



COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge
Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2
MEETING REPORT

DATE: Wednesday, April 26, 2017
TIME: 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Township of Nutley Parks and Recreation Building, Room 300,
44 Park Avenue, Nutley, NJ
ATTENDEES:

First Name	Last Name	Representing
Attendees		
Eugene	Cataldo	Resident - Lyndhurst
Jonathan	DeCamp	DeCamp Bus Lines
Ben	Delisle	Passaic River Rowing Association
Ron	Gastelu	NJ Grill Group LLC
Robert B.	Giangeruso	Township of Lyndhurst
Robert	Heiser	Resident – Lyndhurst
Brian	Intindola	Township of Lyndhurst
Pennie	Landry	Resident – Nutley
Juan	Matallano	Resident – Nutley
Harvey	Morginstin	Passaic River Boat Club
Maryann	Nakonechy	Resident
PO Francis	O’Rouke	Resident – Lyndhurst
Mike	Rossi	Nutley Volunteer Emergency & Rescue Squad
Joseph P.	Scarpelli	Township of Nutley
Don	Schlosser	Petrella Paving
Kerri	Tyerman	Resident – Nutley
Joanne	Victorio	Passaic River Rowing Association
Project Team		
Michelle Lowry	Babula	County of Essex, Dept. of Public Works
Joseph	Baladi	County of Bergen, Department of Planning & Engineering
Martine	Culbertson	M. A. Culbertson, LLC
Josh	Davison	Stokes Creative Group, Inc.
Joseph A.	Femia	County of Bergen, Department of Planning & Engineering
Sarbjit	Kahlon	NJTPA
Brian	Medino	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

Eugene	Murphy, Jr.	County of Bergen, Department of Planning & Engineering
Nicole	Pace	Stokes Creative Group
Rob	Piel	Amy S. Greene Environmental
Bruce	Riegel	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC
Robert	Supino	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC
Matt	Witkowski	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC

PURPOSE OF MEETING

The purpose of this meeting was to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to the Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge over the Passaic River, and obtain community input on the benefits and impacts associated with each option. (See attached Agenda)

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Project Overview & Background

After introductions from the Project Team and Attendees, Joseph Femia, P.E., County Engineer, reminded everyone of the need to study the bridge is due to its age and structural deficiencies. The purpose of the bridge study is to identify how to rehabilitate or replace the existing bridge. The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) is overseeing this phase of the project. The bridge is under both Bergen County and Essex County jurisdiction. The input received from community stakeholders and the public at the prior meetings has contributed to developing the purpose and need statement and the alternatives that will be discussed at this meeting. Bruce Riegel, Hardesty & Hanover Project Manager, will present the project status, the Purpose and Need Statement and information on the conceptual alternatives for bridge improvements.

2. Project Status

Bruce Riegel, Hardesty & Hanover Project Manager, provided the project status and schedule as listed on the Project Information handout distributed to attendees.

- (a) Currently, the project is on schedule. The Purpose and Need Statement has been approved and is included in the handouts (green handout).
- (b) The Concept Development Flow Chart shows the steps to be completed for the Concept Development Phase. The project team has completed the Purpose and Need Statement, and developed conceptual alternatives. A comparison of alternatives matrix has also been developed and over the coming months the engineering and environmental data for each alternative will be entered into the matrix to analyze the options and recommend a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) to move forward to the design phase.





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

3. Community Stakeholders Update

Martine Culbertson, Community Involvement Facilitator, provided an update of the Community and Agency Stakeholders List using the blue handout that has been updated with new stakeholders and agency representatives. She asked attendees to review the list and inform the project team if any changes or new names or organizations should be considered. Martine explained the remainder of the handouts distributed to attendees could be placed or replaced in their Project Portfolio that was being distributed at Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 1 or at this meeting.

4. Purpose and Need Statement

Bruce Riegel presented information on the Purpose and Need Statement as described on the yellow handout. It is based upon the input received from the community at the prior Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 1 and Public Meeting No. 1 and has been approved by the agencies. It is from these goals and objectives that the conceptual alternatives were developed.

