

In keeping with the area I prefer the 45’ high
Wing clearance draw bridge

As a biker the 3.79’ grade is preferred.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Commenter #201
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

I am for option 7A: the construction of a 45 foot drawbridge, as any higher bridge will ruin the aesthetic of this area. The 45 foot drawbridge would be high enough for most vessels to pass underneath without need to open the bridge and stop the flow of traffic.
I would recommend adopting option 7A, and thus the construction of a 45 foot drawbridge, which would allow the flow of most vessels underneath it and would also better blend, aesthetically speaking, with the surrounding 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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

Option 7A is the best option available. A 45 foot drawbridge better answer the aesthetic requirements of the community and would also allow for a majority of vessels to pass underneath the bridge without having to raise it.
Commenter #202
Hi. This is my question which never got addressed yesterday. Also, when is the decision being made about the bridge?

Thank you

Q: Why would you make the bridge height 65 feet above high water mark for the few boats that it affects? There are more people interested in a lower bridge height and preferably a draw bridge. The amount of people who would want or need a higher bridge are negligible compared to those who prefer Lower / fixed bridge.
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study
From: "Passeggi, Fred" <Fred.Passeggi@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 3:52 PM
CC: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Afternoon,

Thank you for your comments and questions. The provision of a low-level fixed bridge is not permitted by the US Coast Guard. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the US Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water. Additionally, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's determination that the Preliminary Preferred Alternative is supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable."

With regard to when a decision will be made about the new bridge, the currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative will be presented to NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA before the end of 2020 for approval to advance to the next phase of design, which is Local Preliminary Engineering.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggi, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #203
My [name redacted] worked on that bridge in 1939. I would very much like to have a small piece if the bridge when it is dismantled. Thank you for your time.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #204
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

9/14/2020

OCEANIC BRIDGE PUBLIC MEETING 3 MEETING QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

QUESTIONS

1. Is it possible to provide a rendering of the view of the bridge from [Redacted]. The view from [Redacted] does not capture the effect the proposed bridge will have on my or my neighbors' properties and consequently our property value and our view.

2. The cross street at Hunt St. is not shown on the diagram. Will it remain? It is a much safer crossing than the ill-managed intersection at River Rd. It also leads directly to Victory Park and the post office.

3. I heard in the meeting the possibility of noise and vibration remediation for local wildlife such as dolphins. Will the safety of our homes and protection of our peace and quiet be considered as well over the period of at least 3 years?

4. You mentioned the improved stopping sight distance on the Middletown side, but it seems the new curve to the east on the Rumson side will decrease sight of Bingham Ave, Oak Tree Lane, and [Redacted] post office parking lot entrance.

5. Can you please provide the exact tallies from the PIC and public meetings #2?

6. Will anything be taken from the property at [Redacted] or their foliage? There are tall trees there that provide noise protection and privacy.

7. I cannot tell from the drawings exactly how much wider the new Bingham Ave and sidewalk will be vs the current. Our twelve 10-year-old cherry trees at [Redacted] remain in an easement in that drawing. How close will the sidewalk be to them? Is there any danger of them being removed?

COMMENTS

1. To quote the purpose and needs statement, the new design of the Oceanic Bridge must serve the people who "live, work, and recreate here." Might I point out that the first word is LIVE, and the needs of those who LIVE closest to the bridge are clearly not represented in the PPA. Those needs being first of all safety, second property value, and third convenience.

2. There is absolutely no need for a turning lane onto Oak Tree Lane; in fact it would only encourage high speed, frequent traffic to go down [Redacted] narrow street. People already do this to beat the light at River Road. The turning lane is an invitation to speed down Oak Tree Lane.

3. It is a terrible shame that Monmouth County is refusing to budget taxpayer resources to pay for its own bridge that meets the needs of its residents instead of bowing to federal regulations.
that will destroy the charm of the area and properties that bring millions of dollars into local
government.

4. This project will only make Rumson a "shortcut" to Sea Bright and cause even more traffic
to build up at the Sea Bright Bridge when it opens.

5. You mentioned more than once the Ocean City-Sommers Point Bridge, which I am familiar
with as a longtime Ocean City vacationer. But the comparison is inapt. First, Ocean City gets
lots more car traffic in the summer time than Rumson, so it is beneficial to them, their residents
and livelihoods to have a fixed span bridge. Also, to my memory, there were not (at the time of
construction) private homes on either end of that bridge. Many condo-style units have been built
since the bridge reconstruction (another thing that would damage our property value here), but
properties such as those on the Rumson side of the bridge are very different than those in the
location of the Ocean City-Sommers Point Bridge. We are not a tourist beach town and should
not be made into the major route to Sea Bright.

6. It is terrible that questions of property value were basically rejected out of hand during the
meeting. Please consider that, even now, it could be difficult for us to sell our home if we needed
to, as this information is public. We are talking a minimum of 8 years when it will be impossible
for us to sell our home, into which we have poured hundreds of thousands of dollars for its
beautification over the last 18 years, should career or life circumstances require it. If we did, there
is no way we would get the same money for a house at the foot of a 65' high highway-style bridge.
We will be the people others feel sorry for. They did so much work to that property,
improved every angle of it, added architecture and trees to make the entry to Rumson more
beautiful, and now they're staring at that monstrosity." If you are honest, you'll admit we on
[redacted] those in this process. We on the corner of[redacted] twice. By the way, contrary to
what people think of Rumson people, this is our only house, the only house we've ever owned,
the house where we've raised our children. This place matters to us.

7. Truly, how many 50' tall boats actually cross under the bridge on a daily, weekly or even
monthly basis? I live here. I look at that water every day. It is a complete exaggeration to suggest
this happens regularly. That some billionaire's once a year jaunt under the Oceanic Bridge should
negatively affect my life, safety, convenience and property value is absurd and unfair. If
Monmouth County residents really want to cross under that bridge, then Monmouth County
residents should pay for a bridge that opens and still protects their own district from a hideous
structure that will bring traffic congestion, trucks, buses, noise and disruption of wildlife to our very
backyards.

REQUESTS
It was stated often during the meeting to submit things we'd like to see in the future bridge.
1. The design of the Front St. Bridge in Red Bank is beautiful. I wouldn't mind so much if the
bridge ended up with some kind of charm and character. On the other hand, the Highlands-Sea
Bright bridge and Ocean City-Sommers Point bridges look like highways not at all in keeping with
the character of the small town into which the Oceanic Bridge leads. Please consider this in the
design plans.
   a. Included in this, as mentioned in the online meeting, consideration of appropriate and
attractive lighting which won't light up the entire sky outside our windows on land.
2. A few people asked for parking for fishing and kayaking on the Rumson side. Thank you for not including this in the scope of study. There is plenty of parking and access (much of it new in the last year) at Victory park, 2 blocks away on the Rumson side and that which will be preserved in a new location on the Middletown side.
Dear Mr. Passeggi and team,

Thank you for sharing the recording and documents from the bridge meeting. As stakeholders residing at [redacted] in Rumson, we are very invested in the future of the Oceanic bridge. We submitted our comments and questions on the website but have not received answers to our questions as of yet. We are submitting them again via email to ensure they are received.

Thank you very much.

---

**OCEANIC BRIDGE PUBLIC MEETING 3 MEETING QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

**QUESTIONS**

1. Is it possible to provide a rendering of the view of the bridge from [redacted]? The view from the [redacted] does not capture the effect the proposed bridge will have on my or my neighbors’ properties and consequently our property value and our view.
2. The cross street at Hunt St. is not shown on the diagram. Will it remain? It is a much safer crossing than the ill-managed intersection at River Rd. It also leads directly to Victory Park and the post office.
3. I heard in the meeting the possibility of noise and vibration remediation for local wildlife such as dolphins. Will the safety of our homes and protection of our peace and quiet be considered as well over the period of at least 3 years?
4. You mentioned the improved stopping sight distance on the Middletown side, but it seems the new curve to the east on the Rumson side will decrease sight of Bingham Ave, Oak Tree Lane, and [redacted] post office parking lot entrance.
5. Can you please provide the exact tallies from the PIC and public meetings #2?
6. Will anything be taken from the property at [redacted] or their foliage? There are tall trees there that provide noise protection and privacy.
7. I cannot tell from the drawings exactly how much wider the new Bingham Ave and sidewalk will be vs the current. Our twelve 10-year-old cherry trees at [redacted] remain in an easement in that drawing. How close will the sidewalk be to them? Is there any danger of them being removed?

**COMMENTS**

1. To quote the purpose and needs statement, the new design of the Oceanic Bridge must serve the people who “live, work, and recreate here.” Might I point out that the first word is “live,” and the needs of those who LIVE closest to the bridge are clearly not represented in the PPA. Those needs being first of all safety, second property value, and third convenience.
2. There is absolutely no need for a turning lane onto Oak Tree Lane; in fact it would only encourage high speed, frequent traffic to go down [redacted] narrow street. People already do this to beat the light at River Road. The turning lane is an invitation to speed down Oak Tree Lane.
3. It is a terrible shame that Monmouth County is refusing to budget taxpayer resources to pay for its own bridge that meets the needs of its residents instead of bowing to federal regulations that will destroy the charm of the area and properties that bring millions of dollars into local government.
4. This project will only make Rumson a “shortcut” to Sea Bright and cause even more traffic to build up at the Sea Bright Bridge when it opens.
5. You mentioned more than once the Ocean City-Somers Point Bridge, which I am familiar with as a longtime Ocean City vacationer. But the comparison is inapt. First, Ocean City gets tons more car traffic in the summer time than Rumson, so it is beneficial to them, their residents and livelihoods to have a fixed span bridge. Also, to my memory, there were not (at the time of construction) private homes on either end of that bridge. Many condo-style units have been built since the bridge reconstruction (another thing that would damage our property value here), but properties such as those on the Rumson side of the bridge are very different than those in the location of the Ocean City-Somers Point Bridge. We are not a tourist beach town and should not be made into the major route to Sea Bright.
6. It is terrible that questions of property value were basically rejected out of hand during the meeting. Please consider that, even now, it could be difficult for us to sell our home if we needed to, as this information is public. We are talking a minimum of 8 years when it will be impossible for us to sell our home, into which we have poured hundreds of thousands of dollars for its beautification over the last 18 years, should career or life circumstances require it. If we did, there is no way we would get the same money for a house at the foot of a 65” high highway-style bridge. We will be the people others feel sorry for. [redacted]. They did so much work to that property, improved every angle of it, added architecture and trees to make the entry to Rumson more beautiful, and now they’re staring at that monstrosity.” If you are honest, you’ll admit we are [redacted] in this process. We on the corner of [redacted] twice. By the way, contrary to what people think of Rumson people, this is our only house, the only house we’ve ever owned, the house where we’ve raised our children. This place matters to us.
7. Truly, how many 50’ tall boats actually cross under the bridge on a daily, weekly or even monthly basis? I live here. I look
at that water every day. It is a complete exaggeration to suggest this happens regularly. That some billionaire’s once a year jaunt under the Oceanic Bridge should negatively affect my life, safety, convenience and property value is absurd and unfair. If Monmouth County residents really want to cross under that bridge, then Monmouth County residents should pay for a bridge that opens and still protects their own district from a hideous structure that will bring traffic congestion, trucks, buses, noise and disruption of wildlife to our very backyards.

REQUESTS

It was stated often during the meeting to submit things we’d like to see in the future bridge.

1. The design of the Front St. Bridge in Red Bank is beautiful. I wouldn’t mind so much if the bridge ended up with some kind of charm and character. On the other hand, the Highlands-Sea Bright bridge and Ocean City-Somers Point bridges look like highways not at all in keeping with the character of the small town into which the Oceanic Bridge leads. Please consider this in the design plans.
   1. a. Included in this, as mentioned in the online meeting, consideration of appropriate and attractive lighting which won’t light up the entire sky outside our windows on land.

2. A few people asked for parking for fishing and kayaking on the Rumson side. Thank you for not including this in the scope of study. There is plenty of parking and access (much of it new in the last year) at Victory park, 2 blocks away on the Rumson side and that which will be preserved in a new location on the Middletown side.
Thank you for your comments and questions. Below are responses to the questions you asked in the order listed in your email:

1. The digital representations were prepared to illustrate how the new bridge would look using general views from the north, east, south and west, and not necessarily to be from a specific location. It is not in the project scope of work for the Project Team to provide a rendering from a specific residence.

2. The cross street at Hunt Street will remain with its existing configuration.

3. Noise impacts during and after construction will be examined later in the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase as part of environmental studies. Measures will be taken to minimize noise impacts during construction.

4. The curves on the Rumson side of the bridge were designed per NJDOT standards and provide the required stopping sight distances.

5. At Public Information Center (PIC) No. 2 a total of 243 PIC comments were received. The horizontal alignment of Alternative 7A was the most preferred of the alignments with 42.5% of respondents indicating as such. 43% of respondents did not indicate a horizontal preference. The remaining 14.5% of responses were mixed among the remaining alternatives. With regard to vertical height preference, 72.43% of respondents supported a 22 foot high movable bridge. 1.23% of respondents supported a 45 movable bridge, and 10.29% of respondents supported a 65 foot high fixed bridge. The remaining percentage of respondents did not indicate a specific height preference. A tally of the PIC Comments from PIC No. 3 will not be completed until after the public comment period closes.

6. Minor impacts are anticipated for the property at [Redacted]. Specific impacts, such as tree removal, would be determined later during the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase.

7. The currently recommended PPA is a conceptual alternative to complete the Local Concept Development Study Phase. Specific impacts to trees at [Redacted] have not yet been identified. The specific property impacts, if any, would be identified and presented during the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Commenter #205
My name is [redacted], and I am a long time Rumson resident who utilizes the bridge for vehicle and marine traffic. I think it is very important to maintain the integrity and beauty of Rumson and do not want to replace the bridge with a bridge that will be 65 feet high. The bridge should remain in character with the area.

If we must replace the bridge, I would like to keep it the same height as it currently exists and construction must be at a minimum of disruption to vehicle as well as marine traffic.

Thank you.
Commenter #206
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/2/2020

As a lifelong resident of Middletown and chairwoman for the [Name Redacted], I am vehemently against the proposed non-movable bridge with a 65' clearance. For safety reasons, I understand the need for extensive repair, and/or replacement. But constructing a bridge similar to that of the Hwy 36 Highlands/Sea Bright bridge would be a gross deformation of the landscape between Middletown and Rumson. This location is a gentle, natural vista for which we hold its future in our hands with this project. We cannot allow this proposal to happen. So few historic sites remain unmarred by progress. Let us be mindful as well as productive in maintaining the integrity of this historic bridge, and in doing so we will preserve the atmosphere and beauty of the surrounding landscape.

I urge you NOT to allow this replacement to go through!

Thank you [Name Redacted]
Commenter #207
It is an awful idea and I do not support it. I for one know that I enjoy walking over the bridge with friends and family and admiring the view, and if it is raised high, we will not be able to do so anymore.
Commenter #208
I live on [redacted] houses down from the bridge. The proposal to raise the bridge is the WORST IDEA EVER! You do not have my support.
The proposal to raise the bridge is the WORST IDEA EVER!

I live on [redacted] houses from the bridge and the aesthetic of natural environment will be compromised by raising it to a level of 81 feet. The suggestion to do so is reckless.

I vote NO for changing the height to anything over the current height. This project does NOT have my 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

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #209
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

I have the following concerns about the 80 foot high fixed bridge:
1) It would be difficult for pedestrians, especially older pedestrians, to cross.
2) It would be a challenge for bicyclists to cross.
3) Keeping such a bridge safe to use in the winter would be difficult.
I believe the 45 foot high drawbridge would be a better solution.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #210
Subject: Public Comment

Date: 8/29/2020, 10:25 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thank you for a through presentation. I would strongly support including some of the architectural features of the current bridge in the final version.
Thank you for your comments. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Commenter #211
Good afternoon,

I appreciate the project team's efforts to find a resolution in a timely and effective manner for a bridge that is so heavily used and depended upon. However, I would like to respectfully share that while I greatly support the rehabilitation of the Oceanic Bridge in the existing location, the idea of relocating the bridge to Browns Dock Road seems like a disastrous alternative. I beg you consider the ecosystems that you would entirely uproot to create a new means of travel to shed a few additional minutes. From the land to the sea, I could write a dissertation on the populations that would feel the harmful effects of relocating the Oceanic Bridge. I also don't see the value-add in taking someone's existing homestead to allow for a new bridge when two viable alternatives are positioned on either end of Navesink River Road - the existing Oceanic Bridge and the Red Bank Bridge. I trust that this decision will be evaluated holistically rather than for the greatest economic gain of the stakeholders listed on your website. I noticed that it did not include people or entities that would need to make considerable sacrifices in the form of land & other assets (intrinsic and real) in order to accomplish this proposed relocation.

I look forward to more information and the public's feedback being shared in the near future.

Thanks & stay well,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #212
I actually like option 7A, not bad, only thing I would love to see added is a few bump outs with a place to sit and enjoy the view.
Subject: Question

Date: 10/16/2020, 5:38 PM
To: "MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com" <MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com>

What exactly what being referred to with the term underwater archeological opportunity?

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. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
Hello

Thank you for your question. With regard to the potential archeological artifact in the Navesink River, additional information is not available to the Project Team as part of the Local Concept Development Study. Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office during the Environmental Screening Process resulted in the determination that an underwater archeological site may be located within the project study area. More detailed Archeological studies will be conducted during the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase in which Section 106, Section 4(f) and NEPA documents are completed and approved.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #213
Greetings: We appreciate the work you have accomplished in the design of our beloved bridge. We live just a few blocks away and also can walk a short bit to sit and watch the river and bridge from the end of our short street. We have attended the meeting online and found it so very helpful in informing us on the various options. We very much agree on the decision you have reached. We love the design of alternative 7A.

Thank you for this opportunity to have our input considered!

Sincerely,
Commenter #214
Think the new bridge should be 45' high - very special and unique - let's keep it that way...
Commenter #215
Dear Mr. Passeggio,

I have received a copy of a notice for an online public information meeting regarding the Oceanic Bridge scheduled to be held on Thursday, August 27th. I received the notice on August 12th. My comments are as follows:

1. This project has been ongoing for some 15 years. To hold a information session with 15 days' notice is unreasonable.
2. How has the meeting been noticed to the public. Many of the affected homes have been sold in recent years and the new owners have no idea that the bridge is going to be replaced with a high bridge.
3. Many of the affected homeowners may not have the availability of an internet connection or the ability to again access to the site.
4. It would appear from the notice that the pictures of the high bridge using a drone will not be available until the presentation. This makes little sense. Make them available now.
5. The notice references in the next to the last paragraph “these meetings are open to all members of the public.” How will the public learn of these “meetings” and when will the second “meeting” take place.
6. The entire process has been delayed for years through NO fault of the Office of the Monmouth County Engineer, why rush now.

I strongly suggest that you wait a few more weeks and have the meetings in Rumson and Middletown held in person with the availability of social distancing and with real notice to the “public.”

Respectfully,
Thank you for your interest in this important bridge study. Responses to the questions and comments in your August 17 email are listed below and referred to as numbered in your email.

1. The County has been seeking improvements for the Oceanic Bridge for numerous years, however this Local Concept Development Study began in Spring 2016. The Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 was scheduled for March 19, 2020 and had to be postponed due to COVID-19 situation. The postponement notice stated the public would be notified once a new date was determined.

New Jersey guidelines require that public meetings provide notification ten (10) days in advance and to post in two newspapers at a minimum. This PIC was advertised in the legal notices section of the Star Ledger and the Two River Times on August 14, 2020 (14-day advance notice).

2. In addition to the legal notices previously mentioned, a third legal notice was sent to the Independent & Atlantic Hub to post on Wednesday, August 19, 2020. The PIC Notice has also been posted on the municipal websites for the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown, as well as on the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) and Monmouth County websites.

Moreover, a mailing of the PIC notice was sent two weeks in advance of the meeting date to local officials, community stakeholders including property owners within the project limits, and the general public who had provided mailing addresses at prior public outreach meetings, totaling 492. Also an email blast of the PIC Notice was sent on August 13, 2020 to local officials, community stakeholders and the public who provided an email address.

3. Regarding your concern of homeowners that may not have the availability of an internet connection, is addressed in the PIC Notice (3rd paragraph):

   For members of the public without internet access, a copy of the meeting presentation can be mailed to you along with the call-in number. To receive a copy, please contact Fred Passeggio at (732) 431-7760 x6690, or fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us. Please provide your mailing address at least 72 hours before the meeting.

4. Some of the project information is still in review and will not be finalized for presentation until the public meeting. The NJTPA protocol, following with New Jersey guidelines, is to present the information to all members of the public at the time of the public meeting for equal access and not allow early access of project presentation information. This protocol is also to assist in presenting the information with the opportunity to ask questions for better understanding of the Bridge Study information.

5. The initial PIC Notice for March 19, 2020 indicated two sessions to be held in-person, 2-4 p.m. in Rumson and 6-8 p.m. in Middletown. The rescheduled PIC Meeting No. 3 will now be held online in one session with a
longer duration from 4-7 p.m. This rescheduled, online meeting is open to all members of the public, as referenced in the first two paragraphs. All PIC meetings held in the LCD Study and in future phases are open to all members of the public and are made known to the public by the methods described above in points 1 and 2.

6. Monmouth County must comply under the Federal guidelines for the Bridge Study that involves a funding schedule deadline. In order for the Bridge Study tasks to be completed within the FHWA timing requirement and to adhere to restrictions on large gatherings due to COVID-19, this PIC Meeting No. 3 (rescheduled from March 19th) is being held online instead of in person.

Please note, the PIC comment period has been extended from the standard 30-day comment period to 45 days to allow ample opportunity for the public to view the project presentation and handouts on the website after the meeting has been held. (www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com)

Thank you for your understanding. The Project Team looks forward to your attendance at the online PIC meeting on August 27, 2020.

Respectfully,
Fred Passeglio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oceanic Bridge

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Thank you for your recent email. Could you please include in the presentation on Thursday the estimated start date of the construction of the new bridge and the completion date of the removal of the present bridge?

Secondly, have local officials in Middletown and Rumson had meetings with County representatives concerning the preferred alternative?

Respectfully,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #216
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Public Comment

Date: 10/16/2020, 4:26 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

The preferred higher bridge has my support as it will be a one time inconvenience and when completed will do away with having to open the bridge and obvious structural/mechanical issues. It would be beneficial to construct the new bridge alongside the existing bridge and allow the existing bridge to be used during construction.

Sent from my iPhone
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #217
Subject: A Tragedy in the Making

Date: 10/6/2020, 11:42 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

To whom it may concern:

A high, non-opening bridge completely disregards the history, the fabric of the community and landscape and would be a tragic example of 'progress' that merely erases the natural beauty of our environment that is such a resource for the region. Penny wise and pound foolish. Please don’t let it happen.

Respectfully,
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #218
The Rumson Borough Master Plan repeatedly recommends the use of a number of green infrastructure techniques to improve resiliency. These techniques are better at protecting water quality, reducing flood damage and providing necessary habitat for wildlife than the manmade alternatives. The so-called armoring of the shoreline with jetties, seawalls and bulkheads are not only less effective at protecting properties from flood damage and cost significantly more to maintain over time, but they contribute to poor water quality, increased turbidity and reduced habitat and breeding grounds for fish and other marine animals.

As such, we request that the wetlands and living shorelines around the base of the bridge be protected and expanded when possible. We understand that it may be necessary to stabilize portions of the shoreline with retaining walls, but request that living shorelines be established in front of any such walls. There is a unique opportunity on the Middletown side to repurpose the unused road area as a place where kayakers and paddle boarders can access the river safely while establishing a living shoreline that beautifies the area and contributes to improvements in water quality, increased habitat and flood resiliency.

Given the history of struggles with water quality and flood damage in the Navesink River, every effort should be made to utilize proven green infrastructure techniques such as living shorelines to protect our most unique natural resource.
Commenter #219
Subject: Oceanic Bridge -- public comment from
From: [Redacted]
Date: 10/10/2020, 11:54 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
CC: M Cubertson <mcubertson@verizon.net>

October 10, 2020

Mr. Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

As a 50 year resident of NJ, I am writing to express support for the PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 7A - EAST ALIGNMENT WITH THE REPLACEMENT MOVABLE CLEARANCE STRUCTURE at 22 feet ("LOW SPAN BRIDGE").

A LOW SPAN BRIDGE is clearly the appropriate type of structure for several reasons. First, it fits best aesthetically in our rural environment. A higher span bridge is out of place and has the appearance and functionality of a highway which is unnecessary and an eyesore. Due to this ugliness, a high span bridge would have the unintended consequence of potentially harming property values in and around the area. We live here so we care.

Second, the volume of boat traffic requiring the current draw bridge to be opened is minimal, particularly in the off season which is 3/4 of the year. Why would an entire region be subject to a new, unsightly high span bridge simply to accommodate that small number of boaters? In fact, the proposed LOW SPAN BRIDGE appears to be ~10 feet higher than the current bridge, would accommodate, without opening, nearly all of the boats that require today's bridge to be opened. It's so clear that a high span bridge is unnecessary and harms the vast majority of residents and provides an unnecessary convenience to a incredibly small number of boaters.

While I recognize that an operator is required for a LOW SPAN BRIDGE, there are many ways to reduce the number of hours they are required to work thereby reducing the operating expense. This is solvable. Unfortunately, I can't comment on sources of funding (ie, federal vs. state vs. public bonds) possibly influencing decision making as this information was not disclosed to the public. I would like to know more about this and if information can be provided, that would be appreciated.

I also attached an email I sent on August 3, 2017 in connection with a prior request for comment.

I am hopeful that a LOW SPAN BRIDGE is approved and I'm happy to speak with you if you'd like. Thank you.

Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Englehart, Inkyung" <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: August 4, 2017 at 1:30:18 PM EDT
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge -- public comment from [Redacted]

[Redacted]

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

[Signature]

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.
October 10, 2020

Mr. Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

As a 50 year resident of NJ, I am writing to express support for the PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 7A - EAST ALIGNMENT WITH THE REPLACEMENT MOVABLE CLEARANCE STRUCTURE at 22 feet ("LOW SPAN BRIDGE").

A LOW SPAN BRIDGE is clearly the appropriate type of structure for several reasons. First, it fits best aesthetically in our rural environment. A higher span bridge is out of place and has the appearance and functionality of a highway which is unnecessary and an eyesore. Due to this ugliness, a high span bridge would have the unintended consequence of potentially harming property values in and around the area. We live here so we care.

Second, the volume of boat traffic requiring the current draw bridge to be opened is minimal, particularly in the off season which is 3/4 of the year. Why would an entire region be subject to a new, unsightly high span bridge simply to accommodate that small number of boaters? In fact, the proposed LOW SPAN BRIDGE appears to be ~10 feet higher than the current bridge, would accommodate, without opening, nearly all of the boats that require today's bridge to be opened. It's so clear that a high span bridge is unnecessary and harms the vast majority of residents and provides an unnecessary convenience to a incredibly small number of boaters.

While I recognize that an operator is required for a LOW SPAN BRIDGE, there are many ways to reduce the number of hours they are required to work thereby reducing the operating expense. This is solvable. Unfortunately, I can't comment on sources of funding (ie, federal vs. state vs. public bonds) possibly influencing decision making as this information was not disclosed to the public. I would like to know more about this and if information can be provided, that would be appreciated. But I find it hard to believe that the total cost of a LOW SPAN BRIDGE (including an operator) is greater than that of a much larger (and longer to complete) high span bridge. My understanding is that these differences favored a LOW SPAN BRIDGE (including the operator). So bridge economics alone point to a LOW SPAN BRIDGE as the best solution.

I also sent comment on August 3, 2017 in connection with a prior request.
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, New Jersey

I am hopeful that a LOW SPAN BRIDGE is approved and I'm happy to speak with you if you'd like. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Thank you for your comments and questions. The aesthetic features of the bridge have not yet been determined. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

With regard to the movable bridge operation, the determination as to when the movable bridge opens and who determines such actions are determined by the US Coast Guard. Additionally, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative will be presented to NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA before the end of 2020 for approval to advance to the next phase of design, which is Local Preliminary Engineering. If the project is approved to advance, NJTPA will allocate federal funds to pay for the remaining design phases and construction.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
October 16, 2020

Mr. Pesseggio,

Thank you for your reply. I appreciate it. My primary concern, as you read in my letter dated October 10, 2020, is the height of the bridge. The "aesthetic" I'm referring to is having the height fit properly into the current rural environment, not the final architectural design features of the bridge itself. In this case, a LOW RISE BRIDGE is appropriate, whereas a high fixed bridge upwards of 65' would be completely inappropriate. I support the Preliminary Preferred Alternative ("PPA"), just at the lower 22' height.

Also, it is still not clear to me the economics of each PPA alternative and the funding sources. Information on this would be appreciated.

Lastly, can you please confirm which height level of the PPA is recommended by your project team and other government entities. That would be appreciated as well.

Thank you for your work and assistance.
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and question. Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team’s determination that the Preliminary Preferred Alternative is supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable." The Local Concept Development Study for bridge improvements has been conducted by Monmouth County using federal funds. The County will seek to use federal funds for the bridge improvements that advance to the design phase.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #220
as a frequent traveler over the bridge, please agree with compromise at the 45' height to allow views and pedestrian access
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #221
I prefer the 45' high drawbridge.

I oppose the fixed-height bridge.
Commenter #222
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

We strongly agree with the proposal for the 45 foot height NOT the 80 foot height. Noise pollution, optics, and difficulty for walkers/joggers/bikers with the bigger bridge are the main reasons for our position. Thank you.
Commenter #223
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/6/2020

My family lives on [redacted] facing the Navesink, and we have a strong connection with the Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge. We can see it from our living room window. We are constantly crossing over it by car or bicycle, or under it in a boat or kayak.

The profile of the contemplated replacement should be as low as possible, either matching the existing 22' height, or possibly just a few feet higher if it permits a new cohort of boats to pass beneath without raising the bridge. I notice that currently, many of the boats for which the bridge is raised would actually clear the bridge deck if it were just two or three feet higher.

A profile in excess of 80 ft in height would make it difficult for pedestrians, cyclists, and wheelchairs to cross, and would spoil the visual character of the bridge and its surroundings.

At the same time, the logistics of the opening/closing of the moveable section could be made more rational, within limits of maritime regulations. The current situation is absurd. On numerous occasions, I've seen 150 cars and trucks delayed 5 - 10 minutes while the bridge is raised to permit the crossing of a boat's fishing tackle.

A new bridge could have a lighter, faster mechanism for raising and lowering, perhaps with shorter spans (if allowed) to permit more rapid movement. It could be semi-automated, operated by a single individual, or fully automated (it works for railroad crossings). It could also eliminate the two redundant steel gates that are manually opened and closed, currently adding about two minutes to each open/close cycle.

I suspect my suggestions comport with the majority of the others you have received. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Commenter #224
Subject: Public Opinion

Date: 10/19/2020, 5:09 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Good afternoon. As a longtime homeowner in Rumson I’m deeply concerned about the height on the new proposed Oceanic Bridge. Are there any other options? I mean boat traffic doesn’t exist throughout the year so why would we need such a massive structure? Our community has dealt with a draw bridge and there is a charm and a small community feel associated with a more traditional aesthetically pleasing bridge. I think the new bridge would be overwhelming and take so much away from the charm and beauty of our community. I believe it would lend a hand in devaluing our properties. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Thank you for your comments and questions. As part of the Local Concept Development Study, a range of conceptual alternatives were developed with various alignments and three options for bridge type and elevation. The Comparison of Conceptual Alternatives Matrix provides information on the alternatives for consideration. Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's recommendation that Alternative 7A - Modified with a 65 foot underclearance at the navigational channel as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) as supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable." Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #225
I'm a daily user of the bridge, and also a native of the area, a historian, and cultural professional. I advocate for design 7A. It is most in keeping with the general scale of our area. A higher bridge would dwarf the modest hills of the Navesink and be visually intrusive. Also, please take into account the inevitable induced traffic a bridge with no drawbridge and new, faster road surface would have - not something we need given the narrow and curvy feeder roads, especially on the Middletown/Locust side.

I appreciate the wide sidewalks and bikeways. It's an actively used ped and bike route and should remain so.

Is there no thought to having a wider viewing platform somewhere? Since we're building a new bridge, why not create a nice spot halfway across for pedestrian views?
Thank you for your comments and question. The provision of a viewing platform has not fully been determined, and may be considered in the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

**Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for**
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #226
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

Maintain or establish living shorelines along areas around bridge construction as well as abandoned road area west of bridge on Middletown side.
Living Shorelines provide protection from erosion, provide habitat for fish and other wildlife, reduce turbidity (clarity), improve water quality, increase stability and reduce flood damage over time. Evidence shows that living shorelines can outperform hardened shorelines (bulkheads) during storm events.

For decades, the Rumson Master Plan has recognized the land and waters around the Oceanic Bridge as critical environmental areas and has recommended that the borough use green infrastructure techniques such as living shorelines to promote resiliency and improve water quality in the Navesink River. Due to significant damage from flooding during Superstorm Sandy, the borough’s contracted engineers specifically recommended the borough investigate “living shorelines to augment these areas and provide additional shoreline stabilization”. The 2015 Master Plan explains that “living shorelines are an approach to shoreline stabilization that uses wetland plants, submerged aquatic plants, oyster reefs, coir fiber logs, sand fill, and stone to provide shoreline protection and maintain important habitat areas” and recommends that the Borough “maximize the protection of natural drainage features and vegetation”.

Further, the positive benefits to water quality of living shorelines over hardened shorelines are well documented. Given the current degradation of water quality in the Navesink River evidenced by the 2015 NJDEP downgrade of 555 acres to prohibited waters, any further hardening of the shores will have negative impact on these already imperiled waters. In contrast, increased use of living shorelines and wetland protection will help protect and improve water quality. I request that living shorelines are protected and/or established along the base of the bridge on both sides and on the shores of the area that is currently the ramp onto the existing bridge on the Middletown side.

Why are living Shorelines important?
As the area has seen rapid population growth and coastal development, natural shorelines have been replaced with manmade structures such as bulkheads, seawalls and jetties. This “hardening” of the shoreline has contributed to the degradation of water quality, reduction of wildlife habitat, increased damage from flooding and increased maintenance costs. The 2015 Rumson Borough Master Plan recommends the use of a number of green infrastructure techniques to improve resiliency. These techniques are better at protecting water quality, reducing flood damage and providing necessary habitat for wildlife than the manmade alternatives. Below are descriptions of how best management practices such as living shorelines, rain gardens, vegetated filter strips and other green infrastructure techniques protect our way of life.

Fishing: Living Shorelines provide a nutrient rich, protected nursery and habitat for fish to breed and thrive. Replacing the natural wetlands with bulkheads and seawalls create a harsh
environment that reduces the fish population that local fishermen rely on for both tourism and commerce as well as pleasure.

Recreational: Living Shorelines absorbs natural wave action and keeps water clear (reduced turbidity) and supports a healthy ecosystem that maintains water quality for recreational swimmers and boaters. Alternatively, bulkheads can increase wave action that increases turbidity which degrades water quality and can result in murky oxygen deprived waters.

Erosion/flood control: Evidence shows that during major storms, a living, natural shoreline performs better than a hardened shoreline resulting in less property damage and less erosion from flooding.

Cost: Living Shorelines are both beautiful and cost effective. Unlike seawalls and bulkheads that degrade over time and require regular high-cost maintenance, living shorelines not only cost less to install, but much less to maintain as they become stronger over time instead of degrading with age. Installation costs of seawalls and bulkheads are 5 to 10 times that of a new living shoreline and maintenance costs can be 50 to 100 times more.

PROTECT EXISTING LIVING SHORELINES AND ESTABLISH LIVING SHORELINES AROUND THE NEW OCEANIC BRIDGE! Preserve the natural ecology and demonstrated intelligent role nature plays in preserving the natural shorelines and surrounding ecosystems. Manmade solutions are vastly inferior and contribute to the further degradation of our waterways as has been demonstrated in aging bulkheads and other artificial hardening shorelines. The Navesink River is in peril and it's your responsibility to play a role in saving it not destroying it.
Commenter #227
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

Just get busy and build the high bridge! Stop wasting money on studies and patch jobs to the old structure!
Commenter #228
September 18, 2020

Dear [Name of Recipient],

As a Rumson landowner, I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Alternative 7-A Modified. 65' fixed span bridge replacement plan.

The current proposal of a high span fixed bridge is not in keeping with the character and history of Rumson. I do not feel the occasional inconvenience of waiting for the drawbridge is worth the unappealing possibility of a 65 foot, high span bridge spoiling our beautiful view of the river and boats.

I feel the Alternative 7-A modified, 45' high drawbridge is a better replacement option.

Thank you.
Commenter #229
As a longtime resident and landowner in Rumson, I would like to express my opinion on the proposed Oceanic Bridge replacement plan.

I do not wish to see the Oceanic Bridge replaced with Alternative 7-A Modified, 65' fixed span.

I feel that a high span, fixed replacement will completely change the landscape of our community and will detract from the "small town" feeling Rumson residents have always cherished. Having lived in Rumson for over 45 years, I can honestly say that the delays from the drawbridge are usually not a huge inconvenience; the wait time— even during the busy summer season— is rarely over 5 to 10 minutes. That seems like a reasonable price to pay to retain the distinctive charm that a drawbridge brings to our town. In fact, I have found that watching the boats go by and enjoying the beautiful scenery is calming and enjoyable. I'm sure I'm not the only resident or visitor who has felt this way.

Therefore, I would strongly support the Alternative 7-A modified, 45' high drawbridge as the replacement option.

Thank you.
September 16, 2020

Dear [Name],

As a representative of the owner of [Business Name], I am not in favor of the Oceanic Bridge being replaced with a high span, fixed bridge.

[Business Name] patrons and our neighbors often express their appreciation of the small town feeling that Rumson enjoys, and we feel that the proposed replacement bridge will negatively impact this feeling.

I would like to ask the committee to please select the Alternative 7-A modified, 45' high drawbridge as the replacement option.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #231
I hope that the guard walls of the bridge will be solid and higher than the headlights of the biggest truck allowed over the bridge. I don’t want headlights of trucks coming along the curves on the ramp of the bridge to shine into the windows of the houses to the east of the bridge.
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 8/27/2020, 3:57 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

As a resident along the river who is within view of the Oceanic Bridge, I am writing to express my support of the 35 foot drawbridge to replace the existing bridge. I feel that this option will maintain the character of the old bridge, while allowing for the majority of taller boats to pass under the bridge without opening.

This will also allow for pedestrians and cyclists to still cross the river without having an extreme up and down grade.

I actively cross the existing bridge daily either running or cycling to gain access to both Huber and Hartshorn Parks. I also pass underneath the boat often in my boat.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone
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 No. 3 - August 27, 2020

Commenter #233
10/16/2020

I am currently a summer resident and have been a Rumson resident for over 70 years. I disagree with the proposal to replace the current bridge with a low version that requires a span capable of opening for boat traffic. This seems to be counter productive as it requires a paid bridge attendant (most times 2) to be on duty 24/7/365. It also opens the door to high cost repair bills to the mechanicals. The traffic delays, particularly in the summer not only waste every ones time but add to pollution problems and could delay emergency vehicles. I sure would not like to be in the back of an ambulance waiting for a pleasure boat to pass thru the bridge. The whole idea of a low bridge doesn’t seem to make much sense especially if the funding for the bridge is cut by the federal government and thus puts a greater tax burden on the local residents. New Jersey seems to have enough or too many taxes already.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #234
A bridge that doesn't have to go up every time some millionaire wants to take out his yacht?
A bridge that doesn't get stuck in the up right position because it was built when Woodrow Wilson
was President?
A bridge that will actually allow thousands of average people to go about their daily business
uninterrupted?

WHAT A CONCEPT! I have friends around the country who can't believe I live in a part of America
where they still have draw bridges like some third world country!

It's about time! Where do I sign to promote this new bridge project???
Commenter #235
First, thank you for the hard and diligent efforts you are making to secure the lower bridge for our river.

I am a sailor and have traveled under the Oceanic bridge with the bridge up many times. You surely can enjoy a bird’s eye view of the bridge from underneath it. It is actually rather humbling. The boating season is at most six months. The drawbridge concept may cause a small inconvenience to waiting drivers, but when the gates go up, everyone is treated to a magic ride across a broad expanse of fresh water and light.

I am writing to support the building of the lower 45” bridge across the river. One of the most dramatic and magical gifts of a lower bridge (as it is now) is that you can see and feel close to the water as you cross it. The majestic river surrounds you as you cross the bridge and it’s beauty and natural appeal is so beautiful and calming.

Having traveled across the replaced Highlands bridge both by car and on foot, I say it is a frightening and unpleasant crossing on foot. Even in a car, the elevation and the height from the water completely eliminates any natural connection between the water and the crosser.

Keep up good work. How can I help?
Subject: Oceanic Bridge LCD Study: Response to Your 10/16/20 Public Comment Form
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 10:19 PM

Hello

Thank you for your comments and question. As the project advances to the next phase of design, Local Preliminary Engineering, additional public outreach meetings will be held where community input will be requested.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeglio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #236
I'm in support of a 65-ft bridge. Obviously today's modern transportation cannot support an antiquated bridge of yester year, it's just not sustainable for the next 50 years.
I support the 65-ft bridge for traffic reasons alone. Today's modern age cannot sustain an antiquated style bridge. People will get used to it like we got used to the Sandy Hook bridge.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #237
As a resident of Fair Haven and one of the 10,000 people that use this bridge daily I would like the County to consider the 45' foot high option. This would still let the majority of boats to be able to pass yet maintain the traditional aesthetics of the peninsula and Middletown communities. A 80 foot bridge is unnecessary for the area and only benefits a handful of boaters. The steep grade of an 80 foot bridge would make it more dangerous for cars and more difficult for pedestrians to use. While a new bridge is necessary, the proposal of this massive structure does not belong in these communities. I hope you take in considerations from residents in the surrounding areas that will be impacted by this decision. Thank you.
Commenter #238
The reasons for selecting a Low Level Moveable Bridge have been clearly pointed out by the
WE CONCUR WITH THEM ALL.

The residents should not have to live with a monsterous 80+ foot structure defacing the
serene view of the Navesink River.

Senior citizens, who comprise a large portion of walkers, would find great difficulty walking
a long 5% grade. Mothers pushing baby carriages would also have a tough time.

This is not a commercial waterway, or ever likely to be one.

With advances in Artificial Intelligence, the task of bridge opening can be vastly
automated, reducing operational costs and convenience of operation.

The iconic views captured by the Hudson River Artists would be no more with a
high bridge. A historic area would be defaced by the desires of a few....against the
will of the majority who can live and enjoy the beauty of the Navesink River.

Money is only for the moment....Beauty is forever!

NO HIGH BRIDGE.

Respectfully,
Commenter #239
Hello my name is [Redacted] I am [Redacted] generation to Middletown Township and a local business owner of [Redacted]. The Oceanic bridge is one of the most amazing bridges in New Jersey. It is filled with great detail and the surrounding natural landscape and historical feeling would be destroyed if a 81' bridge was to be put in its place instead of the beautiful 45' drawbridge that is there at the present moment. We all agree that the infrastructure is falling into disrepair, but if a larger bridge (81') goes in, it is going to ruin the area that we all call home. As a young lad, I can remember sitting in the car waiting for the bridge to go up and getting out of the car to watch the boats go by, it was a great feeling to be able to wave to all the boats from motor boats to sailboats to jet ski's. If a larger bridge goes in it will ruin that fun tradition for future generations. Another issue we will have is the amount of traffic it will cause to our local streets. The draw bridge allowed people to take their time to get to the places they were headed too. One of my main concerns is how it will affect our water ways and the sea life that live near and around the bridge. A larger bridge needs bigger support beams and larger platforms to hold the bridge in place. A lower bridge doesn't need all the extra bells and whistles. Don't vote for the larger bridge, it will destroy the landscape that many of us love seeing on a daily basis. I love driving over this bridge the way it looks right now. I would rather see you tear it down and wait until you build another draw bridge then to see something that's so big and doesn't belong on this side of town.

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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Commenter #240
The Oceanic Bridge is a priceless visual gem. Yes it needs repair, but please keep it a draw bridge.

Since I was little coming over the iconic bridge to visit [redacted] in Rumson, I was aware of the beauty of the Navesink River.

That visual is only possible with its current height and design.

I now live in [redacted] house in Rumson. I walk over that same bridge almost everyday, able to see brown rays swimming, turtles, and fish jumping, its wonderful!

As I walk I pass many of my neighbors doing the same thing.

If the proposed bridge happens, that will go away for me and many others.

Also I think its important to keep the bridge keepers jobs. They are there working the bridge but also watchful over boaters in distress, alerting police when there is a problem, which I have witnessed.
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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Commenter #241
To Whom It May Concern:

The bridge should be low not high.

The beauty of the surrounding area is much more important than your consideration to have the bridge manually operated. Shorten the times of day when bridge can go up or down. Have it done by appointment and for a fee. An app can do this easily. Have it pay for itself. Reassign the person who raises/Lowers the bright to do something else in the “box” while they man their station. Give them computer work.

Make sure the bridge has walkways and bikeways on BOTH sides. This is not a highway. People walk/bike/run and fish from the bridge. Make it accessible to all to enjoy its beauty and benefits.

Unlike the Rumson seabright bridge, which should be high to reduce traffic congestion, the Rumson locust bridge is rarely raised and lowered. Keep it low.
Thank you for your comments and questions. The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens, who determines such actions, and the charging of an opening fee are determined by the US Coast Guard. Monmouth County does not charge vessels to open the bridge, and it is our understanding that the US Coast Guard does not allow a fee to open a bridge. Additionally, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Sidewalks for pedestrians and shoulders for cyclists will be provided on both sides of the bridge.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #242
My opinion is that the 80ft proposed height is too large, and out of place for the area. Would prefer a smaller bridge, drawbridge or not that is closer in style to the current.
Commenter #243
10/15/2020

An 80 foot bridge would ruin one of the most beautiful spots in NJ. I have been walking, running, biking and driving over that bridge just about every day for 40 years and it’s always amazing. 45 feet is bad enough and will accommodate a great percentage majority of the boats that go under the Oceanic Bridge. People with taller boats can keep them on the other side. The number of people using the top is far greater than the few boats that need 80 feet of clearance.

Please don’t mess this up. We pay a lot to live in this area.
Commenter #244
I oppose the plan to build an 80 ft structure. I live in the Historic District, and use the bridge every single day (on foot and my bike).
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Commenter #245
I live within the historic district and oppose the current replacement bridge plan.
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #246
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 

Mailing Address: 

Email: 

Comments/Suggestions:

I would prefer the 45' high draw bridge option many to maintain the unique historical aesthetic we have on the Navesink.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
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Commenter #247
My name is [Redacted]. I am a resident of Rumson, New Jersey. I believe the lower bridge adds to the historical value and property value of our town and of the town of Middletown/Locust. The view from these locations will not be as charming with a large bridge. The lower bridge creates jobs for local people. The lower bridge also allows for bicyclists and pedestrians to have easy access to and from the two connecting towns.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Sent from my iPhone
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 & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 

Comments/Suggestions:

I believe the lower bridge adds to the historical value of the property in the two connecting towns. The view from these locations will not be as charming with a large bridge. The lower old bridge also creates jobs for local people during a difficult time. The higher bridge will be more difficult to access for physical activity too.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
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Commenter #248
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/14/2020

I am fearful of an 80.96 foot bridge height that the County Plan is suggesting. I am totally satisfied with a 79% boat clearance, which Alternative 7-A offers. I feel as though a higher than 45 foot height bridge would encourage increased larger boat travel than the Navesink River due west of the bridge can support because of residential density and the narrowness of the Navesink River as it approaches Red Bank. Larger boats negatively bring more pollution to the Navesink River. The Alternative 7-A is more harmonious design complimenting the aesthetics and architecture of the historic residential housing along the Navesink River.
Commenter #249
Please don’t make a big mistake by building the bridge that does not fit the community or the width of the river. The proposed 81’ tall bridge is a ridiculous idea. If the reason is to allow bigger boats to sail un-encumbered down the river keep in mind the depth of the river is not changing. Make the bridge 45’ tall with a drawbridge. Keep the river area beautiful!!
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Commenter #250
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

I am opposed to a non-drawbridge span over the Navesink River connecting Rumson and Middletown for replacement of the existing Oceanic Bridge. I favor 45 foot high clearance bridge.
Commenter #251
To Whom It May Concern & It Should Concern Everyone:

What are they doing to this special Two River area? What are they thinking? The proposed design by the Monmouth County Engineering Department to construct a massive bridge to accommodate sailboats and powerboats will definitely destroy the charm and warmth of this very special area where walkers, and bikers and joggers should come before sailboats and powerboats.

The boating season is relatively short; whereas, the people who live here and work here and thrive here are here 365 days a year supporting our beautiful neighborhoods. So shouldn’t their preferences weigh heavily on the final decision.

And please don’t refer to the Atlantic Highlands Bridge and compare the two situations. That bridge comes off of Highway 36. This bridge will span two small, quiet communities.

And if boaters are out enjoying a day on the water, that’s the rush. Waiting for the bridge to open should be a natural part of their boating experience.

I very infrequently go over the Highlands Bridge. I don’t care for it at all. I feel as though I am on a roller coaster until I see the other side. It’s too high, too big, too everything.