5. Conceptual Alternatives Overview

Brian Medino, Project Engineer from Hardesty & Hanover, provided an overview of each of the Conceptual Alternatives as detailed in the Draft Description of Alternatives Handout distributed to attendees and as listed on the blank comparison of alternatives matrix copy provided at each table for viewing.

- (a) Conceptual drawings and profiles of the bridge alternatives were on display boards during the presentation and for viewing by attendees.
- (b) Brian explained for each of the bridge alternatives, the cross section would be six foot sidewalks, 8 foot shoulders, and the amount of proposed lanes would be five, however it has not been determined if it would be two eastbound and three westbound or vice versa. The handouts distributed at the meeting tables indicates the existing cross section and the proposed cross sections as well as the bridge profiles (height of the bridge).

Matt Witkowski, H&H Traffic Engineer, presented the traffic operations for each of the approach roadways in Lyndhurst and in Nutley where the ramps to Route 21 include more movements. The Project Team is continuing to coordinate with NJDOT and the Counties to examine short term solutions to the traffic signal timing and phasing currently as well as what options are effective for the long term with the bridge improvements.

Bob Supino, Hardesty & Hanover Bridge Engineer provided information on the various types of movable bridges that could be constructed. The existing bridge is a swing bridge and could be replaced with a single left bascule bridge that uses a counter weight to move up and down. A twin tower system to open the bridge would be like the Stickel Bridge.





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

6. Group Discussion on Alternatives – Pros & Cons

Attendees broke into separate group discussion tables to review each of the concepts in detail and discuss the benefits and impacts to each alternative. There were four table groups. A Preference Survey (yellow handout) was distributed to attendees to provide comments on each of the alternatives and a Questionnaire (pink handout) to provide input on the cross section of the bridge and any approach roadway intersection comments.

Attendees also received dots to complete an exercise to indicate the alternative with most support, least support and if alternatives are possible but require refinement. During the group discussion time, Martine Culbertson distributed four colored dots to each attendee. She explained that after each table had finished reviewing and discussing each option, they had the opportunity to indicate the alternative they most supported (green dot) and least favored (red dot) as well as two other dots for options that with some adjustments might accept (blue) or not likely to accept (yellow). One may choose to use all four dots or not and may place any or all next to alternatives which they support or not. Stakeholders placed their dots privately on newsprint.

The dots assist the project team in identifying which alternatives have preferred support and more importantly, which alternatives with some adjustments may have improvements, which the community could support or those not favored.

After each table presented their findings during the closing comments, the newsprint containing the dots was displayed for everyone to view (Image attached to report).

- (a) The notes taken during each table group discussion are included as Report Attachment 1.
- (b) Both completed handouts by attendees were collected at the end of the meeting. A Preference Survey Summary Report and a Questionnaire Summary Report are attached at the end of this meeting report as Report Attachment 2 and Attachment 3, respectively.
- (c) An image of the dots exercise is included at the end of the report (Attachment No. 4).
- (d) After the group discussions, a presenter from each table provided a brief summary of the discussions from their table to share with all attendees. The following comments were noted on newsprint:

Input / Comments

Group 1

- Concepts 1, 2B, & 2C are ridiculous
- Like concepts 5 & 6 – preferred





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

- Concept 3B liked – needs designated bus lane
- Concept 4C expensive
- Concept 6 option – spend now, keep old as historic
- 5 lanes preferred – better than existing

Group 2

- Keep one lane during construction
- Bridge need to be closed – high concern for closure/detour
- How long closed – any too long – detour/short construction
- 5 lane alternative – extra lane, 3 each
- new lights complicated issue
- dedicated lane, accident rate
- movable necessary – how much boat traffic?
- Concept 3B – add more capacity – 2 lanes
Designated left WB with 2 lanes
Designated EB – striped island
- Right of way concern – easement required

Group 3

- Rowing club – fixed v. moveable not discussed
- Wider channel
- Bike lanes important
- 100' channel option 4B
- car lane more than sidewalk
- no comment – sidewalk both sides

Group 4

- 5 lanes agreed
- not agreed which direction
- sidewalk under Rt. 21 – southbound or northbound
- pedestrian counts
- SE backs up – a little more free flow





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

7. Closing Comments - Feedback

Martine Culbertson reminded attendees of the project website and twitter for sharing of information on the bridge project. The website includes project information such as the handouts, project information sheet, meeting announcements and reports, photos, contact information, and opportunity to submit comments and questions.