In a few words, it was a case of overkill. And, everyone knows it. So, why are you trying to make the same mistake they did? Why don’t you show class, good taste and consideration for the surrounding communities, and do a better job than they did.

Build a new bridge that is complimentary to the area, to the people, and to the boaters. A bridge that will enhance and not detract from the Two River area. A bridge of beauty, style, and grace we can all be proud of. A bridge that will be welcomed and enjoyed by all for many years to come.
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Commenter #252
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

Does the curve length of the 715’ horizontal radius meet the minimum standard?

The PPA link brings you to a profile with 3 options but does not indicate which is the Preliminary Preferred Alternative.

From the other slides it appears that the 65’ fixed bridge is the PPA, it should be noted that hundreds of pedestrians/bikers traverse this bridge on a regular basis. A fixed bridge would also require 5% profile grades in each direction which would inconvenience these pedestrians and also present a potential hazard for vehicle in terms of stopping sight distance especially during inclement weather. Is it really worth the extra cost and safety hazard to provide clearance for a few sailboats to pass under the bridge per summer? This is not a shipping route.
Subject: Oceanic Bridge LCD Study: Response to Your 10/13/20 Public Comment Form
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2/2020, 10:12 PM

CC: 

Hello 

Thank you for your comments and questions. The curve length of 715 feet on the Rumson side of the bridge exceeds the NJDOT minimum standard. Additionally, The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) is Alternative 7A - Modified, which is a fixed span bridge alternative with a navigational channel underclearance of 65 feet.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #253
10/15/2020

I have been a resident of Rumson for 71 years. The Oceanic bridge has been an important part of Rumson history. Just in my family alone there have been [redacted] engagements [redacted] announcements of pregnancies and the countless walks across the bridge talking about life. [redacted] moves to Florida in 1976 and we purchased their house. Whenever they came to visit, after picking them up from the airport, I would have to come through Locust so we would cross over the Oceanic Bridge. [redacted] always said it was the prettiest and most peaceful entry to Rumson. To replace the bridge with a span that looks like the Highlands Bridge would be divesting Rumson of one of its most charming attributes. I think the people whose boats are too big to go under that bridge should either dock their boats in Sea Bright or pay a fee to utilize the span opening. In closing I ask you to consider our history and leave that bridge as is. Thank you.
Commenter #254
I can't think of a financial or practical reason for this bridge to be 80 feet high. It definitely could benefit from being raised up slightly for boat traffic underneath but 80 feet would be obnoxious and likely very costly. I believe most residents of the area would agree with this takeaway and ask for the height to be reconsidered significantly. Thanks
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #255
The proposed 80ft high bridge is way too high for the area. My family commutes over the bridge, run/bikes over the bridge, and boats under it. There is no need for a bridge of this height and will ruin the recreational aspect let alone look terrible. The traffic that builds up when the bridge is up isn't that bad and only a slight inconvenience in a person's day.
Commenter #256
9/12/2020

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is to formally express my sincere hope that the proposed preliminary preferred alternative to the Oceanic Bridge will be scrapped and reconsidered. The current proposal has not taken into consideration the environment and the shorelines along the areas around the bridge...the living shorelines provide protection from erosion, reduce turbidity, improve water quality, increase stability while reducing flood damage over time. Moreover, the living shorelines provide a habitat for fish and other wildlife. I feel it is our duty to give voice to these living shorelines - they need to be protected. If not, you are simply trading one problem for an even bigger one.

Respectfully,

[Name Redacted]
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #257
The proposal for a bridge that is significantly higher off the water and significantly longer than the present design effectively replaces a pedestrian-friendly design with one that is much less inviting, all in the interest of lower cost and more efficient traffic flow. All in all, my comments, included below, have not changed from those that I sent to the Rumson Borough Council fifteen years ago:

May 4, 2005

Mayor [blacked out] and Borough Council

Mayor [blacked out] 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,
Commenter #258
Subject: oceanic bridge proposal

Date: 10/16/2020, 7:13 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Hello, I am strongly opposed to the 65 ft fixed span. It does not fit or work with the community aesthetics and usage. I also do not agree with the height for walkers or bikers. I would be in agreement with the 45 ft height, as a compromise. Why should taxpayers and extra $$$ be spent to benefit the height of a few boats? (and I am a boat owner). Let them dock elsewhere. I do agree with the width-2 lanes with bike/pedestrian lanes on either side is great!

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
Thank you for your comments and question. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states "If a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." This letter can be found on the project website at the following address: [http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NITPA.pdf](http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NITPA.pdf). Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team's determination that the PPA is supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable."

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #259
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Proposal

Date: 10/16/2020, 7:11 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

I strongly oppose the 60 plus feet options presented. Way too high— not necessary given the low volume of boats that need that type of clearance. A lower, 40 foot option should suffice. For the handful of boats that need more than a 40 foot clearance, it is not worth the obtrusive imposition of a monstrous structure on a landmark river that when you google it, is listed as one of the top 10 most scenic rivers in the country. This river is an aesthetic, social and economic asset to this region of New Jersey. Please do not ruin it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #260
10/16/2020

I commend the choice of the 65-foot clearance for the new bridge
MONMOUTH COUNTY
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Commenter #261
Hello,

My comments are attached below but if anyone in the office is interested and has time to read this, I suggest they find the URL link to an article in Traditional Building Magazine. This is not an endorsement of the lead design firm mentioned in the article but the recently completed restoration of the Longfellow Bridge over the Charles River between Boston and Cambridge is a good example of the motivation for my comments. Iconic public infrastructure is worth preserving.

Best of luck to everyone involved in this important project,

(former ________ and lover of all things Navesink, Shrewsbury & Sandy Hook)
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 

Comments/Suggestions:

As planning progresses, I suggest it's very important to maintain appreciation that from an aesthetic perspective the bridge is excellent design. It fits into the landscape beautifully. So much of our public infrastructure N&N in the WPA era is rich in form & function excellence but it's a heritage that sometimes is discarded for financial, bottom line reasons. I encourage all principals in this process to stay as close as possible to the original book of the bridge as a good civic pride gift & example to future generations.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyocceanicbridge@gmail.com
Morning

Thank you for your comments. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
I think alternative 7-A with a 45 ft. max height at the drawbridge would be a much better option for the area in the long run.
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Commenter #262
LIVING SHORELINES

The Rumson Borough Master Plan repeatedly recommends the use of a number of green infrastructure techniques to improve resiliency. These techniques are better at protecting water quality, reducing flood damage and providing necessary habitat for wildlife than the manmade alternatives. The so-called armoring of the shoreline with jetties, seawalls and bulkheads are not only less effective at protecting properties from flood damage and cost significantly more to maintain over time, but they contribute to poor water quality, increased turbidity and reduced habitat and breeding grounds for fish and other marine animals.

As such, we request that the wetlands and living shorelines around the base of the bridge be protected and expanded when possible. We understand that it may be necessary to stabilize portions of the shoreline with retaining walls, but request that living shorelines be established in front of any such walls. There is a unique opportunity on the Middletown side to repurpose the unused road area as a place where kayakers and paddle boarders can access the river safely while establishing a living shoreline that beautifies the area and contributes to improvements in water quality, increased habitat and flood resiliency.

Given the history of struggles with water quality and flood damage in the Navesink River, every effort should be made to utilize proven green infrastructure techniques such as living shorelines to protect our most unique natural resource.

LIGHTING

Intense blue and white lights have a negative effect on a wide variety of fish, birds and marine animals. The light can disorient migratory birds causing them to veer off their path and can perish when they become lost and fatigued. Bright lights can disorient hatching turtles and cause them to leave shore nests at night and waddle into danger. These are just a few examples.

Not only is our area part of the Atlantic Flyway which provides migratory layovers for millions of birds, but the Navesink is home to several species on the endangered or threatened species list including the Osprey, Least Tern, Black Skimmer and the Black-crowned Night Heron as well as the Diamond Back Terrapin

We request that the lighting on the new bridge utilize yellow or green lights designed with wavelengths less disruptive to wildlife as opposed to white and blue lights. We also request that the final design include down-shielding of the lighting to eliminate horizontal glare and all light directed upward.
Commenter #263
The bridge should be raised no higher than 45 feet- 65 feet is ridiculous! Not only would it destroy the beautiful, serene view of the river but would destroy the walking and biking benefits. It is a beautiful walk over the bridge and one which I do several times of the week, along with many others in the community, and 65 feet would not be pleasurable.

In addition the 45 foot bridge would serve 97% of the boats which pass thru- the others could dock their boats in the many marinas in the area. Why should 3% destroy the pleasure the rest of the community gets from the 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #264
Mr. Passeggio -- I am writing to express my support for a 35 foot high drawbridge over the Navesink River to replace the outdated Oceanic Bridge between Rumson and Middletown. I believe a 35 foot height is necessary as a prudent accommodation to the vehicular and boat traffic that will intersect at this important structure for decades to come. This height allowance will significantly reduce the required openings, thereby ensuring a more steady flow of traffic and reduced maintenance expense going forward. Such a structure should have virtually no adverse visual impact. I am hopeful that the replacement of this structure may occur soon, as the present bridge is completely worn out. Thank you.
I believe that a 45' drawbridge is much more in keeping with the current aesthetic of the area and represents an acceptable compromise to reduce traffic delays due to openings while undoubtedly providing lower costs due to less maintenance than the current structure. An 80' fixed span is simply out of place in this area. I wouldn't want to try to drive over an 80' fixed span when it is snow-covered.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #265
The presentation was well thought out and detailed. I agree with the design as is and recommendations. It would be better if we could speed up the pace and construction, but understand that these things take a long time.
Please keep the public posted on developments including resolutions of support and other ways for the public to contribute.
Best regards,
Commenter #266
My general comment is that the proposed bridge, a fixed span with 65' clearance, will be worse for the bicyclists and pedestrians who currently use the bridge. Bicycle usage has increased dramatically recently, and it's very important to take into account the difficulty of crossing this proposed bridge for most people on bikes.

My other comment is regarding the current approach to the bridge on the north side. The pavement is in very bad condition, making it rather treacherous for bicycles. It should be repaired soon, and not wait until the bridge is complete.
Commenter #267
Dear [Name],

As Manager of [Company Name] in Rumson, I would like to express my opinion on the proposed replacement plan for the Oceanic Bridge. I do not want to see the bridge replaced with a high span, fixed bridge.

Our customers enjoy their [Treats] treats on our outside benches with the view of the Oceanic Bridge, exclusively now, due to Covid-19. A 65' high span, fixed bridge would ruin the view and the relaxing experience of watching the boats on the river.

I think the alternative plan - a 45' high drawbridge - would be much better suited to the residents and businesses in Rumson.

Regards,

[Signature]
Commenter #268
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

I have lived in town for the last 40 years and we are currently in the process of buying a property on the Navesink River.
We would hate to see the charm of the existing draw bridge replaced with your proposed much higher fixed bridge. We much prefer the lower 45' high Drawbridge of Alternative 7A.
Please reconsider making this unnecessary drastic change to our charming and beautiful town.

Many thanks
Commenter #269
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)

On Bingham Avenue - Locust Point Road (CR&6A) over the Navesink River
Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown, New Jersey

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – P1CMtg3 Comment Form - 8/27/2020

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: 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:

A new bridge is an opportunity to utilize green infrastructure techniques to protect the Navesink River ecosystem and enhance the shoreline habitat as well. Small changes can result in immense environmental improvements.

As a resident of Monmouth County for 35 years (26 of which are in the Rumson peninsula), and an educator at [Redacted], I realize how critical shoreline protection is. Too often, standard coastal structures such as seawalls and bulkheads have been erected; these create a harsh environment which diminishes the adjacent shoreline habitat and does not promote long-term stability. Water quality degradation and increased flooding result as well, raising overall costs and reducing effectiveness.

Green infrastructure techniques, such as establishing Living Shorelines, are better for maintaining coastline stability and decreasing flood damage. Such techniques should be part of the new Oceanic bridge development. They are also more cost effective to install and maintain.

The inclusion of Living Shorelines would provide stabilization of the shore from erosion due to waves, boat wakes, intense storms, and sea-level rise. Installing a natural living shoreline includes planting marsh and submerged aquatic vegetation, installing organic substrates like fiber mats or bio-log, and adding natural breakwaters such as oyster reefs. This flexible protection will absorb and dissipate wave energy before it reaches the shoreline, prolonging its stability.

These living shorelines will also provide additional habitat for fish and other wildlife. They will serve as a protected nursery for fish and crustaceans to breed, as well as contribute a nutrient-rich habitat for a variety of marine life including shellfish. The living shoreline functions as a filter to improve water quality by reducing turbidity and trapping particles. So many benefits to both the ecosystems and anyone who enjoys river activities! The NJDEP, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Rumson Master Plan all strongly encourage using green infrastructure like Living Shorelines.

In addition to installing green infrastructure, native plantings should be mandated as well in areas around the bridge construction on both sides, and the abandoned road area west of the bridge on the Middletown side. Native plants are tolerant of the conditions existing here, and thus are much more resilient. Having evolved here, they are compatible with the existing soils, water, temperatures, and weather patterns. Native plants provide food and habitat for the pollinators, birds, and wildlife who have evolved along with them. They are attractive flowering plants, grasses, and shrubs that are easier to grow and are more durable during harsh growing seasons, thereby reducing maintenance costs while still providing bank erosion control and year-round landscaping benefits. Native plants do not require fertilizers or pesticides to grow, which can cause detrimental runoff into the river. They are not invasive, so will not threaten the ecosystem. Requiring the use of native plants for the Oceanic Bridge construction project will provide cost-effective long-term benefits and beauty for the wildlife as well as motorists, pedestrians, and the many people who love the river.

Please note that these comments will be submitted via mail as well as email.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: 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:

A new bridge is an opportunity to utilize green infrastructure techniques to protect the Navesink River ecosystem and enhance the shoreline habitat as well. Small changes can result in immense environmental improvements.

As a resident of Monmouth County for 35 years (26 of which are in the Rumson peninsula), and an educator at [Redacted], I realize how critical shoreline protection is. Too often, standard coastal structures such as seawalls and bulkheads have been erected; these create a harsh environment which diminishes the adjacent shoreline habitat and does not promote long-term stability. Water quality degradation and increased flooding result as well, raising overall costs and reducing effectiveness.

Green infrastructure techniques, such as establishing Living Shorelines, are better for maintaining coastline stability and decreasing flood damage. Such techniques should be part of the new Oceanic bridge development. They are also more cost effective to install and maintain.

The inclusion of Living Shorelines would provide stabilization of the shore from erosion due to waves, boat wakes, intense storms, and sea-level rise. Installing a natural living shoreline includes planting marsh and submerged aquatic vegetation, installing organic substrates like fiber mats or bio-logs, and adding natural breakwaters such as oyster reefs. This flexible protection will absorb and dissipate wave energy before it reaches the shoreline, prolonging its stability.

These living shorelines will also provide additional habitat for fish and other wildlife. They will serve as a protected nursery for fish and crustaceans to breed, as well as contribute a nutrient-rich habitat for a variety of marine life including shellfish. The living shoreline functions as a filter to improve water quality by reducing turbidity and trapping particles. So many benefits to both the ecosystems and anyone who enjoys river activities! The NUDEP, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Rumson Master Plan all strongly encourage using green infrastructure like Living Shorelines.
In addition to installing green infrastructure, native plantings should be mandated as well in areas around the bridge construction on both sides, and the abandoned road area west of the bridge on the Middletown side. Native plants are tolerant of the conditions existing here, and thus are much more resilient. Having evolved here, they are compatible with the existing soils, water, temperatures, and weather patterns. Native plants provide food and habitat for the pollinators, birds, and wildlife who have evolved along with them. They are attractive flowering plants, grasses, and shrubs that are easier to grow and are more durable during harsh growing seasons, thereby reducing maintenance costs while still providing bank erosion control and year-round landscaping benefits. Native plants do not require fertilizers or pesticides to grow, which can cause detrimental runoff into the river. They are not invasive, so will not threaten the ecosystem. Requiring the use of native plants for the Oceanic Bridge construction project will provide cost-effective long-term benefits and beauty for the wildlife as well as motorists, pedestrians, and the many people who love the river.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E. 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  monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Hello,

Thank you for your comments. You're correct in your assessment that native planting are preferred, and we will explore the use of green infrastructure in consultation with the permitting agencies during Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #270
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/11/2020

[Redacted]

As a taxpayer and concerned citizen I stand against the plan to increase the vertical height of the Oceanic 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #271
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

[Redacted]

Dear Project manager

I am not in favor of the proposal of a fixed span bridge - as it will take away from the character of existing environment .. I am in favor of replacing the bridge with what we have today ..

One further suggestion is to enforce the coast guard rules that requires boaters take down outriggers and not request an opening if not needed.. I understand this would eliminate over 50% of the openings .. Why this is not enforced is beyond me ..

Sincerely

[Redacted]
Commenter #272
Dear [Name]

As a resident of Rumson my whole life, I would like to weigh in on the bridge replacement plans for the Oceanic Bridge.

I am not in favor of the high span, fixed bridge that has been suggested. I believe the drawbridge plan that is an alternative would be much more suitable to the town of Rumson.

Thank you.
Commenter #273
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/7/2020

Please replace with another drawbridge. An 80 foot bridge would not only be ugly but extremely dangerous. There is no high approach on either side. The people in this community enjoy biking, walking and jogging over the low bridge. That includes families, moms with strollers, children, older folk, etc. It is a quality of life issue. A steep bridge would eliminate its accessibility to most of our community.

Thank you.
Commenter #274
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/11/2020

We support a fixed bridge replacement for Oceanic bridge.

10,000 vehicles cross the bridge every day, causing traffic delays, in both directions, with the current draw bridge. Any type of draw bridge will cause traffic delays.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #275
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: ____________________________
Mailing Address: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

Prior to the meeting on 8-27-2020, I was "keep the bridge as is."

Now after the presentation, which was very good, I suggest the
7 feet proposal. My concerns are the height. I think 65’
is a bit of overkill for this area of Middletown & Rumson.
Navesink River is used for recreational water vehicles not
Serries or "ships". The Army Corps of Engineers planned the
Re 36 Sandy Hook bridge & the Re 35 Belmar bridge - both
huge & don't represent the needs of the patrons of the Oceanic
Bridge. Both are pretty ugly! I suggest either a 22’ height that
can be opened or a 45’ which could be stationary or moveable.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

[Signature]

Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – PIC3 Comment Form - 8/27/2020
At one point you were thinking about a 4-lane bridge - really? The most traffic I have seen on the bridge is 1. Ferry time both mornings and evenings - the other times seem to warrant 4 lanes!
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and question. During the Local Concept Development Study, the Project Team looks at what possible improvements are needed and has only proposed one roadway lane in each direction on the Oceanic Bridge. A shoulder is proposed between the roadway lane and the sidewalk on each side of the bridge for safety as part of the recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA).

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #276
10/6/2020

Just doing some quick math, I estimated that I have been over the bridge about 4,000 times in my 35 years of life. I would say half of those times coming around the bend and looking East to Rumson, I say to myself "I am so lucky that I grew up in such a beautiful area."

The bridge now seems pretty close to perfect if you ask me -- so I ask you not to change the height and if you have to -- please stop at the midsize. I think the high size could seriously change the look and feel of the two rivers area!
I would like to see a new bridge rebuilt or a major overhaul.... The important thing is to maintain the same visual integrity.... Low bridge, old style...

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

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #278
Dear Fred, I live at [Redacted], Locust, due east of the bridge and our view is due west up the Navesink. I was handed a comment sheet by one of the [Redacted] the other day and was asked to send in a negative comment regarding the latest (and hopefully the final) design for the bridge replacement. I am totally in favor of the design as is shown on the county website specifically the one with the 65' height. Any lower bridge that would require a draw span would be unacceptable to me as it would cause unnecessary traffic delays and labor costs to nab it. I think the new design is absolutely fine and doesn't "spoil our view". I actually see no difference in our view with the existing or the proposed. I wish this new bridge had been built 10 years ago which would have saved the tax payers a lot of money in constant repairs that are now necessary to keep the old bridge in service. Let's get it built!

Sincerely, [Redacted]
Subject: S-31 Oceanic Bridge

Date: 10/2/2020, 10:13 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I have viewed the proposed bridge and am in favor of it. I leave due east of the bridge [redacted] in Locust.
Commenter #279
45' high water clearance draw bridge. This is a gateway to recreational parks and trails. Walkers, bikers and other means of transportation should not be prohibited from crossing this bridge due to a steep grade.
Commenter #280
Subject: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge comments

Date: 9/19/2020, 6:25 PM
To: <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Sirs,

As background, I have been a life long resident of the Two Rivers area, I am a resident of Navesink for 25+ years, I have travelled the bridge 2X/Day for those 25+ years, and I am active boater on the Navesink River. So i have looked at, travelled over it and under it for over 40 years, hopefully that gives me some perspective on the varied stakeholders interests.

I understand that there are many stakeholders, each with their own interest, some are mutual and some are not. Therefore I believe that Alternative 7-A Modified with a 45' Draw Bridge is clear choice. This design is the design compromise and best aligns all interested parties.
9/19/2020

Dear Sirs,

As background, I have been a life long resident of the Two Rivers area, I am a resident of Navesink for 25+ years, I have travelled the bridge 2X/Day for those 25+ years, and I am active boater on the Navesink River. So I have looked at, traveled over it and under it for over 40 years, hopefully that gives me some perspective on the varied stakeholders interests.

I understand that there are many stakeholders, each with their own interest, some are mutual and some are not. Therefore I believe that Alternative 7-A Modified with a 45' Draw Bridge is clear choice. This design is the design compromise and best aligns all interested parties.

Respectfully,
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) LCD Study – Public Information Center Meeting – 3/19/20

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 & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 
Comments/Suggestions:

Having been a lifelong resident of the Two Rivers area, having lived in Navesink for 25 years, and travelled over the bridge 2x/day for that period of time, as well as having a boat in the Navesink, the choice is clear to me that Alternative 7-A modified with a 45' draw bridge achieves the proper compromise and balances all interested stakeholders interests.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
Commenter #281
Thank you for organizing this presentation, Martine. I found the simulations/animations especially helpful. My address is [REDACTED] and I am wondering if it would be possible to have a simulation/animation done from my property to gauge how the new bridge will impact our view of the river, etc. I believe my neighbor [REDACTED] may ask for the same thing, so perhaps we could combine both properties into one project. Please let me know if you think this would be possible. [REDACTED]
Subject: Comment on the proposed bridge

Date: 10/12/2020, 11:20 AM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

I currently have a residence [residential address redacted] and I am very concerned the new bridge as proposed will alter/block my current view of the Navesink River. As such, the new bridge will likely result in lowering my property value and therefore, I support replacement of the existing bridge with a lower, modern drawbridge. Thank you very much.
Good afternoon, Martine......I have previously asked the County if they might be able to provide me (and my neighbor) with a simulation of what the new bridge, as proposed, would look like from our properties. I have heard nothing back from them which, I suppose, is not surprising. Do you know the firm that did the study and, if so, do you have contact information for them? Thank you.
Good morning.......I am a new resident in Locust. I listened to the August presentation about the new bridge and would like to know if you can provide me with contact information for the firm that did the animated simulations in the presentation. Thank you very much.
Thank you for your comments and question. The digital representations were prepared to illustrate how the new bridge would look using general views from the north, east, south and west, and not necessarily to be from a specific location. The Project Team's prime consultant, Michael Baker International, Inc. prepared the digital representations.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #282
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

I prefer the 45' high drawbridge of Alternative 7A-- OPPOSE the fixed-height bridge!
Commenter #283
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

9/1/2020

Let's do a major revision on the bridge, we don't need another one. Stop wasting our tax dollars.
Commenter #284
Subject: 65foot clearance bridge

Date: 10/17/2020, 12:04 AM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

There is a trend to have less and less access to our river and Bayshore area. We should install a bridge with a 65 foot clearance to keep more boating possible and create a breathtaking vista for everyday.

Sent from my iPad
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/17/2020

There is a trend to have less and less access to our river and Bayshore area.
We should install a bridge with a 65 foot clearance to keep more boating possible and create a
breathtaking vista for everyday.
Commenter #285
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

Just build a new bridge already! I feel like my life is on the line each time I have to cross that bridge. Its rotting underneath (as seen on many a boat ride). The patchwork of “fixes” is ridiculous. They replaced the Highlands bridge in less than 3 years. This replacement should have been done years ago. It’s in worse shape than the Highlands bridge ever was. Stop catering to the rich folks concerned about their “view”. This is about safety. Why are you waiting for a tragedy to happen? Replace it!!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #286
My husband and I live in Fair Haven and (used to) use this bridge daily when commuting into the city via [redacted] I support the 45' bridge alternative - even if it means there may be more traffic. This is much more in line with the traditional aesthetic of the towns and will still allow people to walk or bike on the 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #287
Subject: Webinar

Date: 8/28/2020, 8:03 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Good job with the webinar.
Good choice with the preferred alternative.
Commenter #288
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/13/2020

I have lived in Rumson for 43 years, during which over half of that time, I owned a boat. The
Navesink River is an absolute treasure! Please do not damage the beauty and experiences of
traveling that waterway, with an 80' High fixed span bridge. The history of the area, still reflected
in most of the remaining original homes along the river, does not need an 80' High concrete
monument as its centerpiece!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #289
Subject: Oceanic Bridge S-31 LCD Study - Comment

Date: 10/12/2020, 10:08 PM
To: monmouthcountyoeanicbridge@gmail.com

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safe
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Thank you for your time and patience during this process. You and your team have been extremely professional during the PIC meetings setting a tone that is civil and constructive, thank you again.

As someone who lives in close proximity to the Oceanic Bridge this conversation is very important to my wife and I. We’re on the Navesink River most days either Stand Up Paddle boarding, fishing or taking in the sunset. As near and dear as the Oceanic Bridge is to us we are very aware of the need for a new bridge. The rational for the taller, more affordable, fixed bridge makes perfect sense. It would seem like this is a decision that has already been reached. I’m afraid however that simple math(and practicality) of this decision does not take in the full emotional temperature of the people that live here. I repeatedly heard person after person voice a desire to have a bridge that is modeled on the existing bridge design. I realize most people have an emotional attachment to the place they live but I do think that the Navesink River is a unique setting and a unique situation. The beauty of the River has attracted a diverse and successful mix of residents. Since so many have voiced a preference for one design over the other I can’t help but think there has to be another option. It would seem to me that if the community was able to come together to fund(or offset additional costs) a bridge that is in keeping with the design of the current one should be seriously considered.

I’m sure there are members of the community that are "out of the box" thinkers who could fundraise, lobby and grant write to offset costs. It would seem like a worthy endeavor. How would something along these lines have to work for your team to actually consider it viable? A 65’ foot span of highway just seems like a mistake here.

Any help or advice in pursuing a lower drawbridge design is greatly appreciated.

Thanks very much,
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and questions. The currently recommended PPA has an estimated construction cost of $145 million. Due to the estimated amount to replace the Oceanic Bridge, Monmouth County is seeking federal funding to replace the bridge. In addition to the initial construction cost, the Project Team considered life cycle costs for each alternative. Monmouth County has considered all possible funding sources that it is aware of.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #290
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/10/2020

My input on the design of the Oceanic Bridge should be kept to the 45’ clearance Drawbridge not the 80.96’ that is being proposed. Please keep the community that this bridge serves in mind as we build out the replacement of our aging infrastructure. The proposed design is not needed and the small percentage of boat owners who the 45’ bridge design won’t accommodate should not outweigh the community’s wishes of a more aesthetically design for the area.

Thank you.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #291
The idea of a 45' draw bridge is a good alternative. However the cost of maintaining the draw bridge compared to the higher bridge financially doesn’t seem like a positive idea. Both look fine in the location and I feel that the 45" draw bridge would require additional maintenance and we would be looking at what we are dealing with the existing bridge we have down the road.
Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #292
please do not move forward with this project. There is enough boat traffic ready on the river. It will obstruct the view of those who have paid for it in their home purchase. While a new bridge is necessary one that high is not.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #293
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 & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions
Please use the space below to provide comments or suggestions (Please print legibly):

Name:
Mailing Address:
Email:

Comments/Suggestions:

Living on the river, just a few houses from the bridge, I was surprised to see the
bridge opening on demand --- and not on a schedule... It looks like many unnecessary openings.
I am very concerned about the necessity of a
new bridge! Perhaps a "like" bridge can
be built adjacent to the old with a limit on
scheduled openings ---- or large boats
should be docked all to the east of
bridge in Seabright Atlantic Highlands etc.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 10/15/2020, 10:14 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I live at [redacted] with a close and direct view of our bridge. The current bridge is graceful and inobtrusive, however it was clear from the webinar that a replacement at 22’ height will not be an option. It is such a beautiful walk over the river. Although a 22’ operational (has A I been considered?) bridge would be my first choice (but with timed openings when needed), it sounded as though the decision has already been made to have a 65’ high bridge the replacement.

During the discussion, it was stated that a 45’ high bridge would accommodate 80-97 % of boats currently using the Navasink. It seems the obvious compromise, and I hope it is seriously being considered. A lower bridge is much friendlier both in use and appearance and keeps in scale with its surroundings.

65’ high is Only necessary for A very few boats and For such a few months of the year! It makes no sense to intrude on our beautiful river valley with such a Dominating structure. The army corps of engineers has not taken the “neighborhood” into consideration.

Just Because there is room to accommodate the massive bridge... does not mean it is right for our community.

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and question. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." Any bridge height below 65 feet would require a movable bridge. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Paseggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #294
As a Rumson native, an Atlantic Highlands resident 20 years, and an avid Navesink waterman and cyclist, my family and I are pleased daily users of the oceanic bridge - long a fixture through my entire life.

I recall well the local community resistance the modular Highlands Bridge. However, that bridge now generates many benefits and few down-sides. (1) Better traffic flow, (2) Better safety for pedestrians and cyclists, (3) better air quality, (4) Few disruptions, (5) time savings and time is money which returns to the local economy, and (6) it's a graceful, visual improvement over the old bridge.

I would support a non-opening modular bridge to replace the oceanic bridge if we can obtain federal funds. The increased grade will not be a major issue for pedestrians, runners, or cyclists, as it has not on the highlands bridge. Instead it will dramatically increase the non-vehicle use of the bridge as well as the beauty of the area, which is one of the most beautiful places in the USA. (I kayak there nearly every evening 9 months a year).

Thanks for including my comments and I'm sorry that I did not know about the survey.
Commenter #295
I would love to see a less Grand option. Something that would not take away the beauty of this bridge and river.
Commenter #296
Dear [Name],

As a lifelong resident of Rumson, I would like the committee to know that I am not in favor of the Oceanic Bridge being replaced with a high span fixed bridge.

The alternative 46' drawbridge plan seems much more in keeping with Rumson’s history and community to me.

Thank you.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #297
Good evening,
I am writing to express my deep opinion that am very much against building a huge concrete bridge over the Navesink. I am in favor of the 45 foot high drawbridge of alternative 7A. I grew up in this area and have many wonderful memories of walking across the drawbridge eating ice cream while we watched the sailboats go under the drawbridge. Please don't destroy such a lovely area with some giant megalith.
Thank you very much.
Sincerely,
Commenter #298
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

[Redacted]

Per my letter to Mr. Passeggio, P.E., I believe the Rumson, Navesink and Locust communities, as well as other communities in Monmouth County would be best served by a 45 foot height bridge, retaining an opening capability for the remaining three percent or so of the vessels which would require it. There are many bicyclists, senior walkers, etc., for whom this would be preferable.

Thanks in advance for your interest and responsiveness.
Commenter #299
I am in favor of the lower bridge option. I think it will be more aesthetically pleasing and more accessible for walkers and bikers.

Since even the lower bridge option will be higher (45 foot high water clearance) than the current bridge, the majority of boats on the Navesink River will be able to pass under without needing to open the bridge. Since only a few boats will need to open the bridge it may be possible to have it open by appointment. This way a bridge tender would not have to sit there all day. Perhaps a 24 hour advance call would suffice. It could be further restricted to certain times of the day. An hour in the morning, an hour in the early afternoon, and an hour in the evening. But the bridge tender would only be there if an appointment has been made ahead of time.

If the opening request are of a rare nature, maybe allow an appointment anytime between some AM and PM time, rather then restricting it to a specific hour in the AM, early PM, and evening. This would give boaters with a tall mast more flexibility to schedule an opening time.

In the summer months there may be merit in having a full time bridge tender. But I think the appointment plan would suffice during the rest of the year.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #300
New Jersey is supposed to go big on renewable energy (50% by 2035?) Since you are dealing with a tidal river, and pouring tons of concrete for a new bridge, why not make one of the underpasses a flywheel/paddlewheel type energy/electricity producing device? I'm sure the Army Corp. of Engineers has a chapter on that in one of their manuals. Produce electricity = defray some of cost of bridge upkeep/personnel. I like the lower level 22' bridge design, like the one we have now.
Commenter #301
10/15/2020

I support the low bridge proposal
Commenter #302
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

I support the choice of the 65-foot clearance for the new bridge.
Commenter #303
Please replace the current bridge with a crawl bridge that is similar size to what is now in place. 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

Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #304
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/15/2020

I am strongly opposed to the c.80' fixed height bridge (Alternative 7-A Modified)
to replace the current Oceanic Bridge.
The c.45' drawbridge (Alternate 7-A) is a much better proposal.
Sincerely,

Oceanic Bridge has two plaques from 1939.
They should be saved and incorporated into the new 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #305
Dear Mr. Passeggio & others concerned,

I just want to quickly reiterate my primary points from the "Community Input Survey:"

* I periodically ride my bicycle over the bridge, and it is well past the point of being safely repaired. My boater friends, who clearly see the bottom of the bridge, confirm that a full replacement is the only option.
* It would be a great travesty, and further proof that money far outweighs logic and justice in our state and county, if anything but a fixed-span bridge replaced the current bridge. There is more than enough room for a fixed-span bridge with a safe slope while another drawbridge, with frequent openings during the summer, is a traffic and environmental disaster. As was recently demonstrated with the new Highlands-Sea Bright Bridge, a community-fitting, fixed-span bridge can be designed and built in the face of "loud minority" NIMBY complaints.

If you'd like any additional information, please just let me know.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #306
I am a homeowner a few blocks from the bridge. I am opposed to the 81' high non-opening structure and am in favor of an intermediate drawbridge with 45 feet of clearance for boats as opposed to the 22 feet we have now. While the tall bridge worked in Highlands, the Oceanic Bridge at that height does not fit into the neighborhood!
Commenter #307
To Whom It May Concern:

I support Alternative 7-A with up to a 45' high water clearance drawbridge to replace the historic Oceanic Bridge between Rumson and Navasink/Middletown.

I strongly oppose Alternative 7-A with an 81' high fixed-span bridge.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #308
Please make this bridge the 45’ high version. It fits very well. the 80’ high bridge doesn’t fit in with the surroundings at all.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #309
The higher bridge will be an eyesore! A lower, 45’ high clearance, movable bridge is much more in line with the 2 Historic Districts on either side of the water. We are boaters and 45’ high water level clearance is more than sufficient - it will let 79%-97% of all boat traffic pass through it without having to open the bridge.

Not to mention, a midlevel movable bridge will have a grade of 3.69% which will considerably reduce the impact on all people who use the bridge for recreational uses compared to a 5% grade 65’ high 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #310
VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

As a resident of Rumson, NJ with frontage on the Navesink River, I am writing to express support for the PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 7A - EAST ALIGNMENT WITH THE REPLACEMENT MOVABLE CLEARANCE STRUCTURE at 22 feet ("LOW SPAN BRIDGE"). We beg of you to not ruin our scenery and small town community feel with an albatross. I understand that the Feds may potentially only pay for the largest option which is why people are trying to justify it and push it on us, but it is all of our duty to educate the Feds on the true cost/benefit analysis and to respect our community atmosphere and wishes. It will be significantly cheaper to build the low span, and at 22', most boats will clear it. Why not give the community the option to only staff the low span bridge with a 7 day per week operator Memorial Day to Labor Day and then some minimal schedule thereafter? Make it incumbent on the community to have to sacrifice something to get what we want. This option could potentially save everyone money as it will be considerably less man hours to staff and significantly less construction costs.

In closing, I am hopeful people come to their senses and that a LOW SPAN BRIDGE is approved and I'm happy to speak with you if you'd like. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Thank you for your comments and question. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water." This letter can be found on the project website at the following address: [http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf](http://monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Oceanic-Bridge-Letter-NJTPA.pdf).

The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens and who determines such actions are determined by the U.S. Coast Guard. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #311
Whilst I appreciate the need to replace the 75 year bridge and minimize traffic disruption the height of the bridge seems intrusive to the surrounding residential and river communities of the Navesink. My suggestion is to go with a design that has a reduced height and operates a drawbridge.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #312
I am advocating for the construction of the 7A design as a replacement for the current Oceanic Bridge. Although there is the need for a replacement structure from an engineering and safety point of view, there is also a strong need to retain our historical and cultural environment that gives such a strong identity to those of us who live in the Navesink community, as well as those that come to admire the beauty of our area. A walk across the 22 foot high bridge is an experience that will be lost in the hike up to the summit of an 81 foot high bridge. It's time to stop engineering away our heritage and to use your talents to both solve the problems with the existing bridge and create a new monument to our history that will be admired and respected by future generations.
Not only is it important to understand how the construction will affect the wildlife/shorelines, but where will the waste of the construction go? Will it be used sustainably?
Thank you for your comment and questions. During Final Design, specifications will be written that will state that the contractor must legally dispose of all construction debris. The contractor will ultimately determine the specific method for disposing construction debris subject to NJDEP regulations.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #314
I would like to voice my support of the 45’ oceanic bridge. In doing so, I would object to the nearly 81’ bridge proposal. This area, our area, is one of natural and historic beauty. The 81’ bridge would be one that increases noise pollution, decreases foot and bike traffic, and significantly undermines the aesthetic beauty of the area; all characteristics that our residents hold dear. I support the 45’ bridge proposal because it more accurately compliments and upholds the values of our 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #315
Good Afternoon,

As someone who grew up in Monmouth County, in particular Rumson and Fair Haven, I have always enjoyed having the Oceanic Bridge be a Draw Bridge. It not only gives the area scenic views but a spiritual and romantic feeling. When the draw bridge is up, it makes you stop and enjoy your surroundings which does not happen very often in this fast paced world. Even when its not up you tend to slow down just so you can take in the beauty of your surroundings. We are very fortunate to have such beautiful views and landscapes in this area and it would be a shame if these were taken away from the public. Having a 80.96 ft Bridge would not only affect the view but also effect certain citizens who currently enjoy walking/biking over it, especially the elderly and handicapped. Since moving out of state I not only look forward to visiting my family but also the area in general. I myself feel very privileged to have grown up where I did and I love showing the area off to others. This always includes a drive and/or walk over the bridge so others can experience not only the beauty of the area but the historical feel that the bridge gives. I enjoy the bridge so much that I even have a picture of the iconic view of it and its backdrop on my computer. When my co-workers walk by they always comment on how beautiful it looks. As I understand that the bridge needs to be rehabilitated and/or replaced I am asking for you not to replace it with a 80.96ft bridge, but rather a 45ft draw bridge. By replacing it with a 80.96ft bridge instead of the alternative I feel that you will be taking away a historic landmark along with the joy that it gives to so many. I appreciate you taking my comments into consideration when making your final decision.

best 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #316
Hello,

I am writing to request that the new Oceanic Bridge remains an Alternative 7A 45 foot Drawbridge. I have lived in Monmouth County my whole life and understand the importance of maintaining and preserving the unique historic quality of the area. A super-highway bridge would be an eyesore and tarnish the beauty of driving over what is, in my opinion, one of the most lovely parts of the peninsula. Please make sure it stays that way!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #317
Dear Local Concept Development Team,

It will come as no surprise to any of you that the Rumson-Fair Haven-Locust area is an exceptionally privileged part of the Garden State. With great privilege comes great responsibility, often reflected in the percentage of our income that we pay in local, state and federal taxes. The taxpayers of the Rumson-Fair Haven-Locust area have manifested time and time again that we oppose the construction of a super-highway style bridge over our Navesink River. Known for its historic buildings, leafy parks and stunning landscapes, the Rumson-area has been a stalwart of charm in an ever-overpopulated and concrete State. It is with the greatest fervor that I oppose the construction of a physically grotesque, massive concrete bridge cutting through the serene natural landscape of my town! The taxpayers have spoken. We want alternative 7A at 45 feet with a drawbridge. We pay more than our fair share to this State and our preferences must be respected.
Commenter #318
Subject: Oceanic Bridge

Date: 10/12/2020, 10:29 AM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

To who it may concern:

I am writing to voice my opinion that the replacement bridge be a 45 foot drawbridge. This would accommodate 90% of the boats without the bridge being opened. Visually it would look better, be easier to walk or bike over and would produce less noise than a higher bridge. Please, please, please put this compromise in place. Thank you
Commenter #319
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com  
Sent: Thu, Aug 27, 2020 9:46 am  
Subject: Oceanic Bridge Project questions

I cross the Oceanic Bridge at least 4 times a day, and have done so for over 40 years. It is my opinion that there are a number of vessels that request a bridge opening when they may not need it. With respect to “on Demand” opening of the Bridge, who determines if the bridge needs to be opened? If the boat is shorter than 22’, or can adjust equipment on that vessel to become shorter than 22’ (outriggers, antenna, etc) is there a fine/fee for that. If so, how much & who determines whether or not a fine/fee would be charged. I also feel that there should be a 'toll' (SEAZPASS) to boaters who need to have the bridge opened for them. They use it, they should help pay for it.

Thank you for your timed consideration regarding this matter.

Respectfully-
Thank you for your comments and questions. The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens, who
determines such actions, and the charging of an opening fee are determined by the US Coast Guard. Monmouth County
does not charge vessels to open the bridge, and it is our understanding that the US Coast Guard does not allow a fee to
open a bridge. Additionally, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Mr. Passegio-
Can you tell me what the square footage of the roadway will be for the PPA 7A modified and the 7B 45' high drawbridge options? I would assume that the total roadway surface for the higher fixed span bridge would be considerably more than the 45' high draw bridge.
Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter.
10/16/2020

I have been working on this bridge project for over 15 years. I cross the Oceanic Bridge at least 6 times a day. I have crossed the Oceanic Bridge more than 70,000 times over the past 40 years. I have met with Local, County, State, and Federal officials about this project numerous times. This is why I volunteered my time since 2004.

I am against the PPA of Alternative 7-A modified for a number of reasons. Alternative 7-A modified will have a road surface level of over 80' at the highest point with a grade of 5%. That is over 3 times the height of the current bridge. This fixed span bridge, taller than a 6 story building, will dramatically impact the view shed of the area as well as the use of the bridge for recreational purposes. (walking, jogging, cycling) Another possible issue for a 65' high fixed span bridge with a 5% grade will be accidents in freezing and snowy weather. This is something that hasn't ever been an concern for the last 80 years.

The PPA is a giant wide bridge (over 80' tall and 54' wide) that does not blend with the 2 historic districts (Locust & Rumson) that it will connect. I believe that the noise pollution will significantly increase with a 65' high fixed span bridge as well.

I feel that a 45' high water clearance Mid-Level draw bridge would be a good compromise. A 45' high water clearance drawbridge would let 80%-90% of all boat traffic through with out having to open. A Mid-Level draw bridge would also have considerably less impact on the view shed of the surrounding area and the recreation use of the bridge for the many people who are on it daily.

I also believe that the PPA is too wide. I don't think that the replacement bridge needs 2-6' wide sidewalks on both the east & west sides of the bridge. The existing bridge has 1 sidewalk on the east side of the bridge which I feel is sufficient for the usage of the bridge with the additional 8' bike/breakdown lanes on both sides.

I know that there are a number of bridges funded by the Federal Government that have had the length to build a high fixed span bridge, but after public input built draw bridges. (The Bridge of Lions in St. Augustine, FL, and the Wilson Bridge in Alexandria, VA)

I believe that the costs involved with the PPA are not correct and that the socio-economic costs to the community are not being thoroughly taken into consideration.

Respectfully-

[Signatures]
I couldn't confirm if my Public Comment was submitted or deleted, so I am writing it again.

I have lived here in the Two Rivers area of Monmouth County for most of my 67 years. I have crossed the Oceanic Bridge more than 70,000 times over these years. I have been involved with this project for more than 15 years. I have met numerous times with local, Monmouth County, NJ State, and Federal Officials regarding this project. I am appreciative of the changes that have been made to this process, trying to be inclusive to the public and local stakeholders who will be affected by whatever the final design may be.

I do not agree with the PPA for a number of reasons:
1.) A high fixed span bridge with a roadway height of over 80’ and a roadway width of 54’ will drastically affect the view shed of the historic districts it connects and the area for miles around.
2.) A high fixed span bridge over 80’ tall with a 5% grade will dramatically impact the recreational use of the bridge by walkers, joggers, & cyclists.
3.) A 80’ high roadway will create a potentially dangerous roadway during sub-freezing and snowy conditions, that has never been an issue for the past 80 years.
4.) The PPA will generate considerably more noise pollution and storm water runoff than the current bridge.

I support a 45’ high water clearance draw bridge that is a good compromise on a number of concerns.
1.) A 45’ high water level clearance draw bridge would allow 80%-90% of the boat traffic to pass without having to open.
2.) A 45’ high water level clearance draw bridge would have a grade of 3.69% which would be considerably better for the recreational users of the Oceanic Bridge.
3.) A 45’ high water level clearance draw bridge would greatly reduce the effects on the surrounding view shed for the area.

I also believe that the PPA roadway width can be trimmed by removing the west side 6’ wide sidewalk. There is no need for a sidewalk on both sides of the bridge.

I know that the Federal Government PREFERENCES to build a high fix span bridge where applicable. However, I know of at least 2 bridges in the US that have been built as draw bridges due to socio-economic issues for those areas (The Bridge of Lions in St. Augustine, FL and the Wilson Bridge in Alexandria, VA). I feel that the socio-economic impact for this project have not been taken under consideration strongly enough. Hopefully, the Public Comments will confirm this.

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this very important local matter.
Responses to October 9th email with three questions:
1) The Project Team has been continually responding to written questions submitted to the County Project Manager after the August 27th PIC Meeting No. 3 and are continuing to do so given the volume of written questions and comments received via email, the online PIC comment form and those from fax and U.S. postal mail.

2) Once all questions and comments have been reviewed and any responses emailed, they will be compiled into a file. The file with personal information redacted, will post to the project website under Community Activities to Date documents from the PIC Meeting No. 3. Once the PIC Comments Received File is approved, the PIC Meeting No. 3 Summary Meeting Report will also be posted. An email blast will be sent to local officials, community stakeholders and the general public who provided an email address to inform everyone of the posting, anticipated in December.

3) Once all PIC written comments received and responses have been reviewed and compiled into one file, the County will schedule a local officials meeting with Middletown and Rumson to discuss the PIC Meeting No. 3 comments received and request for resolution of support for the PPA. Attendance is at the discretion of the local officials in what their meeting process requires as to whether it is open to the public or by invitation.

Response to October 15th email with one question:
The total square footage of the roadway (including sidewalks and parapets) for the recommended PPA (65’ fixed bridge Alternative 7A - Modified) is 186,300 square feet. The total square footage for Alternative 7B, with a 45-foot drawbridge option is 179,820 square feet.

Response to October 22nd letter with four questions:
1) Monmouth County has made its final recommendation for the PPA as Alternative 7A - Modified with 65 feet of underclearance. The final decision to advance the project from Local Concept Development to Local Preliminary Engineering will be made by the Interagency Review Committee, which is composed of NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA.

The remaining three questions posed in your letter are answered above in our responses to your October 9th email responses.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

---

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
Commenter #320
Subject: PIC mtg comments
From: [Redacted]
Date: 9/4/2020, 9:57 AM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

I live in Rumson and view the Oceanic Bridge (in its current alignment and height) as an iconic local structure and part of the community. Any significant change to the bridge will destroy what makes this area unique and beautiful. The higher bridge options all would obstruct the view of the Navesink area highlands from Rumson and remove that inherent link between the Rumson/Navesink communities. From this point of view, I object to the proposed replacement alternative.

A question for the design/management team: Has the rehabilitation process/techniques used and implemented by Florida DOT on the historic St. Augustine bascule Bridge of Lions been investigated for application on the Oceanic Bridge due to its similarity. Both bridges provide integral components to the community but the St. Augustine bridge rehab followed an approach that was able to maintain the aesthetics of the bridge. For more information, see the July 2011 ASCE Civil Engineering magazine (Just the Right Balance, p58). I think more information should be provided as to how an approach similar to the St. Augustine bridge was considered for the Oceanic Bridge and if not how it will be considered in the options.
Thank you for your comments and question. The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings. Additionally, the Project Team is evaluating this bridge in compliance with the Section 106 and 4(f) regulations with regard to historic structures. The Project Team has initiated coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #321
To Whom It May Concern,

I think an 80 foot bridge is too high for this area. I like the idea of a mid-level drawbridge with 45 feet of clearance above the water. This bridge would let 80 to 90 percent of the boats pass through without having to open. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone
I think 80 feet is too high for this area. I like the plan for a mid-level drawbridge with 45 feet of clearance above the water. This bridge would let 80 to 90 percent of the boats pass through without having to open. 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #322
Subject: Oceanic Bridge (S31) Replacement

Date: 10/7/2020, 9:48 AM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thank you for encouraging public comment.