The following feedback comments and action items were noted:

Feedback

- Opportunity
- Concepts confusing – a lot of options, variations
- Bridge closed – do they have to be closed? How long? Please one lane
- Rt 7 near Hackensack – Whitpenn: long span
- 1905 built in one year – 3 bridges in one year
- Address traffic signals now prior to bridge
- Good format, productive input

Next Steps – Action Items

- Fill in matrix – project team
- USCG (U.S. Coast Guard) & agencies review
- Website – reports and updates
- Local officials meeting – discuss PPA once agency review scheduled
- Public meeting w/stakeholders & general public – PPA input, afternoon & evening sessions

8. Next Steps - Closing Comments

Both Joseph Femia, Bergen County Engineer and Michele Lowry Babula, Essex County Project Engineer, thanked attendees for their comments and for Nutley hosting the meeting facility. The next steps will be for the project team to fill in the information needed to complete the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix, to coordinate with the agencies to review the matrix; to meet with local officials to present the matrix information and discuss a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) to recommend; and then a public information center meeting will be scheduled to present the matrix information and a PPA for additional public input, that is anticipated in the Fall 2017.

Any questions, please contact Joe Baladi, Hudson County Project Manager or Luis Rodriguez, Essex County Project Manager or Bruce Riegel, the H&H Project Manager. A meeting summary will be





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

provided and posted to the web site with other project information. If anyone would like to view the conceptual alternative plans, an appointment can be made Bergen County, Essex County, NJTPA, Hardesty & Hanover or at Township of Lyndhurst.

In closing, the project team thanked attendees for their input. It is another important step to developing improvements for the Kingsland Avenue (De Jesse Memorial) Bridge. Martine Culbertson will inform community stakeholders of the public meeting date to be held in Fall 2017 and a mailing and legal posting will be done to notify the general public. Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

KEY ACTION ITEMS

1. H&H project team will study the input provided at the meeting and enter data in the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix from bridge, roadway, traffic analysis, environmental and cultural resources in coordination with Bergen County, Essex County and the municipalities.
2. Attendees to review Community Stakeholders List, Draft Written Description of Alternatives and other Handouts; provide any comments and updated contact information; and attend Public Meeting in Fall 2017.
3. Martine Culbertson will provide meeting summary, update Community Stakeholders List, notify community stakeholders and the general public in scheduling the Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting in the Fall 2017.

NEXT MEETING

Local Officials Meetings and Public Information Center (PIC) Meetings (2 Sessions- one in each community)

Date: (date to be determined)

Time: 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. (brief presentation at 2:30pm)

Location: Senior Center or Town Hall, Lyndhurst, NJ (location to be determined)

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. (brief presentation at 6:30pm)

Location: Nutley Recreational Center, Nutley, NJ (location to be determined)

We believe the foregoing to be an accurate summary of discussions and related decisions. We would appreciate notification of exceptions or corrections to the minutes within three (3) working days of receipt. Without notification, these minutes will be considered to be record of fact.
NJTPA Bergen County/Essex County Kingsland Avenue Bridge Project Study Team





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge
Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Township of Nutley Parks and Recreation Building, Room 300
44 Park Avenue, Nutley, NJ, 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

AGENDA

The purpose of this meeting is to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to the Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge over the Passaic River, and obtain community input on the benefits and impacts associated with each option.

I. *WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION*

- Project Overview & Status
- Community Stakeholders Update

II. *BERGEN COUNTY / ESSEX COUNTY KINGSLAND AVENUE BRIDGE OVER PASSAIC RIVER*

- Purpose and Need Statement
- Conceptual Alternatives Overview
- Group Discussion on Alternatives - Pros & Cons
- Group Discussion on Alternatives – Improvements
- Group Results - Key Points

III. *DISCUSSION AND NEXT STEPS*

- Community Feedback
- Action Items – Local Officials Meetings & Public Information Center Meetings
- Closing Comments





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge
Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2 – REPORT ATTACHMENT
TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Table Discussion Notes - Group 1

TABLE GROUP 1 (Bruce Riegel, Eugene Murphy, Nicole Pace)

Concept 1:

- "Engineering nightmare" - no way
- 2 lanes is not enough - especially during rush hour
- light changes before the bridge?
- any double-decker options available?