I oppose the PPA, 7A, for S-31, and oppose any 65' fixed bridge design. A 65' fixed bridge will change the character of the river crossing and the surrounding communities. Much like the bridge replacement on Route 36 in Highlands, a 65' bridge will unavoidably become a highway-like crossing that dominates the areas it connects because of its scale. I fully understand the appeal to engineers and accountants. But as a resident, I reject the degradation of the area's inherent beauty since there are viable alternatives.

2. I strongly support a new 25' drawbridge to replace the existing bridge.

While out of the project team's scope, I suggest scheduling S-31 bridge openings so boaters can plan for travel under a drawbridge rather than disrupting car traffic. According to the Coast Guard letter, there were a maximum of 935 lifts per year in the 2011-2015 period. There is therefore considerably more auto traffic over the bridge than under it, especially with the increasing use of the commuter ferry over the past decade. Scheduled bridge openings would allow for both boaters and car drivers to plan for bridge openings, rather than building the highest possible bridge.

3. A mid-level movable structure 45' bridge is acceptable, but not an ideal, alternative. I consider it an unnecessary compromise, as a new 22' bridge will address the same needs.

Aesthetic Requirements: No matter what the option, the bridge should be designed to harmonize aesthetically with its environment. For example, the Front Street Bridge in Red Bank was designed to integrate aesthetically with its surrounding area, whereas the Route 36 bridge in Highlands does not seem to have had any design beyond its engineering. As a result, the Route 36 is the worst of NJ stereotypes in concrete form, despite the spectacular natural environment around it. We have an opportunity to do better. Let's make the most of it!

Thanks again for inviting public comment.

Sincerely,
Hello [Name]

Thank you for your comments. The operation of the movable bridge as to when it opens and who determines such action and schedule, are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Coast Guard. Additionally, based on U.S. Coast Guard regulations, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be developed in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #323
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: __________
Mailing Address: ________________________________
Email: ________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:

To whom it may concern—The Oceanic Bridge needs to be replaced. I ask that this be done in an environmentally friendly as possible, using a living shoreline that will promote resiliency & improve water quality in the Navesink River—a very important estuary! I ask that the replacement be at a height that is in keeping with the historic look of the area, accessible to walking & bike traffic — so is too high!

Thank you.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, October 16, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #324
Rumson resident who would like the bridge to remain a drawbridge!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #325
As a concerned citizen and taxpayer whose property value stands to be impacted by this impending decision, I formally stand against any proposed plan that calls for increasing the vertical height of the 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #326
I don’t want to see the current bridge being replaced, but if it needs to happen I prefer the lower 45’ option. That seems to be a good solution that addresses the needs of boaters and runners/walkers alike.
Commenter #327
The public Zoom meeting was a great way to communicate all of the planning into the new bridge so far. Although I was one of the participants that placed “red dots” on the proposed fixed bridge options at the Middletown meeting 2 + years ago, the presentations at the recent Zoom meeting, and especially the video models, convinced me that a new fixed bridge will be graceful, with a gradual enough change in height to still allow for walking and biking across, and practical (no more waiting ever for the bridge to close).

The economic cost and environmental impact presentations were excellent too.
Commenter #328
I and many others in the area prefer the 45 foot high drawbridge of alternative 7a. we oppose the fixed high 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #329
10/10/2020

I vote for the lower heighted 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #330
Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name: 
Mailing Address: 
Email: 
Comments/Suggestions:

THIS BRIDGE IS ICONIC. IT SHOULD
BE SAVED AS A LIVING PART OF
THE HISTORY OF THE RUMSON - LOCUST
AREA AND THE NAVESINK RIVER. IT WOULD
BE A SHAME TO LOSE THIS ICONIC
STRUCTURE.

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us
Hello, I support the [redacted] And their reasoning for a Midlevel replacement vs. a High level fixed bridge. Having lived in this community for my full 55 years, I have a huge appreciation for the Navesink River, and the incomparable beauty it possess. Let’s keep this intact. Thank You.
Commenter #332
The current proposal for a non-opening bridge to replace the current Oceanic Bridge is a really bad idea for a variety of reasons including the destruction of the spectacular view and the increase in noise level. But perhaps the biggest offender is that 5% grade which will be dangerous for vehicular traffic in inclement weather and make the bridge unusable for recreational purposes. It's a steep hill to climb on a bike and well nigh impossible to run. That would be a real shame. Please do not build such a travesty. Instead please build the mid level opening bridge that further reflects the gorgeous design of the current 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #333
The proposed design is best (High bridge/no opening), and attractive. The design fits well with the landscape. The height will accommodate any vessel with a draft or height that is suitable for the river and channel. Lighting should be moderate and unobtrusive to the surroundings and neighbors. Speed limit should be reduced. Public access for recreation should be increased on both sides of the river.

Bridge openings are a nuisance to locals, too long and frequent, costly to staff, and a waste of time and fuel.

Thank you for considering the preferred design for local residents.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #334
As a resident of the Oceanic Village of Rumson, I strongly oppose the current plan for the new bridge. As least weekly, my family and I use the bridge for exercise- walking, running and biking over it. The new height that is proposed would make this activities impossible - especially biking.

I also think the historic charm and beauty of the area will be taken away by a giant, modern bridge. The proposed bridge is no where aligned with the current structure in size or style. Please propose a new plan with a much smaller and ascetically pleasing structure. The one proposed is going to kill the beauty of this area!

I grew up here and this bridge has always been a landmark and hallmark of the peninsula's beauty. Please don't destroy that!

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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/12/2020

Dear ________,

As you probably know, the Oceanic Bridge connecting Rumson with Middletown, has deteriorated to the point where it must soon be replaced. I would like to enlist your support for a replacement structure that preserves the many fine qualities of the existing bridge.

We in this area have been fortunate that the Oceanic Bridge is a human-scale structure that invites crossing by casual strollers as well as folks driving around on local errands. From its gradual slopes and modest height above the water to its historic architectural style, it is in keeping with the historic districts it connects.

The reason we need your support is that the front-running alternative is a 70-foot high non-opening structure much like bridges over commercial waterways in South Jersey. The federal government, who will fund the project, prefers such bridges. We need your help in convincing them that we have a special case: one where preserving property values, historic character and a pleasant bridge-crossing experience outweigh their preference for non-opening bridges.

I'm hoping you will agree that the replacement should be another bascule bridge of similar architecture and height that meets modern construction codes. Such a bridge is already an alternative. The county-borne estimated cost of operating an opening bridge is $10.65 million over 75 years (before a recent plan to reduce bridge-tender hours). But the federally-borne estimated cost of construction and 75 years of maintenance is lower, $47 vs. $49.5 million.*

Please lend your support.

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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #336
As a forty plus year resident of the two rivers area I oppose the 81' proposed replacement Oceanic bridge. I would support a 45' high bridge. This will sustain the traditional aesthetic of the bridge while allowing for the majority of water traffic to pass underneath the bridge without disrupting the traffic on the roadway above. I enjoy biking and walking over the bridge and a 3.7% grade would be much more enjoyable and enable more people to use the bridge for exercise comfortably. Please do not replace our lovely oceanic bridge with a 81' bridge.

Respectfully,
Commenter #337
This is pretty simple to me. The current bridge is a beautiful example of architecture from the past. We know after it was built it one awards for its beauty. Now Some people want to reconstruct it, make it larger so you won’t have to have a bridge attendant. I don’t understand why we can’t keep it the height that it is, don’t put a drawbridge in at all because why should tax money have to pay for the boats of so few people That have to take it vantage of opening the bridge. Even if there were 50 or 100 boats moored in Fair Haven and Red Bank large enough to require this the cost just does not compute! Why should the many have to pay for the rich few.
Here is a prime example of government working only for the entitled few. It’s unconscionable those few would destroy a thing of beauty for their own gain.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #338
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/16/2020

We attended several meetings and reviewed the pictures of the various bridge options and still feel a drawbridge similar to the existing one is the best option. This would be in keeping with the area and "waiting for the bridge" is a part of living in this area. We have been using the existing bridge for over fifty years and have had no problem using it. The newcomers always want to change things to the way they want them to be.
Commenter #339
Subject: Bridge comment

Date: 9/2/2020, 11:09 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I am in favor of replacing the existing bridge with a wider bascule bridge in a similar location (or slightly shifted east). If you can raise the bridge a few feet and still allow for opening occasionally that should work. The majority of boat owners west of this bridge operate power boats that do not require the bridge to open. For power boats that have "stringers" or antennas that reach beyond the bridge height they simply need to lower them as the bridge should not open for them (as in most of Florida). For sailboats they need to know that the bridge will only open on a restricted schedule. For instance, on the weekends it could be every 2-3 hours on the hour or on the hour when 3 or more boats are awaiting bridge opening.

To me it's a matter of boater education. Make the restrictions reasonable for the mass majority of power and sail boaters. If there is a sailboat that is interested in more frequent openings there are plenty of marinas to the east of the Oceanic.

For the greater interest of the overall community and residents there is no reason for this bridge to become a fixed span bridge that is unsightly. Totally ruins the character of the areas around it and for the boating community at large.

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, NJ

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

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

Name:________________________________________________________
Mailing Address:______________________________________________
Email:________________________________________________________

Comments/Suggestions:
I have lived in Rumson for 44 of my 59 years and have been on these rivers often.
I feel strongly that a 65' fixed span bridge would ruin the character of the area
and create an eyesore.
A new bridge in keeping with the style and history of the existing bridge would be a terrific asset.
Additionally, biking, walking or running over a 65' bridge will be a chore instead of enjoyment

Kindly submit the comments by Friday, April 24, 2020 to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

Thank you.
Thank you for your comments. The determination of the movable bridge as to when it opens and who determines such actions are determined by the US Coast Guard. Additionally, marine traffic takes precedence over vehicular traffic when crossing a navigable channel.

The aesthetic features of the new bridge will be advanced in the future Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases with input gathered at public outreach meetings.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #340
Please keep the new bridge like the current (old) bridge. That is a 45 foot high Drawbridge. I oppose the fixed-height 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #341
10/16/2020

As a boater I strongly support the drawbridge alternative. Much more flexible?
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #342
10/15/2020

Really want to keep a drawbridge at this location to keep the integrity of the area. No way should an arch bridge be constructed!
Hope you make a good choice!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #343
I want to keep a draw bridge as it stands now!
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #344
10/10/2020

I am strongly for the 45' drawbridge as opposed to the 81' high fixed bridge! Aesthetically the draw bridge would be much more attractive & environmentally more pleasing. 81' seems excessive to a fault! We were long time sailors & in my lifetime of living in Rumson/Middletown I have never seen a sailboat with a mast height of 60' or more in our rivers. Please do not build an 81' bridge,
Commenter #345
While all this is going on, would there be consideration to deepen, straighten, or widen the channel, east of the bridge, as that has always been an issue for larger power boats and sailboats with fixed keels?
Subject: RE: Oceanic Bridge Local Concept Development Study
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 10/5/2020, 4:05 PM
CC: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Afternoon,

Thank you for your question. At this time, the widening or deepening of the channel is not within the scope of this project. Any changes to the channel would have to be advanced under a separately funded project and would be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

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.
Commenter #346
Subject: Request for Assistance on Bridge View at [Redacted] Entrance

Date: 9/29/2020, 1:41 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

I am a property owner [redacted] right where the new bridge will join the mainland on the [redacted] side. You have in your presentations several computer simulated views of the bridge. Could myself and my neighbor get simulated views from our property so as to understand what remedial steps we might take such as vegetation plantings etc.? Alternatively can you let us know the company that did the simulation for you so that we can contact them? We are more than happy to pay for this service.

Thank you,
Thank you for your comments and question. The digital representations were prepared to illustrate how the new bridge would look using general views from the north, east, south and west, and not necessarily to be from a specific location. The Project Team's prime consultant, Michael Baker International, Inc. prepared the digital representations.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #347
I utilize the Oceanic Bridge daily to commute to work in Red Bank. The bridge is great to walk over and appreciate the scenic view. PLEASE PLEASE keep the bridge at the current draw bridge height. The Highlands bridge is terrible to drive over in bad rain or snow. Please keep the Oceanic bridge at same height,
Commenter #348
The bridge needs replacement. I use it almost daily and I’m quite afraid I’ll be a casualty when it collapses.
Commenter #349
Subject: Comments/suggestions

Date: 10/16/2020, 10:49 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street Freehold, NJ 07728

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

I'm in favor of a 45' high water clearance drawbridge. This will allow for most boat traffic to pass through without opening the bridge, and it's in keeping with the historical aesthetic of surrounding towns.

An 81' high fixed span bridge would, not only, be unfriendly to walkers, but would create far too much noise pollution in our peaceful communities.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
I'm in favor of promoting a 45' high water clearance drawbridge. It is more in keeping with the historical aesthetic of our waterways and surrounding towns. 45' will allow for most boat traffic to pass through without opening the bridge. In my opinion, mounting an 81' high fixed span bridge is not in harmony with the beauty that we savor on the Navesink. Not only is it not walker friendly, but it will inherently add more noise pollution to a peaceful community.
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #350
I commend the choice of the 65-foot clearance for the new bridge to increase the recreational value of the area for water sports.
Commenter #351
10/16/2020

I oppose the proposed fixed height of 80.95 feet for the new Oceanic bridge. I was raised on the Navesink River and continue to utilize it regularly. I have been boating under and walking and riding my bike over the Oceanic bridge for over 50 years. The Navesink River and the Oceanic bridge are an integral part of this community. The impact on the entire community must be considered. A 45 foot high bridge will allow most if not all boat traffic to pass through. Families, walkers, joggers, and cyclists will be able to continue to use this bridge for exercise and enjoyment. The surrounding communities encourage healthy living and bike lanes have recently been added to the local roadways. An 81 foot bridge will dramatically increase the grade which will negatively impact it’s accessibility to many. In addition a successful bridge design must be natural, simple, and harmonious with its surroundings. Aesthetics is an integral part of the bridge design. A 45 foot high drawbridge is the right choice for our community.
Commenter #352
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
Sent: Tue, Aug 25, 2020 8:23 pm
Subject: Local Concept Development Study Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

I would like to voice my opinion on the Oceanic Bridge project. I would like to see a bridge approximately 35 feet high with drawbridge. This would accommodate most boats using the waterway and would maintain the current aesthetic. In my opinion, it is a most spectacular bridge with a view of the Navesink which is exquisite. It offers the people of the state one of the most beautiful views of our most beautiful state. I hope you will consider this option for the bridge.

Thank you.
Commenter #353
September 17, 2020

Dear [Name],

We would like to express our opinions on the replacement bridge plan for the Oceanic Bridge. We are NOT in support of the Alternative 7-A Modified, 65' fixed span bridge replacement plan.

We believe that a fixed bridge with such a high span will negatively affect the small town nature of Rumson.

We would prefer to see the Alternative 7-A modified, 45' high drawbridge as the bridge replacement.

Sincerely,
Commenter #354
I have lived here my entire life and I am against the 81 ft bridge. It will ruin our beautiful two river area. The 45ft bridge is a much better compromise. I wish it could stay the same but I guess that's not an option.
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

10/5/2020

I strongly prefer a lower (45 ft or less) drawbridge
Taller steep bridge would inhibit walking and cycling.
Channel is not deep and does not accommodate many large or tall boats
Beautiful views would be ruined by a tall 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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #356
I appreciate the work that many people have contributed to findings a suitable replacement for the Oceanic Bridge. It is important that the new bridge preserve the aesthetic, practical attributes, and environmental character of the existing structure, consistent with modern construction codes and manageable cost.

Thank you.
Commenter #357
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: Public Comments & Suggestions

8/28/2020

In reviewing the draft list of stakeholders, I recommend that the Monmouth County Vocational School District (MCVSD) and the Marine Academy of Science and Technology (MAST) be added. With the large number of students from across Monmouth County to MAST on Sandy Hook, there are a number of bus routes that use the current bridge.
Commenter #358
Subject: FINAL and UPDATED comments from [REDACTED] regarding Oceanic Bridge (S-31) conceptual alternatives and PPA (LCD study)

Date: 10/16/2020, 6:43 PM
To: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Please accept this attachment as the final and official comments from [REDACTED] regarding the Conceptual Alternatives and PPA for Oceanic Bridge (S-31) on the Navesink River.

Due to an unintentional error, I had submitted an incomplete/incorrect version of comments at 4:59 PM today. I request you to disregard and delete those comments.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email with the updated and official comments from [REDACTED]

Thank you,

———Attachments:———

[REDACTED] comments to Oceanic Bridge PPA-10162020-FINAL.pdf 27 bytes
October 16, 2020

Fred Passeggio, PE
County Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering and Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street, 3rd Floor
Freehold, NJ 07728

RE: Conceptual Alternatives and Recommended PPA as part of the Local Concept Development Study for Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Conceptual Alternatives and Recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) as part of the 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, New Jersey.

These comments are submitted on behalf of [blank], a broad-based coalition of 115 conservation, environmental, fishing, boating, diving, religious, student, surfing, women’s, business, civic and community organizations united to protect and preserve the marine and coastal ecosystems of New York and New Jersey.

[Blank] has a strong presence and is interested in the health of the Navesink and Shrewsbury Estuary. In 2016, following the downgrade of over 500 acres of shellfishing area due to pollution, coordinated and organized the Rally for the Navesink, a coalition of groups dedicated to improving and maintaining water quality in the Navesink River watershed through research, education, and policy. The primary pollution sources in the region include urban and agricultural stormwater runoff and failing infrastructure. The proposed improvements to the Oceanic Bridge (S-31), must develop and incorporate sound strategies to mitigate pollution and protect the ecologically sensitive Navesink estuary and local Historic preservation areas.
recognizes that the Oceanic Bridge (S-31) is old and has serious structural erosion and deficiencies that need to be addressed immediately. Improved structural conditions that ensure the safe passage of vehicles above and boats below is a critical priority. Equally critical is the fact that any proposed improvements to the bridge, by way of rehabilitation and/or replacement, could impact existing environmental health in the Navesink estuary. The primary goal is to prevent and reduce marine pollution and protect the water quality and environmental health of the New York – New Jersey Bight, including the Navesink and Shrewsbury Estuary. The current status of the project is preliminary and in the Local Community Development Phase. Recommends that the following issues of concern pertinent to water quality and environmental health be thoroughly and satisfactorily evaluated, and management measures to reduce environmental impacts are detailed before moving ahead with any chosen replacement alternative (including PPA 7A).

acknowledges that the Oceanic Bridge is in serious disrepair and needs to be replaced, and it needs to be emphasized that environmental impacts and mitigation of harm should be of utmost concern in determining a preferred alternative to the existing bridge. Climate change effects and associated storm surges and extreme weather events are growing and visible threats to the Jersey Shore, and the Navesink and Shrewsbury Estuary is at higher risk to climate change impacts. Coupled with this is the increasing problem of nonpoint source pollution, especially from stormwater runoff, from urban/mixed land use surfaces in the watershed. The history of pathogen contamination from stormwater runoff in the Navesink River and its impacts on shellfish harvest bed closures is well-known (Rally for the Navesink). The Navesink, in recent years, also experiences algal blooms, potentially from nutrient pollution in runoff. Any replacement alternative to the existing Bridge would result in altering pervious surfaces and create additional impervious surfaces which could exacerbate stormwater impacts, if not minimized and managed especially using green infrastructure.

Monmouth County Transportation Audit and Sustainable Transportation Plan (NJPTA, 2011 https://www.njptta.org/Planning/Subregional-Programs/Studies/Completed-Studies/2010-2012/Monmouth-County-Transportation-Audit-and-Sustainable.aspx) describes how climate change could impact transportation infrastructure in the region. Some salient features of the report are: (i) Monmouth county is vulnerable to climate change effects and the proposed location falls under inundation flood zones for high intensity category 3 and 4 hurricanes especially. Costs of infrastructure maintenance from storm damage are projected to escalate in the coming years; (ii) Extreme temperatures also affect infrastructure and will cause pavement softening, migration of liquid asphalt, or premature road deterioration, all requiring additional maintenance; and (iii) More importantly, this plan addresses and emphasizes the need for creating smart and sustainable improvements such as increased pedestrian and bike-friendly options to mitigate the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions by developing a set of formal design criteria.

It must be noted that based on current and prospective navigational needs on the Navesink River, the United States Coast Guard had made a preliminary determination that supports either of two
preliminary preferred alternatives – a movable bridge with a 22 ft. vertical clearance (closed), or
a fixed bridge with a 65’ VC (closed). According to USCG, any final decision/approval can be
made after a completed application from the County and in accordance with regulations.

In this context, urges Monmouth County, the towns of Rumson, Middletown, the local
community, and the Project Team to evaluate the following issues that will likely increase the
adverse risks to water quality and health of the Navesink:

Environmental Impact Statement

The Environmental constraints map that is available is a simplified visual representation of many
issues of concern in the project/proposed region. These include significant habitats with
endangered species, wetland, tide zones, floodplains, historic zones, among others. Any
information on current/potential water quality issues are lacking. Details of the environmental
screening studies conducted by the project team are not clearly mentioned. expects that a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be developed to
accurately reflect the impacts of whichever selection is made as well as a comparison to other
alternatives.

Nonpoint source pollution runoff and stormwater impacts

Nonpoint source pollution is one of the largest contributors to pollution in waterways.
Stormwater drainage from highways is often empirically managed and not evaluated thoroughly.
Bridge and deck runoff contain a variety of pollutants such as heavy metals, fecal contaminants,
nutrients, metals, oils, grease, litter and microplastics, and often enter the waterway without any
treatment. Bridge deck runoff is not widely studied and factors that impact runoff quality
include: (i) dimensions of the deck; (ii) road surface composition; (iii) precipitation events; and
(iv) how the deck drainage systems are designed and maintained.

In this proposed project, significant impacts to water quality and associated aquatic health are
likely from runoff during construction and post-construction. These need to be elaborately
investigated prior to any decision making in order to implement sustainable management
measures to reduce these adverse impacts.

As the Navesink is a sensitive environment, with a history of known bacteria pollution, the
proposed alternative must evaluate key concerns and develop and implement a decision model
that adheres to local, state, federal regulations and also take into account any future
improvements to existing regulations. The focus should be on the following:

(i) runoff characteristics of bridge deck, bridge structure, the approach highway;
(ii) assess how deck runoff will impact receiving water quality; and
(iii) what Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used to mitigate these impacts.

Current regulations by the NJ Department of Transportation do not explicitly specify best
management practices for bridge and highway runoff beside the basic standard requirements (e.g.
swales, bioretention), which may not adequately meet all treatment goals. These measures will not entirely meet the growing challenges from stormwater runoff and, hence, recommends a detailed investigation of this as one key requirement before the final selection of any PPA.

It must also be noted that the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection’s (NJDEP) Green Infrastructure Rules for stormwater management became effective in 2020 that requires specific green infrastructure BMPs for development projects. While NJ Department of Transportation does not specify these recommendations currently, it is expected that these will be required in the future. So, this proposed project should assess how green infrastructure can be implemented effectively in this project.

recommends incorporating modeling tools such as Stochastic Empirical Loading and Dilution model (SELDM, United States Geological Survey - Federal Highway Administration) to predict and assess the potential effects of runoff on receiving waters.

Environmental Impacts from Construction

recommends that a thorough assessment and evaluation of the construction process and impacts on noise, water quality, sediment quality, navigational disturbances should be completed. The study should focus on: (i) siting of staging area; (ii) debris removal/management; (iii) wetland zone impact from; and (iv) risk of sediment load to waterways.

Other Significant Concerns

Finally, outlines the following issues of concern that must also be evaluated prior to the start of the project.

- What will be the status of the old bridge? Will it be demolished, or will there be efforts to rehabilitate with a goal on environmental sustainability such as the Hudson Yards? Will a feasibility study be conducted to assess if it can be used as a model recreational space that the local community can enjoy on the water?

- What are the plans for the existing 50-foot footings, piles/piers? Will there be an evaluation with different options?

- is enthusiastic about the removal of up to 800 feet of existing bulkhead. However, it is essential that the shoreline area be replaced with a living shoreline with green infrastructure that will address the twin goals of minimizing erosion impacts and stormwater management. Erosion of coastlines has resulted in a huge economic burden and this will only continue to increase with growing threats from climate-change-related adverse weather events in the future. Again, emphasizes that the project needs to ensure that this area is stabilized into a living shoreline and also requests feasibility studies for naturalizing additional areas.
- If PPA 7A is approved, what will become of the land west of and including the old bridge area which is currently a park? Will it be designated as an open natural wildlife habitat area with a living shoreline?

The preferred alternative for Oceanic Bridge (S-31) must account for current and future risks and impacts to water quality and ecological health of the Navesink River and clearly outline implementable actions to address them. Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions or seek further input, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Respectfully submitted.
Thank you for your comments and questions regarding the Conceptual Alternatives and PPA for the Oceanic Bridge (S-31) on the Navesink River. The existing bridge is currently recommended for demolition after the new bridge is constructed. Additional engineering and environmental studies will also be conducted for the existing piers and piles during the Local Preliminary Engineering Phase. Alternatives analysis will include an analysis of the feasibility of maintaining the existing historic structure (as per Sections 106 and 4(f) regulations) and building a new structure, for transportation purposes on a new alignment. The specific use of the land on the Middletown side of the bridge will also be evaluated further during the future design phases. The project team will work with Stakeholders and permitting agencies (e.g., NJDEP, USFWS and NOAA) to determine the appropriate shoreline mitigation during the design and permitting process.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #359
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 11:21 AM
To: annaheer@co.m痛みouth.nj.us

Subject: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Please see attached correspondence. Thank you.
May 8, 2020

Via Email and Regular Mail
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., County Engineer

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Dear Mr. Ettore:

In or about 2004, Monmouth County commenced discussions about rehabilitating or replacing the Oceanic Bridge between the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Shortly thereafter, a number of residents in both municipalities formed a 501(c)(3) corporation known as [redacted] Since 2004, a period of some 16 years, [redacted] has advocated for any replacement of the Oceanic Bridge to be a bascule bridge.

During the initial discussions and public presentations, many citizen groups, associations and governmental entities agreed with [redacted] that a bascule bridge would be preferred over a high fixed bridge, including Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissions, Middletown Historic Association, Rumson Historic Association, Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Discussions were held among representatives of the Federal Department of Transportation, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, your office and [redacted] the conclusion of which was that if Monmouth County wanted a bascule bridge, the State and Federal Departments of Transportation would support same.

During these 16 years, no action has been taken to finalize plans for a rehabilitated or new Oceanic Bridge. In the interim, it has been reported to [redacted] that the federal regulations have been modified to require a fixed bridge as the “default alternative.” During these 16 years, since Monmouth County decided to rehabilitate or replace the Oceanic Bridge, the costs of either alternative have significantly increased. I do not believe the fault is that of your office or Monmouth County. Rather, I believe that during these 16 years, there have been significant changes in the Federal and State Rules and Regulations governing such projects.

It is now the understanding of [redacted] that the preferred alternative of your office and the North Jersey Planning Authority is a fixed bridge having 65 feet of clearance between mean high tide and the bottom of the bridge. It is anticipated that the roadway and railings would add
another 20 feet so that the preferred alternative would tower approximately 85 feet above the
Navesink River.

Since 2004, [redacted] has seen literally hundreds of diagrams, plans, routes, and financial
projections concerning the rehabilitation or replacement of the Oceanic Bridge. As of this date,
no preferred alternative has been discussed or explained to those who would be most affected by
the appearance of a fixed bridge, i.e. homeowners on the easterly and westerly sides of the bridge
in Middletown and Rumson. Accordingly, [redacted] respectfully requests the following:

That the county engage the services of a commercial hydrogen balloon company
that would place 8 or 10 balloons along the present Oceanic Bridge at the
anticipated height of the railings of a new fixed Oceanic Bridge which would be
approximately 85 feet above mean high water.

When I was representing [redacted] some years ago, local residents surrounding the site
of an application for development had questions about the height of a new multi-story storage
building. The services of a commercial balloon company were engaged to locate balloons at the
height of the four corners of the proposed building. Both [redacted] and local residents
found this much more demonstrative than architectural renderings.

I know this will involve an expenditure on the part of the County. However, if the expenditures
of the County on a rehabilitated or replaced Oceanic Bridge since 2004 are reviewed, the costs of
placing the balloons as requested will be minuscule.

On behalf of [redacted], I would like to thank you for considering this request and hopefully
approving it. If you have any questions, please call me at [redacted]

Respectfully yours,

[redacted]

cc: [redacted] Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey
Transportation Planning Authority (via email and regular mail)
[redacted] (via email only)
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 3:01 PM
To: engineer
Subject: [EXTERNAL]FW: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Just following up re the attached letter. Please respond. Thank you.
May 8, 2020

Via Email and Regular Mail
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., County Engineer

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Dear Mr. Ettore:

In or about 2004, Monmouth County commenced discussions about rehabilitating or replacing the Oceanic Bridge between the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Shortly thereafter, a number of residents in both municipalities formed a 501(c)(3) corporation known as [redacted]. Since 2004, a period of some 16 years, [redacted] has advocated for any replacement of the Oceanic Bridge to be a bascule bridge.

During the initial discussions and public presentations, many citizen groups, associations and governmental entities agreed with [redacted] that a bascule bridge would be preferred over a high fixed bridge, including Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissions, Middletown Historic Association, Rumson Historic Association, Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Discussions were held among representatives of the Federal Department of Transportation, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, your office and [redacted], the conclusion of which was that if Monmouth County wanted a bascule bridge, the State and Federal Departments of Transportation would support same.

During these 16 years, no action has been taken to finalize plans for a rehabilitated or new Oceanic Bridge. In the interim, it has been reported to [redacted] that the federal regulations have been modified to require a fixed bridge as the “default alternative.” During these 16 years, since Monmouth County decided to rehabilitate or replace the Oceanic Bridge, the costs of either alternative have significantly increased. I do not believe the fault is that of your office or Monmouth County. Rather, I believe that during these 16 years, there have been significant changes in the Federal and State Rules and Regulations governing such projects.

It is now the understanding of [redacted] that the preferred alternative of your office and the North Jersey Planning Authority is a high fixed bridge having 65 feet of clearance between mean high tide and the bottom of the bridge. It is anticipated that the roadway and railings would add
another 20 feet so that the preferred alternative would tower approximately 85 feet above the Navesink River.

Since 2004, [redacted] has seen literally hundreds of diagrams, plans, routes, and financial projections concerning the rehabilitation or replacement of the Oceanic Bridge. As of this date, no preferred alternative has been discussed or explained to those who would be most affected by the appearance of a fixed bridge, i.e. homeowners on the easterly and westerly sides of the bridge in Middletown and Rumson. Accordingly, [redacted] respectfully requests the following:

That the county engage the services of a commercial hydrogen balloon company that would place 8 or 10 balloons along the present Oceanic Bridge at the anticipated height of the railings of a new fixed Oceanic Bridge which would be approximately 85 feet above mean high water.

When I was representing [redacted] some years ago, local residents surrounding the site of an application for development had questions about the height of a new multi-story storage building. The services of a commercial balloon company were engaged to locate balloons at the height of the four corners of the proposed building. Both [redacted] and local residents found this much more demonstrative than architectural renderings.

I know this will involve an expenditure on the part of the County. However, if the expenditures of the County on a rehabilitated or replaced Oceanic Bridge since 2004 are reviewed, the costs of placing the balloons as requested will be minuscule.

On behalf of [redacted], I would like to thank you for considering this request and hopefully approving it. If you have any questions, please call me at [redacted]

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

cc: [redacted], Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (via email and regular mail)

[redacted] (via email only)
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:22 AM
To: engineer

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oceanic Bridge Replacement

Please see attached letters.
July 17, 2020

Via Email and Regular Mail
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., County Engineer

RE: Oceanic Bridge Replacement

Dear Mr. Ettore:

I wrote a letter to you on May 8, 2020, a copy of which is attached. As I have not heard from you, I assume you have rejected our request to place commercial hydrogen balloons on the Oceanic Bridge at the anticipated height of the railings of a replaced Oceanic Bridge.

I would respectfully request that you and the members of your office determine another methodology to visually demonstrate to the public the height of the replacement bridge. Perhaps 6 or 8 wooden poles could be attached to the present Oceanic Bridge which would reflect the height of the replaced high bridge. Alternately, perhaps photographs could be taken from the easterly and westerly sides of the Oceanic Bridge from Rumson and Fair Haven and the new bridge could be superimposed on the photographs. Obviously, architectural renderings are of very little use.

I look forward to hearing from you in this matter. If you wish to meet with representatives of we will come to your Freehold office.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

cc: [Name] Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (via email and regular mail)

[Email only] (via email only)
May 8, 2020

Via Email and Regular Mail
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., County Engineer

RE: Replacement of Oceanic Bridge

Dear Mr. Ettore:

In or about 2004, Monmouth County commenced discussions about rehabilitating or replacing the Oceanic Bridge between the Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Shortly thereafter, a number of residents in both municipalities formed a 501(c)(3) corporation known as [Redacted]. Since 2004, a period of some 16 years, [Redacted] has advocated for any replacement of the Oceanic Bridge to be a bascule bridge.

During the initial discussions and public presentations, many citizen groups, associations and governmental entities agreed with [Redacted] that a bascule bridge would be preferred over a high fixed bridge, including Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissions, Middletown Historic Association, Rumson Historic Association, Township of Middletown and the Borough of Rumson. Discussions were held among representatives of the Federal Department of Transportation, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, your office and [Redacted], the conclusion of which was that if Monmouth County wanted a bascule bridge, the State and Federal Departments of Transportation would support same.

During these 16 years, no action has been taken to finalize plans for a rehabilitated or new Oceanic Bridge. In the interim, it has been reported to [Redacted] that the federal regulations have been modified to require a fixed bridge as the “default alternative.” During these 16 years, since Monmouth County decided to rehabilitate or replace the Oceanic Bridge, the costs of either alternative have significantly increased. I do not believe the fault is that of your office or Monmouth County. Rather, I believe that during these 16 years, there have been significant changes in the Federal and State Rules and Regulations governing such projects.

It is now the understanding of [Redacted] that the preferred alternative of your office and the North Jersey Planning Authority is a high fixed bridge having 65 feet of clearance between mean high tide and the bottom of the bridge. It is anticipated that the roadway and railings would add
another 20 feet so that the preferred alternative would tower approximately 85 feet above the Navesink River.

Since 2004, [redacted] has seen literally hundreds of diagrams, plans, routes, and financial projections concerning the rehabilitation or replacement of the Oceanic Bridge. As of this date, no preferred alternative has been discussed or explained to those who would be most affected by the appearance of a fixed bridge, i.e. homeowners on the easterly and westerly sides of the bridge in Middletown and Rumson. Accordingly, [redacted] respectfully requests the following:

That the county engage the services of a commercial hydrogen balloon company that would place 8 or 10 balloons along the present Oceanic Bridge at the anticipated height of the railings of a new fixed Oceanic Bridge which would be approximately 85 feet above mean high water.

When I was representing [redacted] some years ago, local residents surrounding the site of an application for development had questions about the height of a new multi-story storage building. The services of a commercial balloon company were engaged to locate balloons at the height of the four corners of the proposed building. Both [redacted] and local residents found this much more demonstrative than architectural renderings.

I know this will involve an expenditure on the part of the County. However, if the expenditures of the County on a rehabilitated or replaced Oceanic Bridge since 2004 are reviewed, the costs of placing the balloons as requested will be minuscule.

On behalf of [redacted] I would like to thank you for considering this request and hopefully approving it. If you have any questions, please call me at [redacted].

Respectfully yours,

[redacted]

cc: [redacted] Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (via email and regular mail)

[redacted] (via email only)
On behalf of the County Engineer, Joseph Ettore, thank you for your continued interest in the Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge project. Please find attached a response letter to your recent inquiries.

Thank you and please contact Fred Passeggio, County’s project manager for the Oceanic Bridge, with any questions.

Inkyung
August 10, 2020

RE: Oceanic Bridge Replacement

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your patience and understanding while the Project Team considered the questions and concerns in your letter dated May 8, 2020 and letter dated July 17, 2020. Below is an explanation and response to your questions and concerns.

Monmouth County and the Project Team continue to work on the Local Concept Development (LCD) Study of the Oceanic Bridge (S-31). Your suggestion of a balloon test was considered, but it was determined that such a test would not adequately demonstrate what a fixed height bridge would look like to the public. A higher-level fixed bridge replacement alternative would not be constructed in the same alignment as the existing bridge, so balloons placed from the existing bridge would not appropriately simulate the location or alignment of a proposed bridge replacement. A balloon test would also be subject to wind, rain, and other atmospheric factors that could affect a uniform height of the balloons. Public interpretation of what the height of the balloons represents may be misunderstood and may not provide a comprehensive image from either side of the river, nor demonstrate an appropriate view across the Navesink River.

Based upon Project Team discussions of how best to visualize a fixed bridge replacement alternative, a different methodology was chosen. Using drone cameras, digitally scaled 3-D CAD models were created to demonstrate how the fixed bridge replacement alternative would look from various locations. In addition, still image representations have been created to
demonstrate how the public would view the high-level fixed bridge replacement alternative from various locations within the project area.

As you may be aware, the County had to postpone the Public Information Center (PIC) scheduled for March 19, 2020 because of COVID-19 restrictions on large gatherings. Please note that Monmouth County will be sending a Public Notice announcing an online PIC to be held later this month where the Purpose and Need Statement, the conceptual alternatives and the recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative will be presented. Monmouth County welcomes your attendance and participation at this next PIC meeting.

If you need additional information, please contact the Monmouth County Project Manager, Fred Passeggio (fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us, 732-431-7760x6690). Thank you for your continued interest in this important transportation improvement bridge study.

Very truly yours,

Joseph M. Ettore, P.E.
County Engineer

cc: Freeholder Director
    County Administrator
    Director of Public Works & Engineering
    Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team
Inkyung,

Thank you for forwarding the letter of August 10 from Mr. Ettore. When will the images referenced in the letter be available? Will they be on the website? Please advise.
Good afternoon,

The project team is working to finalize the presentation and images for the upcoming online Public Information Center (PIC) meeting no. 3. Presentation and the images will be available on the project website after the PIC meeting on the project website at: https://link.edgepilot.com/s/a3e0f8ef83v1 user40qotM11BzyVMw?u=http://monmouthcounty/oceanicbridge.com/

For your information, the online PIC meeting has been scheduled for August 27th, 4-7pm with the ~30 minute presentation starting around 4:15pm. Project website will be updated shortly with the upcoming meeting information. Please note the online PIC meeting requires a pre-registration as noted in the attached online PIC meeting notice.

Thank you and please contact Fred Passeggio, County's project manager, with any questions.

Inkyung
Monmouth County, in cooperation with the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and the Federal Highway Administration, will be hosting an online Public Information Center meeting to inform local residents, officials, businesses and the general public regarding the Local Concept Development Study of the Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) on Bingham Avenue – Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River located between the Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown.

The purpose of the Public Information Center meeting is to inform the public of the Purpose and Need Statement and the conceptual alternatives and to solicit input and comment on the recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) for bridge improvements. This meeting is being conducted in conformance with Federal and State regulations. The public is invited and encouraged to comment on the project.

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020
Time: 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Presentation begins at 4:15 p.m.
Where: Online via GoToWebinar
Please go to www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com and click on the meeting link to register. Instructions will be sent to you via email prior to the meeting.

For members of the public without internet access, a copy of the meeting presentation can be mailed to you along with the call-in number. To receive a copy, please contact Fred Passeggio at (732) 431-7760 x6690, or fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us. Please provide your mailing address at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Written comments will be accepted through Friday, October 16, 2020. Comments may be mailed, faxed or emailed to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street, 3rd Floor
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

These meetings are open to all members of the public.

For additional information or to submit comments online, please visit the project website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com
Mr. Passegio-
Good Morning-
I have an idea to increase the Publicity for the upcoming Oceanic Bridge Meeting (scheduled for Thurs. 8/27/20).
In the past we have gotten Monmouth County to to place an electric sign on each side of the bridge (Rumson & Middletown/Locust) giving the meeting info out as people drive over the bridge. Is this something that could be done quickly?
We have been actively working on the project since 2004. This is a VERY IMPORTANT MEETING and we need to make sure that we can get as many people as possible to participate in the process.
Thank you for your timed consideration regarding this matter.
I look forward to your response.
Respectfully-
-----Original Message-----
From: Passeggio, Fred <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: Englehart, Inkyung <Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>; M A Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>; Osorio-Sanders, Andres <Andres.Osorio-Sanders@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Sent: Fri, Aug 21, 2020 9:16 am
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Publicizing Oceanic Bridge Meeting

please be advised that VMS (electric signs) advertising the August 27, 2020 Public Meeting for the Oceanic Bridge were deployed yesterday afternoon on each side of the bridge.

Thank you for your interest in this important project.

Respectfully
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Mr. Passeggio -
Good Morning. I was very pleasantly surprised yesterday afternoon to see the sign on the Locust/ Middletown side of the bridge on my way home from work. Where is the sign on the Rumson Side located? I didn't notice 1 on Bingham Ave.?
Thanks again for your prompt attention to this matter.
Respectfully-
[Redacted]
Subject: Street lamps on the Oceanic Bridge
Date: August 30, 2020 at 10:54:37 PM EDT
To: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: Inkyung Englehart <Engleha@co.monmouth.nj.us>, Joe Ettore <Ettore@co.monmouth.nj.us>

Mr. Passeggio-
Thank you again for getting the VMS (electric signs) out last week to help publicize the online meeting for the Oceanic Bridge project. I think that there was a good online turnout for the meeting.
I am curious to know the height of the lampposts (33) on the Oceanic Bridge? I would guess that they are close to 25'-30' high above the roadway. I was wondering if it would be possible to install windsocks on the lampposts possibly with heavy duty windsock poles to show the actual height of the proposed 65' high replacement bridge? This would give the public a true visual of how high the replacement bridge would be and with the windsocks and the windsocks could stay up for the comment period safely.
I look forward to hearing back from you at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully-
To: Passeggio, Fred <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: Joe Ettore <jettore@co.monmouth.nj.us>; Martine Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Sent: Tue, Sep 8, 2020 9:34 am
Subject: Fwd: Street lamps on the Oceanic Bridge

Mr. Passeggio-
Good Morning. I hope you had a good Labor Day Weekend and were here in NJ. the weather was beautiful.
I am following up on my inquiry from Aug. 30th regarding the height of the lampposts on the Oceanic Bridge. I have spoken with a number of people who thought my idea to fly windsocks from the lampposts to show the height of a 65’ high (to 85’ high overall) bridge would look like.

I also have spoken with a number of people who knew nothing about the online meeting and want to comment on the bridge for the public record. My thought is to install the VMS signs on both sides of the bridge reminding people of the Public Comment Period. I feel that we need to get as much public notice on this as possible for this very important project decision.
Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter. I look forward to hearing back from you soon.
Respectfully-

[Redacted]
Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Representatives of the [REDACTED] would respectfully request a meeting with you to present questions about the PPA for the new Oceanic Bridge.

If you could provide us with several dates and times during the week of September 28th, when several of us could meet with you in Freehold, it would be greatly appreciated. If such a meeting can be arranged, we would be glad to forward several of our more important questions to you in advance.

Thank you for your time and attention.
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 3:55 PM
To: Passeggio, Fred

Subject: [EXTERNAL]RE: Request for a Meeting

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

I would greatly appreciate it if you would respond to my email below. Several of us are trying to establish our schedules for next week and if we can determine when we might meet with you, it would helpful.

If you do not wish to meet with us, please advise us.

Respectfully yours,

---

Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:17 AM
To: fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

Subject: Request for a Meeting

Dear Mr. Passeggio,

Representatives of the [REDACTED] would respectfully request a meeting with you to present questions about the PPA for the new Oceanic Bridge.

If you could provide us with several dates and times during the week of September 28th, when several of us could meet with you in Freehold, it would be greatly appreciated. If such a meeting can be arranged, we would be glad to forward several of our more important questions to you in advance.

Thank you for your time and attention.
Subject: RE: Request for a Meeting- Bridge S-31
From: "Passeggio, Fred" <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Date: 9/15/2020, 4:01 PM
CC: "monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com" <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your interest in this important bridge study. As mentioned in the Public Information Center Meeting No. 3 Notice (attached) and again in the presentation, please submit your questions and comments in writing as noted below, so they will become part of the official public documentation. The Project Team will respond to questions either in writing or if you would like by phone.

Written comments will be accepted through Friday, October 16, 2020. Comments may be mailed, faxed or emailed to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety  
Hall of Records Annex  
1 East Main Street, 3rd Floor  
Freehold, NJ 07728  
Fax 732-431-7765  
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

Thank you for your understanding.

Fred Passeggio, P.E.  
Monmouth County Division of Engineering  
Hall of Records Annex-Freehold, NJ 07728  
732-431-7760 x6690
Online Public Information Center Meeting Notice

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

Monmouth County, in cooperation with the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and the Federal Highway Administration, will be hosting an online Public Information Center meeting to inform local residents, officials, businesses and the general public regarding the Local Concept Development Study of the Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31) on Bingham Avenue – Locust Point Road (CR8A) over the Navesink River located between the Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown.

The purpose of the Public Information Center meeting is to inform the public of the Purpose and Need Statement and the conceptual alternatives and to solicit input and comment on the recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) for bridge improvements. This meeting is being conducted in conformance with Federal and State regulations. The public is invited and encouraged to comment on the project.

Date:    Thursday, August 27, 2020
Time:    4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
          Presentation begins at 4:15 p.m.
Where:   Online via GoToWebinar
          Please go to www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com and click on the meeting link to register. Instructions will be sent to you via email prior to the meeting.

For members of the public without internet access, a copy of the meeting presentation can be mailed to you along with the call-in number. To receive a copy, please contact Fred Passeggio at (732) 431-7760 x6690, or fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us. Please provide your mailing address at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Written comments will be accepted through Friday, October 16, 2020. Comments may be mailed, faxed or emailed to:

Fred Passeggio, P.E., Project Manager
Monmouth County Division of Engineering & Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street, 3rd Floor
Freehold, NJ 07728
Fax 732-431-7765
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com

These meetings are open to all members of the public.

For additional information or to submit comments online, please visit the project website: www.monmouthcountyoceanicbridge.com
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, New Jersey

Conceptual Alternatives & Recommended PPA: 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, October 16, 2020 to:
Fred Passeggio, P.E.
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
monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
To: Martine Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>; Englehart, Inkyung
<Inkyung.Englehart@co.monmouth.nj.us>; Ettore, Joseph <Joseph.Ettore@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: Passeggio, Fred <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>

Sent: Thu, Sep 24, 2020 2:02 pm
Subject: No comments for close to 30 days

Martine, Inkyung & Joe-
As you know, we have been working on this project for over 15 years, since 2004. We have sent in questions the day of the Virtual Public meeting as well as individual questions & requests addressed to Mr. Passeggio since the Aug. 27, 2020 meeting. We have also requested a meeting with Mr. Passeggio to address some specific questions. The only response we got from Mr. Passeggio was that our questions will be answered. To date we have no response to any of our questions. We feel that our questions are being 'swept under the rug' and not answered in a timely manor.
When will our questions be answered?
I look forward to hearing back from you at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully-
September 29th, 2020

Mary Ameen, Executive Director
mameen@njtpa.org
David Behrend, Deputy Executive Director
DBehrend@njtpa.org
Sasha Frimpong, Director
SFRimpong@njtpa.org
Local Programs and Project Development
North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
One Newark Center,
17th Floor, Newark NJ 07102

Dear Mary, David, Sasha,

For the past sixteen years our organization has been advocating for a reasonably low bridge as the replacement for the aging Oceanic Bridge (S-31) connecting the historic districts of Rumson and Locust (part of Middletown). The present bridge is a 1939, art moderne structure that fits in well with these historic districts. Attached please find a description of the Locust historic district.

Sincerely,
LOCUST HISTORIC DISTRICT
Township of Middletown

Middletown Landmarks Commission
THE LOCUST HISTORIC DISTRICT

Description:

Locust is a dispersed community that stretches along Locust Point Road and Navesink River Road. The Locust Historic District begins at Lakeside Avenue, runs northwest along Locust Point Road to its terminus with Navesink River Road, then continues east along Navesink River Road for 1.2 miles. The linear form of the community is the result of its close proximity to Clay Pit Creek and the Navesink River, two bodies of water which form the north and eastern boundaries of the district. Characterized by verdant, rolling terrain with framed views of the Navesink River, the Locust District is the site of numerous late nineteenth century, Shingle Style summer houses. Throughout the district, buildings are generally sited far off the road, and are hidden from passing view by mature trees and thick hedges.

Significance:

The Locust 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. Its history has been profoundly influenced by its productive and scenic lands which border Clay Pit Creek and the Navesink River. The convenience of water transportation influenced the early settlement of Locust and has continued to shape its economy and lifestyle.

The precise date of settlement of Locust is unknown; however, on January 25, 1664 the Navesink Sachem Popomora sold the "Newesingh lands" to a group of Englishmen from Gravesend, Long Island, led by Captain John Bowne and James Grover. James Grover was one of the twelve men who were granted the historic Monmouth Patent in April 1665 by Governor Nicolls of New York, confirming their land purchases from the Native Americans. James Grover, who was one of the leaders of the Middletown settlement, was also one of the first owners of land bordering the Navesink River which today constitutes the Locust area.