Concept 2A:

- Getting better

Concept 2B:

- forget that
- ridiculous

Concept 2C:

- no - ridiculous

Concept 3A:

- needs 3rd dedicated lane for RT21
- contact DOT about giving up the boat ramp

Concept 3B:

- like this one;
- needs dedicated bus lane during high travel times for buses
- good but a little iffy

Concept 4A + 4B movable

- the only solution; keeps existing bridge in use
- add a ferry
- don't think it will work - prefer a fixed bridge

Concept 4C:

- probably most expensive so far
- don't like it

Concept 5:

- like this because partial bridge remains open
- its workable if Coast Guard allows it
- traffic needs to stay open

Concept 6:

- spent the money now to avoid doing it again
- yes - this is a good option
- all other solutions are simply band aids
- keep old bridge for history and revisit bridge on opposite side
- don't like it
- looks good but not realistic



COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

Table Discussion Notes - Group 2

TABLE GROUP 2 (Brian Medino, Joe Baladi, Michele Lowry Babula)

- What is height of RT 7 bridge : 50 feet
- Decamp - 24 trips a day -> 525 passengers a day
- Will there be an alternative bridge
- Detour route alone is undesirable -> detour to RT3 is undesirable
- Staging maybe an option
- for morning over bridge -> to RT3
 - > up to Park to xxxx to Rt3
 - > up Stuyvesant
 - > on Ridge
- Lyndhurst passengers are stranded without bridge
- Starting date? 2025 possible
- Duration of construction
- Most likely alternative: 3B - 5 lanes: - 3 westbound and 2 eastbound
- If a 5th lane was added, which direction is better? Nutley side is backed u to Washington in morning. Lyndhurst side is backed up in afternoon
- Intersection problem: entrance & Exit to RT21
- Adding extra lane on eastbound is better because lanes bottleneck & intersection
- Timing of 3 intersections
- Concern about accidents with people trying to get around those turning lights
- Westbound traffic under RT21, provide 2 lanes thru & thru left
- might need to acquire property of bank
- How much boat traffic really goes through bridge?
- Is there any way to keep at least one lane open during construction? This would be very desirable to business owner / restaurant owner
- Traffic lights make it worse
- Essex County : what is set back @ bank?



Table Discussion Notes - Group 3

TABLE GROUP 3 (Matt Witkowski, Rob Piel)

The various alternative design concepts were presented by Matt Witkowski of Hardesty and Hanover to the three stakeholders in Group 3. The three stakeholders represented the rowing clubs on the river and the power boat users on the river. An additional stakeholder joined the group late in the discussion. The following comments were received:

1. A fixed bridge vs a movable bridge does not affect the rowing clubs. The width of the channel is important to the rowing clubs. The wider the channel the better. A rowing skull is 20 feet wide and when racing they need to be able to pass each other with sufficient room so as not to hit each other or the bridge.
2. Bike lanes are important. However, they should not disappear at the end of the bridge such that bikers are forced into traffic.
3. The more lanes on the bridge the better. A wider bridge is better.
4. Can the 5 lane bridge be designed to have the center lane switch directions during peak hours to accommodate the change in volume during commuting hours?
5. It is important to look beyond the bridge and modify the intersections on both sides of the bridge to improve traffic flow.
6. Rowers prefer the 100' channel (option 4B) or the two 65 foot channels (Option 4C).
7. Is widening the Rt. 21 bridge in Nutley off the table?
8. Sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides are important.
9. An extra lane for cars is more important than a sidewalk.
10. Option 3B is the best option because it provides the best improvement to traffic flow.
11. Concept 5 is not feasible from a constructability perspective.
12. Concept 6 is too expensive and would result in the removal of the boat ramp which is unacceptable. Concept 6 is crazy.



COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

Table Discussion Notes - Group 4

TABLE GROUP 4 (Bob Supino, Joe Femia, Sarbjit Kahlon)

No Build:

- Traffic congestion will remain on the bridge

Rehab Alternatives:

- Traffic congestion will remain on the bridge
- Historical elements don't need to be preserved.
- Need for shoulder for bicyclists.

Fixed Concepts:

2A:

- Traffic congestion is not improved on the bridge.

2B & 2C:

- Concepts are not feasible
- A lot of impact to Route 21 and in Lyndhurst.
- USCG controls the vertical clearance of the bridge.

3A:

- Fewer lanes west bound than east bound. Third lane east bound can be used by the cars turning from the 21 NB ramp.
- 21 NB ramp should be striped for two lanes.
- Traffic will be detoured for about 2 years during construction.
- Why is the sidewalk on the south side instead of the north side under 21? Same side as the existing sidewalk.
- Suggested restriping at River Rd. NB intersection. (in front of DD) Make it right only and combine left and NB traffic.

3B:

- Three lanes going west bound has better LOS than three lanes east bound.
- Traffic will be detoured for about 2 years during construction.
- Why is the sidewalk on the south side instead of the north side under 21? Same side as the existing sidewalk.
- Suggested restriping at River Rd. NB intersection. (in front of DD) Make it right only and combine left and NB traffic.
- 21 NB ramp should be striped for two lanes.

Movable Concepts:

- Traffic will be detoured for 2-3 years during construction.
- 21 NB ramp should be striped for two lanes.

Concept 5:

- Existing bridge can stay open partially to traffic during construction.
- 21 NB ramp should be striped for two lanes.
- Minimize impacts to adjacent properties.

Concept 6:

- Existing bridge can stay open to traffic during construction.
- A lot of impact to adjacent properties.
- 21 NB ramp should be striped for two lanes.
- Major impact to Route 21.



COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

PREFERENCE SURVEY SUMMARY REPORT

Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE: 17

TOTAL PREFERENCE SURVEYS RECEIVED: 16

OPTION	PREFERENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
1: NO BUILD	<input type="checkbox"/> Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs replacement traffic & structural Add ferry service to take some stress off structure
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	1	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	15	
2: MAJOR REHABILITATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Support	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good money after bad Needs replacement traffic & structural
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	1	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	7	
3: MODIFIED REHABILITATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Support	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good money after bad Interested on leaving one or two lanes open Needs replacement traffic & structural
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	4	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	8	
4: CONCEPT 1 Existing Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 10' Vertical Clearance over MHW, 4-Lane Section under Rt. 21	<input type="checkbox"/> Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you will build 4 lanes, its just as easy to build 5 Fixed at 10'
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	5	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	9	
5: CONCEPT 2A Existing Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 10' Vertical Clearance over MHW, 5-Lane Section under Rt. 21	<input type="checkbox"/> Support	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reasonable+ buildable If you will build 4 lanes, its just as easy to build 5 Consider only if concept 6 is deleted
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	8	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	4	
6: CONCEPT 2B Existing Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 18' Vertical Clearance over MHW	<input type="checkbox"/> Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway height problem; good for river traffic only which is minimal 18' clearance over water
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	3	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	12	
7: CONCEPT 2C Existing Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 30' Vertical Clearance over MHW	<input type="checkbox"/> Support	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway height problem; good for river traffic only which is minimal
	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe	2	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	11	





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

OPTION	PREFERENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
8: CONCEPT 3A Existing Alignment, 5-Lane Bridge Section (Additional Eastbound Lane)	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	8 2 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best one • Dedicated RT21 Lane • Not bad but 3rd lane needed westbound - not east • Look to move sidewalk under RT21 to the North side because southeast quadrant at River Road + Park Ave backs up through the intersection
9: CONCEPT 3B Existing Alignment, 5-Lane Bridge Section (Additional Westbound Lane)	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	12 3 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in one or two lanes open • Good concept. Height is a factor • Support with ability to keep access open between Nutley & Lyndhurst • Better traffic flow • Yes!, if concept 6 is deleted • Look to move sidewalk under RT21 to the North side because southeast quadrant at River Road + Park Ave backs up through the intersection
10: CONCEPT 4A Existing Alignment, Movable Bridge with one 65' Waterway Channel	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	2 6 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River clearance is supported • Too narrow for passing rowing shell
11: CONCEPT 4B Existing Alignment, Movable Bridge with 100' Waterway Channel	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	5 4 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River clearance is supported
12: CONCEPT 4C Existing Alignment, Movable Bridge with two 65' Waterway Channels	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	2 3 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River clearance is supported
13: CONCEPT 5 Southern Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 9' Vertical Clearance over MHW	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	2 2 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested if • Would take more time to complete