The arrival of David Burdge from Hempstead, Long Island, marks one of the earliest permanent settlements in the area. In 1715 David and his wife Phoebe, their sons Jonathan, Uriah and David, left Hempstead and settled near the mouth of Clay Pit Creek on the south shore. His deed from Benjamin Borden clearly describes 357 acres of land which comprises all of modern day Locust, bounded by Clay Pit Creek and the Navesink River as far as Browns Dock Road. Burdge paid "two hundred eighty Pounds current money of New York" for this choice tract of land. The Burdges operated a grist mill adjacent to the creek near the Stone Church from the mid-18th to the early 19th century. Through the years members of the Burdge family have been active in the affairs of the community and their descendants still live in Locust today.

From earliest times farming and fishing were Locust's principal occupations. In the early 19th century the "Shrewsbury" or Navesink River oyster was considered a great delicacy. Clay Pit Creek became an active center of shellfishing, as well as an ideal harbor for the boat men who sailed to New York with clams and oysters for the restaurant trade. Locust still retains one original oyster house, which stands on the Captain Pitman Johnson property at 451 Locust Point Road. In the 1850s Joseph Mount built a large dock at Locust Point to employ the new, faster steamboats in
sending Locust produce and oysters to the city.

Those same steamboats returned with the first summer visitors to the area, and by the 1860s Locust had begun its transformation from a farming/fishing community into a haven of seasonal country residences for well-to-do New Yorkers. In 1869 Mrs. Sylvanus Reed of New York, a noted women’s educator, bought the Captain William Johnson farm and subsequently the Benjamin Burdge farm. She built four summer cottages for herself and children and called the enclave "Reedmont." In 1898 Mrs. Reed founded, in her home, the Monmouth County Historical Association, a key organization in preserving the county’s rich heritage.

Mrs. Reed and the Reverend Haslett McKim of New York, another summer resident, were instrumental in the development of the original Oceanic Bridge at the turn of the century. They donated the land for the approach and contributed to the construction of the causeway. The bridge connected the two larger communities of Middletown and the Rumson-Red Bank peninsula, thereby enhancing the prosperity of the entire river area.

By the late 19th century Locust had become a busy summer resort area capable of supporting three hotels. A special carriage met the "Sea Bird" at Mount’s Dock and transported vacationers to the New Amsterdam Hotel, which still survives as a private home. The Willow Glen, built by Henry Wright in the 1880s on Clay Pit Creek, and the Locust Point Hotel, operated by Michael Despreaux, no longer stand.

Many homes were constructed in Locust during the growth period at the second half of the nineteenth century, and several bear the imprint of a remarkable local craftsman/builder named Nehemiah Brower. He worked in Locust for over fifty years and is known to have constructed eight houses within the historic district, as well as the General Barclay Parsons house at 421 Locust Point Road. Working with his son, Brower also constructed "The Ivy" at 534 Locust Point Road.

Despite some encroachment, Locust 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. Very few of Locust’s historic buildings have been destroyed, although former summer houses and outbuildings from the nineteenth and early twentieth century were converted into year-round residences. Following World War II numerous buildings fell victim to insensitive alterations and modernizations. Although their interiors may retain original fabric, many of the structures can no longer be readily identified from the exterior as historic.

In those cases where the original core of the building is no longer visible, a designation of "Non-contributing" has been assigned. Several questionable properties have been heavily altered, for instance by the replacement of historic windows and siding. Those that retain an identifiable historic nucleus have been designated "Contributing." Because Locust is most significant as a late nineteenth century summer community, and in large part retains the appearance of a well-to-do resort area, "Key" designations have been applied to properties that support or contribute to an understanding of that era. These include those Reemedon properties that have not been significantly altered, several Shingle Style summer homes along Clay Pit Creek, the New Amsterdam Hotel and the Locust General Store.
To: Passeggio, Fred <Fred.Passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Cc: Marline Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>; Joe Ettore <jettore@co.monmouth.nj.us>

Sent: Wed, Sep 30, 2020 9:52 am
Subject: Electronic signs at Oceanic Bridge

Mr. Passeggio-
I wanted to thank you for placing the 2 Electronic signs on each side of the Oceanic Bridge with a message about the deadline for the Comment period for the Oceanic Bridge Project. I believe that this will encourage more Public Comments on the project, as many people are still uniformed about it.
Do you have a timeline on when I can expect the answers to our other questions that we sent in over 30 days ago?
I would hope, and expect those questions will be answered before the deadline for the Public comment period.
Thank you again for your time and consideration regarding this very important matter.

Respectfully,
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2020 3:04 PM
To: Ameen, Mary <mameen@njtpa.org>; Frimpong, Sascha <SFrimpong@njtpa.org>; Behrend, David
<DBehrend@njtpa.org>

Subject: Monmouth County Bridge S-31

Please see attached correspondence with exhibits. Thank you.
October 2, 2020

Via Hand-Delivery
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
and Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Fred Passeggio, Project Manager
Department of Public Works and Engineering

RE: Monmouth County Bridge S-31
Preliminary Preferred Alternative

Dear Mr. Passeggio:

This letter is being written to you as a “Comment” to and in opposition to the recently Preliminary Proposed Alternative (“PPA”) for a new Oceanic Bridge spanning the Navesink River between the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown. The PPA that was first announced to the public on August 27, 2020 consists of a fixed bridge having 65 feet of clearance between the bottom of the span crossing the channel and mean high water (“MHW”) with the roadway peaking at 81 feet above MHW. In all likelihood, the top of the railings will be approximately 85 feet above MHW and the lampposts possibly even higher. [unreadable] has opposed a high bridge since it was formed in 2004. Recognizes the need to replace the present Oceanic Bridge; however, it believes that a new bridge should have a clearance of no more than 45 feet.

As you are aware, the great majority of the openings of the present Oceanic Bridge are unnecessary. There are no scheduled times for openings, e.g. every half hour or every hour. For a number of years, scheduled openings were and may possibly continue to be in effect for bridge spanning the Shrewsbury River between the Boroughs of Rumson and Sea Bright. More importantly, there is no requirement that power boats lower their outriggers and antennas when going under the Oceanic Bridge. The large majority of the openings could be eliminated if boat
owners would lower their antenna and outriggers. Accordingly, requests that the PPA include the present Alternative No. 7A-Modified location with a clearance of no more than 45 feet above MHW. Obviously, the bridge would have to be a bascule bridge in accordance with the requirements of the United States Coast Guard.

The PPA suffers from the same negative issues as did the 55 foot high bridge proposed in 2010:

**Alternative A.** (Replace Bridge with High-Level Fixed Bridge) meets the project need, however, the option will result in major historic impacts since the existing structure will be removed and replaced with a high-level fixed bridge. This alternative causes a drastic overall aesthetic impact to the surrounding area. This alternative has a relatively steep grade of 6% [now 5%] for a length of approximately 3,000 feet which would negatively impact bicycle and pedestrian traffic. AASHTO guidelines for bicycle facilities indicates that grades greater than 5% are undesirable for bicyclists and also recommends a maximum grade length of 800 feet for grades of 5 to 6%. A high-level fixed bridge alternative would also have a negative socio-economic effect on the surrounding municipalities. A high-level bridge alternative has the potential to result in lost tax revenues to the municipalities in the range of $45 million to $65 million due to diminution of property values. This lost tax revenues may have negative impacts on the social services provided by the communities. Therefore, Alternative A is not considered a desirable option.

**Alternative B.** (Replace Bridge with Low-Level Movable) meets the project need though the option will result in major historic impacts since the existing bridge will be removed. However, to mitigate this impact the replacement bridge will have aesthetic treatments similar to the existing structure in terms of its scale, silhouette, materials, railings, and architectural features of the operator’s houses. In addition, the movable bridge functionality of the existing structure will be maintained. Based upon the above, the low-level movable alternative for bridge replacements is recommended. The alternative provides the best balance between the issues of minimizing cost, controlling traffic impacts and mitigating historic impacts.

Of the alternatives considered, the only one that is viable, meets the project need, addresses community support, minimizes
potential negative socio-economic impacts on the municipalities is Alternative B — Replace Bridge with Low-Level Movable Bridge. This alternative provides a compatible bridge appearance and functionality consistent with the existing historic structure at the lowest construction and life cycle costs. This alternative provides the best balance between competing issues and is therefore recommended for further development.  

The Oceanic Bridge is a good example of a project where the costs, in the form of lost property values, damage to historic environments, the loss of esthetic and recreational resources outweigh any cost differential between the PPA and a new bascule Oceanic Bridge having 45 feet of clearance above the MHW.

In 2010, when the proposed new Oceanic Bridge was to have a clearance of 55 feet above MHW and an overall height of some 70 feet, many governmental organizations opposed such a bridge in favor of a low-level bascule bridge.

I am enclosing copies of the following resolutions supporting a low movable bridge. While they were adopted some 10 to 15 years ago, the underlying findings have not changed.

A. Resolution adopted by the Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissioners at a meeting held August 10, 2009, which supports a low bascule bridge. I do not believe that the Board of Recreation Commissioners has ever changed its position.

B. Resolution adopted by the Borough of Rumson on May 19, 2005 opposing a new bridge having a minimum of 55-foot clearance above MHW. I do not believe that the Borough of Rumson has ever changed its position.

C. Resolution adopted by the Borough of Little Silver on October 17, 2011 opposing a new 70-foot high bridge. I do not believe that the Borough of Little Silver has ever changed its position.

---

1 Technical Report, High Level Fixed Bridge versus Low Level Moveable Bridge Analysis, including comments from the NJDOT and Monmouth County dated April 15, 2010, submitted by the Office of the Monmouth County Engineer to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, at Pages 49 and 50.
D. Resolution adopted by the Borough of Little Silver on June 6, 2005 opposing a 70-foot-high new bridge with a minimum of 55 feet of clearance above MHW. I do not believe that the Borough of Little Silver has ever changed its position.

E. Resolution adopted by the Borough of Fair Haven on October 11, 2011 opposing a 70-foot-high bridge having a minimum of 55 feet above MHW. I do not believe that the Borough of Fair Haven has ever changed its position.

F. Resolution adopted by the Borough of Fair Haven on May 9, 2005 opposing a new 70-foot bridge having 55 feet of clearance between the bottom of the bridge and MHW. I do not believe that the Borough of Fair Haven has ever changed its position.

G. Resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth on August 27, 2009 opposing a high bridge having a clearance of 55 feet above MHW. I do not believe that the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth has ever changed its position.

H. Resolution adopted by the Township of Middletown on June 7, 2005 opposing a 70-foot-high fixed bridge. I do not believe that the Township of Middletown has ever changed its position.

I. Letter from the Riverside Drive Association dated July 16, 2004 opposing a high fixed bridge in favor of a low movable bridge. I do not believe that the Riverside Drive Association has ever changed its position.

J. Resolution of the Middletown Landmarks Commission adopted August 11, 2005, supporting a low bascule bridge. I do not believe that the Middletown Landmarks Commission has ever changed its position.

Many of the reasons cited by the various governmental entities supporting a low movable bridge have not changed notwithstanding the passage of 10 or 15 years. They include the following, all of which referred to a bridge having 55 feet of clearance above MHW, not 65 feet:

1. A 70-foot-high fixed bridge would greatly impede those individuals who presently use the bridge for recreational purposes.
2. A 70-foot replacement bridge would degrade the traditional character of the Rumson and Middletown historic districts.

3. 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.

4. Construction of a high bridge would permanently obliterate and/or dominate some magnificent vistas that are presently inherent in the Rumson and Middletown waterfronts.

5. This type of structure, a high bridge, with extremely steep grades would almost totally deprive walkers, joggers and bikers of an enjoyable crossing and view that have been valued since the origin of the Oceanic Bridge.

6. The construction of a high bridge with its extremely steep grades would introduce a level of noise pollution never before experienced in this area of Monmouth County.

7. A high bridge would block the river views of many of the homes and businesses near the Oceanic Bridge.

8. With a high bridge, vehicles would be less able to safely cross the bridge in icy and snowy weather.

9. A high bridge would diminish the property values on both sides of the Navesink River based on the adverse impact on their view-sheds.

10. A few drivers are unable to tolerate traversing a high bridge. For them, a high bridge is a major obstacle.

As stated, I do not believe any of the governmental resolutions have been amended or rescinded. To the extent that representatives of the Monmouth County Division of Engineering and Public Safety and/or the New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority intend to meet with any of the above governmental organizations, it is requested that notice be given to so that we too may join such a meeting.

On November 9, 2005, the of East Brunswick, New Jersey forwarded its opinion to concerning the Oceanic Bridge replacement. The conclusion reached by was that the market value of homes facing a bridge with 55 feet of clearance as opposed to
25 feet of clearance would be diminished by approximately 23%. The report which was provided to the Division of Engineering and Public Safety has never been rebutted.

Indeed, the Consulting Report Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by [redacted] for Monmouth County by the [redacted] dated March 24, 2010 concluded:

Based on the survey methods used to develop the potential value impact factors, and given [redacted] definition of the study area and specific parcels likely to be affected, Integra estimates a potential property value impact in the order of $45 million to $65 million.²

It should be noted that the potential adverse property value impact of $45 million to $65 million was in 2010 dollars, not 2020 or 2030 dollars.

In addition to the governmental bodies that opposed a bridge having a clearance of 55 feet above MHW, organizations such as the [redacted] and the [redacted] similarly opposed a new high bridge.

The installation of the PPA would create a major 54-foot-wide highway connecting the Locust Historic District on the north and the Rumson Historic District on the south, the residential district on the north side of the Navesink River and the residential/commercial district on the south side of the Navesink River. The findings of the various governmental agencies mentioned in this letter make it clear that there are social, economic, and environmental reasons that favor the selection of a movable bridge, many, if not all of which have not been considered in the analysis of the PPA (23 CFR, Paragraph 650.809).

Finally, we disagree with the interpretation of CFR, Paragraph 650.803 by the New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority and the County of Monmouth which states in part: “It is the policy of FHWA: (b) To provide fixed bridges wherever practicable...” This is not the “open-and-

² Technical Report, High Level Fixed Bridge versus Low Level Moveable Bridge Analysis, including comments from the NJDOT and Monmouth County dated April 15, 2010, submitted by the Office of the Monmouth County Engineer to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, at Pages 22 of Appendix B.
shut” case as it was stated to be in the recent Public Meeting No. 3. If it were, we would not have 2 FHWA Notice 6640.22 dated July 17, 1981, which states in part that “At least one fixed bridge alternative shall be included with any proposal for a movable bridge to provide a comparative analysis of engineering, social, economic and environmental benefits and impacts.” This expands the definition of “practicable” to go beyond just feasibility and cost.

This Regulation has been around since 1987. [redacted] would not have wasted its time over the years if the Regulation had been interpreted in the way it seems to be interpreted in the present preliminary plans. In fact, on June 21, 2005, when the Regulation was in effect, [redacted] met with representatives of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) and the Monmouth County Engineer’s Office at the New Jersey Division of the FHWA in Trenton. FHWA Division Bridge Engineer [redacted] told [redacted] that since the Oceanic Bridge is not on the federal highway network, the FHWA would accept whatever bridge height was acceptable to the NJDOT and presumably the Coast Guard. [redacted] of the NJDOT then said that NJDOT would be guided by what the Monmouth County Engineer’s Office recommended. Then on November 11, 2009 [redacted] met again in Trenton with the FHWA, the NJDOT and the Monmouth County Engineer’s Office. In that meeting FHWA Division Administrator [redacted] recommended emphasizing the historical aspects, e.g., that the bridge is on the New Jersey Register of Historic Places. In neither meeting was there given the impression that a high bridge was a ‘slam dunk’ based on Regulation 650.803.

It is strongly urged that the PPA be rejected in favor of a new preferred alternative bridge having a clearance of no more than 45 feet above MHW.

Respectfully yours,

[redacted]

cc: [redacted] Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
and Traffic Safety
Attention: Fred Passeggio, Project Manager
October 2, 2020
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North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
Attention: [Redacted] Executive Director
Attention: [Redacted] Deputy Executive Director
Attention: [Redacted] Director Project Development and Local Programs

Federal Highway Authority
Attention: [Redacted] Division Administrator
Attention: [Redacted] Monmouth County Engineer

Township of Middletown
Attention: Mayor [Redacted]
Attention: Members of Township Committee

Borough of Rumson
Attention: Mayor [Redacted]
Attention: Members of Borough Council

Borough of Sea Bright
Attention: Mayor [Redacted]
Attention: Members of Borough Council
EXHIBIT A
The following resolution was offered for adoption by Commissioner Hennessy:

**RESOLUTION**  
R-11-10-11=338

WHEREAS, at the regular meeting of the Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissioners held on August 10, 2009, the Board adopted Resolution No. R-09-8-10=328, endorsing and fully supporting a low bascule bridge replacement for the Oceanic Bridge; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Recreation Commissioners urged the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders to do all in its power to ensure that a low bascule bridge replaces the present Oceanic Bridge; and

WHEREAS, the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders has supported a low bascule bridge replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge; and

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 been 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, Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc. (“Friends of the Oceanic Bridge”) have 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.

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;

   // A

R-11-10-11=338 (Continued)
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 sailboats and even power boats from proceeding underneath; and

G. Finally, representatives of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth have expressed their preference for a low bascule bridge as opposed to a 70-foot-high, fixed bridge.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissioners reaffirms its endorsement and support of a low bascule bridge replacement for the Oceanic Bridge; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Recreation Commissioners urges the Board of Chosen Freeholders to reaffirm its support to do all in its power to ensure that a low bascule bridge replaces the present Oceanic Bridge; and

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; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary-Director forward a certified true copy of this resolution to Governor Chris Christie, 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, the Mayor and Governing Bodies of Middletown and Rumson, the Clerk of the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, County Administrator, County Counsel, the Monmouth County Engineer Joseph Ettore, and the Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc.

Seconded by Commissioner Hood, and adopted on roll call by the following vote:

In the affirmative: Chairman Loud, Vice Chairman Rummel, Commissioners Harmon, Peters, Raynor, Manville, Hennessy, Horsnall and Hood

In the negative: None

Absent: None

I hereby certify the above to be the true resolution adopted by the Monmouth County Board of Recreation Commissioners at the regular meeting of the Board on TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 11, 2011

JAMES J. TRUNCER, Secretary-Director
EXHIBIT B
May 19, 2005

Councilwoman DeVoe offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

BOROUGH OF RUMSON
COUNTY OF MONMOUTH
STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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 above;

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 landhold vistas evidences this bridge to be in complete harmony with the, treasured surroundings; and

(\(B\))
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 obliterate and/or dominate the magnificent vistas that are presently inherent in the Rumson and Middletown water fronts, 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 steep grades, would introduce a level of noise pollution never before experienced in this area of Monmouth County; many tests will clearly evidence the geometric increase in noise as a function of increasing road grade; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that securing the federal funding required by Monmouth County for this bridge replacement is not (with emphasis, not) totally limited to a high level fixed bridge.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be forwarded to Acting Governor Richard J. Codey; U.S. Senator Frank Lautenberg; U.S. Senator Jon S. Corzine; U.S. Congressman Rush Holt; State Senator Joseph A. Palais; State Assemblyman Steven J. Corzine; State Assemblyman Sean T. Kean; Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Attention Thomas J. Power, Director; Federal Highway Authority, Attention Dennis L. Merida, Division Administrator; Office of the Monmouth County Engineer, Attention Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., P.O. and Inkyung K., Englehart, P.E., Principal Engineer; the New Jersey State League of Municipalities; the Two Rivers Council of Mayors; and the Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc., Attention Richard D. McCumber, Secretary.

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 Chairman Rubin and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Braddick, Conley, 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 Runion at a regular meeting held on May 19, 2005.

[Signature]
Thomas S. Rogers
Borough Clerk/Administrator
EXHIBIT C
October 21, 2011

Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association, Inc.
P.O. Box 213
Rumson, NJ 07760

RE: Oceanic Bridge

Dear Friends of the Oceanic Bridge Association:

Enclosed please certified copies of the Resolution adopted by the Governing Body of the Borough of Little Silver at their meeting of October 17, 2011.

Very truly yours,

Helen Gormley
Acting Administrator/Deputy Clerk

Enc.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, 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 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 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 with a minimum 55 feet clearance to bottom of structure and an overall structure height of 70 feet minimum; and

WHEREAS, replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge as proposed above would cause 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 historic neighborhoods and the type and nature of the proposed high level fixed structure would disastrously impact the area; and

WHEREAS, the present Oceanic Bridge, constructed in 1939, is a graceful, beautiful, low level, drawbridge that compliments the beauty of its location and is in harmony with the surroundings; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Little Silver agrees with the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Rumson;

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 obliterate and/or dominate the magnificent vistas that are presently inherent in the Rumson and Middletown waterfronts, as well as being a permanent visual blemish on the neighboring communities of Fair Haven and Sea Bright; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this type of structure, with its extremely steep grades, would almost totally deprive walkers, joggers and bikers of a service view that has been valued since the origin of the Oceanic Bridge; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that construction of this type of structure, with its extremely steep grades, would introduce a level of noise pollution never before experienced in this area of Monmouth County as a function of increasing the road grade; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this Resolution be sent to the Monmouth County Division of Engineering to the attention of Joseph M. Ettore, P.E., County Engineer, Governor Chris Christie, State Legislators and New Jersey Legislators representing the Borough of Little Silver.

[Signature]

1, HELEN GORMLEY, Deputy Borough Clerk of the Borough of Little Silver, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a resolution adopted by the Borough Council of the Borough of Little Silver, County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, at a regular meeting held on October 17, 2011.

Helen Gormley
Deputy Borough Clerk
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, 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 in need of replacement; and

WHEREAS, in sufficient 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 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 with a minimum 55 feet clearance to bottom of structure and an overall structure height of 70 feet minimum; and

WHEREAS, replacement of the present Oceanic Bridge as proposed above would cause 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 historic neighborhoods and the type and nature of the proposed high level fixed structure would disastrously impact the area; and

WHEREAS, the present Oceanic Bridge, constructed in 1939, is a graceful, beautiful, low level, drawbridge that compliments the beauty of its location and is in harmony with the surroundings; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Little Silver agrees with the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Rumson;

(\( D \))
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 obliterate and/or dominate the magnificent vistas that are presently inherent in the Rumson and Middletown waterfronts, as well as being a permanent visual blemish on the neighboring communities of Fair Haven and Sea Bright; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this type of structure, with its extremely steep grades, would almost totally deprive walkers, joggers and bikers of a service view 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 steep grades, would introduce a level of noise pollution never before experienced in this area of Monmouth County as a function of increasing the road grade; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certified of this resolution be sent to the Borough of Rumson, State Senator Ellen Karcher, Assemblyman Mike Panter, Assemblyman Bob Morgan and the Two River Council of Mayors.

resOceanicBridge

I, MICHAEL D. BIEHL, Clerk of the
Borough of Little Silver, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a resolution adopted by the Borough Council of the Borough of Little Silver, County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, at a regular meeting held on June 6, 2006.

Michael D. Biehl
Administrator - Clerk
EXHIBIT E
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.
4. Limit the size of said and power boats that can use the 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, RMC
Municipal Clerk
EXHIBIT F
May 13, 2005

Todd Thompson
Friends of the Oceanic Bridge
61 West River Road
Rumson, NJ 07760

Re: Resolution #2005-72

Enclosed is a Resolution in Support of the Positions of the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown regarding the Oceanic Bridge. This Resolution was passed by the Governing Body of the Borough of Fair Haven at their May 9th meeting.

Very truly yours,

Valerie T. Heilweil
Deputy Municipal Clerk

Monmouth Co. Div. of Engineering
Monmouth Co. Bd. Of Chosen Freeholders Dir. Thomas Powers
Hon. Frank Pallone, Jr.
Hon. Frank Lautenberg
Hon. Rush Holt
Hon. Jon S. Corzine
Fed. Highway Authority Div. Adm. Dennis Merida
Asbury Park Press
The Courier
The Hub
The Journal
The TwoRiver Times
COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF FAIR HAVEN  
MONMOUTH COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

RESOLUTION

Motion by Peters  Seconded: Walrath

AFFIRMATIVE: Bess, Gilmour, Peters, Schissler, Walrath
NEGATIVE:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN: Katich

RESOLUTION #2005-72

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 Moderne 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.
4. Limit the size of said and power boats that can use the 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.

1. 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:

This resolution was duly adopted by the Council of the Borough of Fair Haven at a Meeting held on May 9, 2005

Valerie T. Heilwell
Deputy Municipal Clerk

I, Valerie T. Heilwell, Deputy Municipal Clerk of the Borough of Fair Haven in the County of Monmouth in 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
EXHIBIT G
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.
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 sailboats 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>
Resolution No. 05-156

RESOLUTION ENDORSING AND REQUESTING
FEDERAL FUNDING FOR REPLACEMENT
OF OCEANIC BRIDGE BY LOW LEVEL
MOVABLE (BASCULE) BRIDGE

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

WHEREAS, a low level movable (bascule) bridge design has
been considered by the Office of the Monmouth County engineer
and appears to present a suitable replacement that strikes the
best balance between the various objectives: minimizing costs,
controlling traffic delays and construction time, and preserving the neighboring area and its historic and aesthetic features, and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration has on occasion provided funding for low level movable bridges when appropriate 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

MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. O'Grady</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Parkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Peters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Schraenberger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor T. Hall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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, 2003.

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

Heidi Abs, Township Clerk
EXHIBIT I
July 16, 2004

VIA HAND DELIVERY
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Hall of Records Annex
One East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Theodore A. Giannechini, P.E., P.L.S., P.P.
County Engineer

RE: Monmouth County Bridge S-31 (Oceanic Bridge),
County Route 8A, Bingham Avenue – Locust Point
Road over Navesink River in the Borough of Rumson
and the Township of Middletown

Dear Mr. Giannechini:

The Riverside Drive Association ("Association") is an association of homeowners residing in the area of Navesink, McClees, Browns Dock, Locust Point and Cooper Roads in Middletown. The Association was formed 81 years ago for the main purpose of oiling the dirt roads in the summer and plowing them in the winter. Through the ensuing years, it has evolved into an organization of nearly 240 families who work together to preserve the quality of life we have come to enjoy in this area. The goals of the Association are:

* Keeping the membership informed on all matters affecting the neighborhood and the Navesink River and initiating united action when necessary.

* Assuring the safety of our members and their properties.

* Preserving the environment and protecting the ecology of the area.

* Enhancing the quality of life of the neighborhood.

* Advancing the welfare of the general community.

Members of the Association, including the undersigned, attended the Public Information Sessions for the above-captioned project held on June 14, 2004 in Rumson and June 16, 2004 in Middletown. The purpose of this letter is to provide
2004 in Middletown. The purpose of this letter is to provide public input and comments regarding the project as requested during the Public Information Sessions.

The Association expresses in the strongest possible terms its objections to any "high level" fixed bridge whether on the existing alignment or a new alignment. The Association firmly believes that rehabilitating the present bridge has not been sufficiently examined. Indeed, even prior to the Public Information Sessions, your experts ruled out the possible rehabilitation of the existing bridge or the rehabilitation and replacement of the bascule span as not feasible. Accordingly, the public was left with a series of bad choices and it is strongly recommended that these "not feasible" alternatives be re-examined as they very well may be possible alternatives.

While we disagree that the "high bridge" options are feasible and believe that other options are worthy of further study, we do agree in general that if the present bridge is going to be replaced, a realigned roadway is better than the existing alignment, although that depends on the precise routing of the realigned road.

The reasons that the Association and its officers and members object to the "high bridge" include, but are not limited to the following:

1. The "high bridge" option directly conflicts with the Monmouth County Planning Board’s Scenic Roads Plan (Adopted September, 2001, see Appendix D) (“Plan”). Likewise, the stretch of Monmouth County 12-A along the Navesink River is also included on this list. The Plan is submitted in fulfillment of state master planning obligations for the County of Monmouth and was adopted unanimously by the Monmouth County Planning Board. It makes it clear that one of the primary policy goals of the County is the preservation of scenic resources of which the Oceanic Bridge is certainly one. A copy of the resolution, which is instructive as to the goals and policies of the county is attached to these comments. It must be adhered to in any action taken by the County with respect to the Oceanic Bridge. It is also noteworthy that the concerted efforts of local communities along the Navesink River, including our Association, were instrumental in assuring that both 12-A and 8-A were included in the Plan, and so that their scenic and historic values would be preserved by it.

The Plan is quite clear on the need for any bridge to be compatible in design and scale to its surroundings. The Plan contains many explicit references to actual projects in the County and how they must fit into their surroundings, such as the rebuilding of the bridge in Tinton Falls using local materials in a design sympathetic to
the historic district in which such bridge is located. A good example of the Plan’s explicit requirements for the Oceanic Bridge is this excerpt from page 21:

“New Bridge or existing bridges proposed for reconstruction, should be designed to permit viewing of scenic resources. Where applicable, a minimum 5.0’ wide sidewalk should be provided in addition to the shoulder and the travel lanes. The exterior bridge treatment should be designed to contextually reflect the architectural or thematic character of the surrounding area (See Figure 7 below).”

Rather than fitting in with historic, natural beauty of the Navesink River and surrounding area, a massive 55-70 foot high bridge will dominate it. It will adversely affect the viewshed from Red Bank to Sea Bright, and particularly along Monmouth 12-A in a manner not permitted by the Plan, even if the life cycle cost of other low bridge options is higher. See, e.g. Plan page 67, “Structures Intrude on View. Objects that obstruct or intrude into a viewshed.” Thus, these options must be excluded from further consideration and should not be regarded as “feasible” from a planning or legal perspective.

2. As set forth earlier, other options should be more carefully considered.

The low bridge options are listed in the study as costing more. While construction costs of a drawbridge are comparable or lower than a high span, they are stated to involve higher operation and maintenance costs. Assuming that both of these facts are correct – and we currently do not have sufficient information on which to make that assumption - the report does not seriously consider whether navigational requirements compel a high bridge or a drawbridge.

At the turn of the century, the Navesink had substantial commercial boat traffic, primarily because of the lack of good road connections to the rest of the State of New Jersey. Long term irreversible changes in transportation infrastructure have eliminated virtually all large scale maritime commerce from the River. Virtually all traffic on the River is pleasure boats. In most places, the River is only a few feet deep. Even in the main channels, low tide clearances do not support vessels with substantial draft and it is unlikely that any maintenance dredging will be conducted in the River in the near future for environmental and other reasons. Neither the rail bridge nor the new Route 35 bridge make accommodation for such vessels. Thus, we believe that the scoping study should consider a low bridge without a draw or bascule bridge feature as a feasible alternative. We are aware that this may require substantial interaction with
federal authorities to secure approval of such an option, and that it might require foregoing federal money for dredging. However, that does not, by itself, render this option not feasible.

3. The "Draft Summary Matrix" presented at the Public Information Sessions is misleading in weighing alternatives. We assume that the draft summary matrix appearing on Page 26 of the Scoping Study is designed as part of an environmental impact study type requirement in which different interests must be weighed in evaluating the best bridge options, along with means for mitigating adverse effects. Thus, the relative ranking of the options is critical in evaluating the options before the County.

With regard to the matrix, we agree that any high bridge option has "poor" architectural design mitigation and a low level bridge is "good" from this perspective. However, consistent with county policy, since scenic impacts are an inherent part of environmental impacts, the environmental impacts of a high bridge should be rated as having significant adverse effect, rather than "minor."

Moreover, the matrix appears to assert that the "historic impacts" of the high and low bridge options are equal, as they are both simply listed as having an "adverse effect." We agree that demolition of the existing bridge will clearly have an adverse effect on the bridge itself, which is an historic structure and is eligible for state register protection. However, as discussed below in more detail, the impact of a high bridge is significantly greater on historic resources than any low bridge option, because of the effect on historic resources which are adjacent to the new bridge. A new 50-70 foot high bridge will be plainly visible from historic districts in Middletown (the immediately adjacent Locust is a state register district) and Rumson, and will seriously detract from those districts by introducing a discordant, modern high rise structure into a low rise, human scale area. A low bridge does not have an "adverse effect" on these adjacent historic resources. The decision matrix should reflect this by either rating a high bridge option as "Severe Adverse Effect" or creating a separate matrix for historic district impacts.

Because this project is partially state funded, the proposed bridge project is subject to formal review by the State Historic Preservation Office for adverse impacts on the State Register Locust historic district under the New Jersey Register of Historic Places act (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-15.128 et seq.). Under state regulations, this consultation must take place at "the earliest stage of planning for any undertaking." We specifically note that a high bridge option is almost assuredly a regulated encroachment on the Locust district because it constitutes: "introduction of visual elements that are out of character with the registered property or alter its setting." NJAC 7:4-7.4.
Theodore A. Giannechini, P.E., P.L.S., P.P.
County Engineer
July 16, 2004
Page 5.

4. Two other issues are simply not reflected in the matrix. First, the high bridge will have an adverse effect on recreational use of the bridge. The Plan makes note of the need for sidewalks and bike usage on bridges, but a high bridge will take a potential Tour de France winner to use for biking. Second, a high bridge will clearly have an adverse effect on homes and businesses adjacent to the new routing, even if no taking results. These effects should be considered by any credible study of the bridge alternatives.

5. Several of our members are avid fishermen and experienced bird watchers. One, in particular, is active outdoors twelve months of the year. He began fishing for flounder each April under the Oceanic Bridge several years ago. For the past three years, he has observed a pair of Perigrine falcons nesting under the bridge. The nest site is on the northwest side of the bridge tucked in on top of one of the abutments. From March until June of each year, he has observed these birds hunting avian prey along side of the bridge and feeding their fledglings on the nest. Any plans to repair or replace the bridge should take into account the well-being of these threatened species.

6. The bridge presently spans the Navesink River between two historic neighborhoods. The one on the south is a recognized and zoned historic district of Rumson and the one on the north, is a recognized and zoned historic district of the Township of Middletown. To destroy the present esthetically pleasing bridge that is eligible for the National Register and replace it with a high bridge would be irresponsible. Finally, the present low Oceanic Bridge is not only historic but esthetically is a gem. Any destruction of the present bridge would be detrimental to its beauty and historic character and would lead to adverse results. The views of the River and opposite shores from both the Rumson and Locust sides of the river would be inalterably destroyed.

7. The adverse affect on the restaurants on the southwesterly side of the bridge would be devastating as its diners would look into a brand new bridge abutment rather than under and across the bridge.

The opinions expressed in this letter are shared by Hartshorne Woods Association, Monmouth Hills Association and a number of residents in Rumson. We will be soliciting the opinions of the Officials of the Borough of Rumson and Township of Middletown. We would welcome further discussions with representatives of your office concerning this very important matter.
Finally, I am enclosing a copy of the history of the Riverside Drive Association which will emphasize in greater detail many of the goals and accomplishments of the Association since it was founded in 1923.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

RICHARD D. McCOMBER
President

RDM/jmh
c: Amy doc/county engineer letter
Enclosure

cc: Honorable Frank Pallone, Jr. (w/history)
Honorable Harry Larrison, Jr. (w/history)
Honorable Theodore J. Narozanick (w/history)
Honorable Amy H. Handlin (w/history)
Honorable Thomas J. Powers (w/history)
Honorable Edward J. Stominski (w/history)
James Gray, Clerk of the Board (w/history)
Louis Paparozzi, County Administrator (w/history)
Daniel J. Wolfe, Director of Public Works & Engineering (w/history)
Joseph M. Ettore, Assistant County Engineer (w/history)
Honorable Joan Smith, Mayor of the Township of Middletown (w/history)
Rosa Crowley, Clerk of the Township of Middletown (w/history)
Honorable John E. Ekdahl, Mayor of the Borough of Rumson (w/history)
J. Gary Sammon, Clerk of the Borough of Rumson (w/history)
Salt Creek Grill (4 Bingham Avenue, Rumson, NJ 07760)
Attention: Steve Bidgood, General Manager (w/history)
John Karlin, President, Hartshorne Woods Association (w/o history)
John Lewis, Vice President, Hartshorne Woods Association (w/o history)
William Schreiber, President, Monmouth Hills Association (w/history)
Asbury Park Press, Attention: Terry Gauthier Muessig (w/o history)
Two River Times (w/o history)
The Independent (w/o history)
APPENDIX D

MONMOUTH COUNTY PLANNING BOARD SCENIC ROADWAY RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO. 01-12

RESOLUTION ADOPTING
THE MONMOUTH COUNTY SCENIC ROADWAY PLAN
AS AN ELEMENT OF
THE MONMOUTH COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT GUIDE

Paul Kieman, Jr. offers the following resolution and moves its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Monmouth County Planning Board adopted The Monmouth County Growth Management Guide: Goals, Objectives and Policies in December 1995 as the official county master plan pursuant to NISA 40:27-4 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, a main goal of The Monmouth County Growth Management Guide: Goals, Objectives and Policies is to preserve the valuable historic, cultural, natural and scenic resources of Monmouth County; and

WHEREAS, a main goal of The New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan is the preservation and enhancement of areas with scenic value; and

WHEREAS, a main goal of many Monmouth County municipal master plans is the preservation of scenic resources; and

WHEREAS, Monmouth County has long been known for its scenic natural resources, from the views of the Atlantic Ocean and Raritan Bay to the hardwood forests and farmlands; and

WHEREAS, Monmouth County has numerous county roadways from which one can view these scenic natural resources and oftentimes the roadways are scenic in their own right; and

WHEREAS, in order for future generations of Monmouth County residents to enjoy the scenic resources the county has to offer, a pro-active approach to planning and developing the land within or around these scenic resources needs to be implemented; and

WHEREAS, the Monmouth County Planning Board has prepared The Monmouth County Scenic Roadway Plan that (1) identifies those county roadways, or sections of county roadways, that have high scenic value; (2) establishes alternative design guidelines for scenic county roadways for use by Monmouth County in its development review process and capital improvement program; and (3) presents other methods of preserving and enhancing scenic county roadways that can be implemented by other agencies and governmental jurisdictions.

83
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Monmouth County Planning Board, in accordance with NISA 40:27-4 et seq., hereby adopts *The Monmouth County Scenic Roadway Plan* as an element of *The Monmouth County Growth Management Guide*.

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an attested copy of *The Monmouth County Scenic Roadway Plan* be sent to the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, the governing body and planning board of each municipality in the County, the county planning boards of neighboring counties and to the New Jersey State Planning Commission.

Seconded by Frederick Storz and passed upon the following vote:

In the affirmative:  Mr. Rottagliata, Mr. Storz, Mr. Klemm, Mr. Warters, Mr. Illman, Mr. Giannell and Mr. Giannechini

In the negative:  None

Abstain:  None

Absent:  Freeholder Director Larrison and Freeholder Powers

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Monmouth County Planning Board at a meeting on September 17, 2001

[Signature]

Oeraldine A. Elias
SECRETARY TO THE BOARD
EXHIBIT J
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.
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.
ADOPTED: ____________________

Mary Lou Strong, Chairman

### 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
To: Martine Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>
Cc: skahlon@njtpa.org <skahlon@njtpa.org>; fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us <fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us>
Sent: Fri, Oct 9, 2020 3:36 pm
Subject: Re: Oceanic Bridge S-31 LCD Study - Reminder Public Comment Period Ends 10/18/20

Martine-
Thank you for the updated information.
A couple of questions:
1.) When can we expect the questions that were submitted at the Aug. 27, 2020 meeting to be answered?
2.) What is the time frame for when the public will see the Public comments summary report on the County website?
3.) When will the county meet with the town officials from Middletown & Rumson? Can our group be invited to attend those meetings as long standing stakeholders of this project?

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding thesis inquires.
Respectfully-
Subject: Public Comment Oceanic Bridge (S-31)

Date: 10/16/2020, 3:56 PM
To: monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com
CC: Martine Culbertson <maculbertson@verizon.net>

I am not sure if my Public comment was submitted. I tried to send it in twice.
Also, I would like to know what the total number of Public Comments submitted for this project are.

Thank You-
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2020 10:42 AM
To: fred.passeggio@co.monmouth.nj.us

Subject: Monmouth County Bridge S-31

Please see attached correspondence sent on behalf of [REDACTED] Thank you.
October 22, 2020

Via Email Only
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
and Traffic Safety
Hall of Records Annex, 1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728

Attention: Fred Passeggio, Project Manager
Department of Public Works and Engineering

RE: Monmouth County Bridge S-31
Preliminary Preferred Alternative ("PPA")

Dear Mr. Passeggio:

Would you please advise me as to the following:

1. The date when the County of Monmouth will make its final decision as to the PPA for the new Oceanic Bridge.
2. When may we expect responses to the questions that were raised during the August 27, 2020 virtual presentation of the PPA, e.g. the archaeological points of interest lying east of the new structure beneath the Navesink River.
3. A written analysis of the comments made during the August 27, 2020 virtual presentation of the PPA.
4. The dates when representatives of your office plan to meet with the governing bodies of the Borough of Rumson and the Township of Middletown to discuss the PPA.

cc: [Name] Freeholder, Director and Member of North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
Attention: [Name], Executive Director
Attention: [Name], Deputy Executive Director
Attention: [Name], Director Project Development and Local Programs
Office of the Monmouth County Engineer
Attention: Joseph M. Ettore, P.E.
Attention: Inkyung Englehart
Thank you for your comments and questions. At this time, the Project Team feels that the prepared digital representations adequately illustrate how the new bridge would look from various vantage points in the area. The current lamp posts are approximately 21 feet in height from the sidewalk. Also, the installation of windsocks on the lamp posts would not be on the same horizontal alignment and not properly represent the proposed new bridge profile, as the height varies throughout the length of the bridge.

As previously mentioned, the public comment period was extended from 30 to 45 days to allow more time for the public to view the bridge study information and provide written comments. After the comment period closes, all responses to questions and comments will post to the project website with personal information redacted for all to view. With regard to the installation of electronic VMS signs, Monmouth County will install these signs prior to the end of the public comment period and a reminder email will be sent prior to all those who have provided email addresses.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Subject: Oceanic Bridge LCD Study: Responses to Your 10/9, 10/15, and 10/22 Emails
From: Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge <monmouthcountyoceanicbridge@gmail.com>
Date: 12/2020 10:40 PM

Responses to October 9th email with three questions:
1) The Project Team has been continually responding to written questions submitted to the County Project Manager after the August 27th PIC Meeting No. 3 and are continuing to do so given the volume of written questions and comments received via email, the online PIC comment form and those from fax and U.S. postal mail.

2) Once all questions and comments have been reviewed and any responses emailed, they will be compiled into a file. The file will be posted to the project website under Community Activities to Date documents from the PIC Meeting No. 3. Once the PIC Comments Received File is approved, the PIC Meeting No. 3 Summary Meeting Report will also be posted. An email blast will be sent to local officials, community stakeholders and the general public who provided an email address to inform everyone of the posting, anticipated in December.

3) Once all PIC written comments received and responses have been reviewed and compiled into one file, the County will schedule a local officials meeting with Middletown and Rumson to discuss the PIC Meeting No. 3 comments received and request for resolution of support for the PPA. Attendance is at the discretion of the local officials in what their meeting process requires as to whether it is open to the public or by invitation.

Response to October 15th email with one question:
The total square footage of the roadway (including sidewalks and parapets) for the recommended PPA (65’ fixed bridge Alternative 7A - Modified) is 186,300 square feet. The total square footage for Alternative 7B, with a 45-foot drawbridge option is 179,820 square feet.

Response to October 22nd letter with four questions:
1) Monmouth County has made its final recommendation for the PPA as Alternative 7A - Modified with 65 feet of underclearance. The final decision to advance the project from Local Concept Development to Local Preliminary Engineering will be made by the Interagency Review Committee, which is composed of NJTPA, NJDOT and FHWA.

The remaining three questions posed in your letter are answered above in our responses to your October 9th email responses.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690

Local Concept Development (LCD) Study for
Monmouth County Oceanic Bridge (S-31)
Email: MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge@gmail.com
Website: www.MonmouthCountyOceanicBridge.com
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 No. 3 – August 27, 2020

Commenter #360
Hello,

[Organization Name] is a non-profit organization that has preserved and promoted the history of Middletown, New Jersey since 1968. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Oceanic Bridge project. The majority of our trustees, noted at the end of this letter, contributed to and approved these comments.

Of course, we do not like to see historically-significant structures demolished. Ideally, we would like the existing bridge to be preserved. Its eligibility for the National Register attests to its importance. However, we understand the professional opinion of the experts is that the existing Oceanic Bridge has reached the end of its useful life, and it appears to be a foregone conclusion that it cannot be saved.

Again, it is our wish that the current bridge be rehabilitated. If that is not feasible, we respectfully ask that the selected design for a new bridge be reconsidered. Its height would be highly incongruous with the character of the Locust Historical District on the Middletown side and also would not mesh with the Rumson side. We recognize the reason for the chosen height, but feel that the 22 feet option, or even the 45 feet option, would be more acceptable due to the lower profiles. We also understand the federal guideline to not install a movable bridge, but a movable bridge has traversed the river at that point for almost 130 years. Surely the local populace is well-acustomed to the occasional wait at the drawbridge, and undoubtedly, today’s technology would result in drawbridge maintenance being reduced from its current level. A smaller width would also be preferred. This may be accomplished by placing the bike and pedestrian lanes on one side only. To have the existing, quaint bridge replaced by a behemoth befitting a superhighway, only for the benefit of the few recreational boaters who have very large masts, would be a mistake.

It is our desire that the new bridge have an appropriate aesthetic design. We hope there will be some, and that when the time comes the public is asked to participate in the final look. The existing bridge has been said to be in the “art-moderne” style, an offshoot of the art deco movement. At the time of its construction, it was reported that it was designed to look like a ship. It even won an award for “Most Beautiful Bridge of the Year” from the American Institute of Steel Construction. According to the New Jersey Historic Bridge Survey, it is “historically and technologically noteworthy. Its design details demonstrate careful attention to style and proportion including Moderne-style steel railings and operator houses.” It might be nice if the new bridge could mimic the existing one’s style.

We ask that there be an exploration to save a portion of the bridge on at least one side for use as a fishing pier or as a landscaped sitting or viewing area (akin to New York City’s Highline). Unfortunately, this would not contain the bridge’s iconic towers, but it would be nice to retain the piers as a reminder of what was once there. These areas would be an appropriate site for signage or a display that explained the history and significance of the previous bridges. [Organization Name] and other historical societies would likely be glad to help prepare such a display. Interestingly, this pier concept was also proposed in 1940 before the original bridge was demolished.

We’d also like to note that it was reported that there are plaques embedded into the bridge related to its dedication and its award for Most Beautiful Bridge (reportedly, the plaques apparently use its official name of
Navesink Bridge). If they do still exist, we'd like these to be saved prior to demolition and donated to a local historical society. It was also reported that a time capsule was embedded within a pier of the original bridge in 1891. While we assume this disappeared when that bridge was demolished, if somehow the tin box should be found during the new construction, it too should go to a historical society.

Thank you. Please let us know if you need any assistance or have any questions.

Sincerely,
Thank you for your comments. The NJDOT Project Delivery process, which was adopted by NJTPA and has been approved by the NJ FHWA Division Office, requires that the Project Team examine a range of conceptual alternatives for bridge improvements. The currently recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) was developed as one of the many conceptual alternatives that were presented at the online Public Information Center (PIC) meeting and analyzed with other alternatives in the comparison of alternatives matrix. Also noted in the online PIC meeting, the U.S. Coast Guard determines the height of a fixed bridge. A preliminary determination of navigational clearance letter was issued by the U.S. Coast Guard that states "if a fixed bridge alternative is selected, its vertical clearance must be at least 65 feet at mean high water. Based on available geometric parameters, it is the Project Team’s recommendation as the PPA, supported by the Code of Federal Regulations Section 650.809, which states: "A fixed bridge shall be selected wherever practicable."

Rehabilitation and new location alternatives, that avoid or minimize impacts to historic resources have been evaluated. Additional Cultural Resources studies and coordination will be conducted during Section 106, Section 4(f) and the NEPA process in Local Preliminary Engineering and Final Design. Consultation with interested parties to address mitigation measures will occur during Local Preliminary Engineering in accordance with Section 106. Consideration for saving a portion of the bridge for use as a fishing pier or viewing area, along with saving identified historical elements such as the plaques or time capsules will be further evaluated in Local Preliminary Engineering.

With regard to the overall width of the currently recommended PPA, the bridge will remain a two lane bridge (one lane in each direction) with shoulders proposed on both sides of the new bridge to provide bicycle compatibility and also to provide an area for vehicles to pull over in case of an emergency. As cyclists are required to travel in the direction of traffic, shoulders are required on both sides of the bridge. Sidewalks are also proposed on both sides of the bridge to increase provisions for pedestrians, improve waterfront access, eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the roadway to access a single sidewalk, and connect into the existing and proposed sidewalk network.

Regards,
Oceanic Bridge S-31 Study Project Team

Fred Passeggio, P.E.
Monmouth County Division of Engineering
Hall of Records Annex, 3rd Floor
1 East Main Street
Freehold, NJ 07728
732-431-7760 x6690
Commenter #361
10/11/2020

As property owners that will be impacted by this decision we vote to not increase the vertical height of the bridge in any current or future plan.