COUNTY OF BERGEN / COUNTY OF ESSEX



Local Concept Development Study for Kingsland Avenue (De Jessa Memorial) Bridge Township of Lyndhurst and Township of Nutley, NJ

OPTION	PREFERENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
14: CONCEPT 6 Northern Alignment, Fixed Bridge with 9' Clearance over MHW	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Support	2 3 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much construction & change. Cost. • Support 100%. The only solution for long term

Preference Survey Summary Notes

- *Not all surveys are completely filled in*
- *Indicates a preference for concept 3: 20*
- *With concept 3, the preference is for 3B: 12*
- *Everybody agrees something must be done*





**Kingsland Avenue (De Jesse Memorial) Bridge over Passaic River
Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE**



QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY REPORT

Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE : 17 TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED: 13

1. **There are sidewalks on both sides of the existing bridge. Is there any reason to change the number or widths of the sidewalks on the bridge for the future? Please comment.**

Yes: 4 No: 9

- No wide enough
- For carriage, wheelchairs + people walking next to each
- To create driving lanes
- Wider bridge being built for future

2. **Should outside shoulders be provided on the Kingsland Avenue Bridge to accommodate bicyclists? Please comment.**

Yes: 9 No: 3 Maybe: 1

- It would be safer but the 15' outer lane could accommodate bicyclists
- My family likes to ride bikes across the river
- Or stripped bike lanes

3. **Do you prefer the 4-lane or 5-lane section for the new bridge? Other lane configurations?**

4-lane: 5-lane: 12 Other: 6

- whichever is best for traffic

4. **Currently, there are 4 lanes along Park Avenue under Route 21. Should the roadway be increased to 5 lanes?**

Yes: 11 No:

Should westbound traffic have two thru lanes at the River Road intersection?

Yes: 5 No: 1 Maybe: 1

- Depends on what option has a better LOS
- As long as it is westbound
- But concerns about pedestrian safety



**Kingsland Avenue (De Jesse Memorial) Bridge over Passaic River
Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE**



7. How active is the boat ramp and parking lot on the Nutley side? Do you use the area? Any suggested improvements? (*continued*)

- Can be eliminated - contact owner DOT? Underutilized - could be parking if NJ Transit private bus pickup added.
Only support option that leaves current bridge open during construction + has max # lanes!
Hackensack - Seton Hall Medical School opening on former Roche Site will be adding significant traffic into Nutley over bridge.
New residential coming to overall redevelopment of Roche - now called "On three".
New Owners Prism, have submitted redevelopment plans to Nutley Board of Commissioners & should be reviewed.
Look into temporary ferry during construction.
Option 6 in my opinion the only long term option -use existing historic bridge as pedestrian & biking walkway & historic water park tourist attraction

Questionnaire Summary Report Notes

- *Preference for 5 or more lane solution*

KINGSLAND AVE BRIDGE

PREFERENCE SURVEY	
NO BUILD	● ● ● ●
MAJOR REHABILITATION	●
MODIFIED REHABILITATION	● ●
CONCEPT 1	● ●
CONCEPT 2A	● ● ● ● ●
CONCEPT 2B	● ●
CONCEPT 2C	● ● ●

CONCEPT 3A	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
CONCEPT 3B	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
CONCEPT 4A	
CONCEPT 4B	●
CONCEPT 4C	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
CONCEPT 5	● ● ● ●
CONCEPT 6	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

● : FAVOR IN SUPPORT

● : MAYBE SUPPORT NEED ADJUSTMENTS

● : NOT SO MUCH

● : DON'T SUPPORT