



**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2**  
**MEETING REPORT**

DATE: Monday, April 24, 2017  
TIME: 3:30 p.m – 5:30 p.m.  
LOCATION: Harrison High School Library,  
401 Kingsland Avenue, Harrison, New Jersey  
ATTENDEES:

First Name	Last Name	Representing
<b>Attendees</b>		
Ryan	Cote	Newark CEDC
Thaddaeus	Diggs	University Hospital
Michael	Fernandez	Resident – Harrison
Josh	Frank	Resident – Newark
George	Hawley	Resident - Harrison
Simon	Lo	Simon Productions
Radhika	Menon	Bridgetower Condo Association
Jeffrey	Peck	MONOC Ambulance
Ron	Rowe	
Jorge	Santos	Newark CEDC
Chad	Spies	New Jersey Performing Arts Center
Fredrick	Strickland	Saint Michael's Medical Center
Richard	Tully	ShopRite of Kearny, Inc
Matt	Weber	Harrison High School
Luke	Young	Speedway LLC Gas Station
Steven	Zheng	Speedway Gas Station
<b>Project Team</b>		
Martine	Culbertson	M. A. Culbertson, LLC
Josh	Davison	Stokes Creative Group
Anthony	DiMaggio, P.E.	McCormick Taylor, Inc
Sarbjit	Kahlon	NJTPA
Thomas	Malavasi, P.E.	County of Hudson Engineering
Nicole	Pace	Stokes Creative Group
Rob	Piel	Amy S. Greene Environmental
Bruce	Riegel, P.E.	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC
Luis E.	Rodriguez	County of Essex Engineering
Amy	Sokalski, P.E.	McCormick Taylor, Inc.
Robert	Supino, P.E.	Hardesty & Hanover, LLC



**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**

---



## **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

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 Bridge Street 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, Martine Culbertson, Meeting Facilitator, 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 Essex County and Hudson County jurisdiction. Comments received from community stakeholders and the general public at the prior outreach meetings have contributed to developing the conceptual alternatives that will be discussed at this meeting.

### 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.

### 3. Community Stakeholders Update

Martine Culbertson, Community Involvement Facilitator, provided an updated Community and Agency Stakeholders List (blue handout), which includes 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. The handouts distributed to attendees can be placed or replaced in their Project Portfolio that was distributed at Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 1 or at this meeting.





**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**

---



#### 4. Purpose and Need Statement

Bruce Riegel presented information on the Purpose and Need Statement as described on the green 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

Amy Sokalski, Project Engineer from McCormick Taylor, 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. Each table also has a set of plans for viewing and during the group discussion.
- (b) Amy explained for each of the bridge alternatives, the cross-section would be six foot sidewalks, 8 foot shoulders, two 11 foot lanes eastbound and one 11 foot lane westbound. One of the handouts distributed at the meeting indicates the existing bridge cross section and the proposed cross section. Originally the project team was considering 5 foot shoulders, majority of stakeholders suggested 8 foot shoulders for cyclists and safety.

Bruce Riegel 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.

The following comments and questions were noted during the alternatives overview:

- *Question:* Who pays for the demolition and for construction?

*Response:* Federal funding includes right-of-way and construction costs.

- *Question:* Did you look at using the old railroad bridge as possible crossing further north?

*Response:* The project team did examine the possibility of using the railroad bridge for a northern alignment, however there are significant impacts to right-of-way, traffic turns and flow at Clay Street intersection if traffic diverted north, and railroad jurisdiction and ownership.

- *Question:* How long would it take to construct a new bridge?

*Response:* It would require an estimated two years to construct and 1½ years for major rehabilitation. As a movable swing bridge, it can't be staged (ie. maintain some traffic on the bridge), so all traffic would have to be detoured during construction or major rehabilitation.





**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



- 
- *Question:* What about inclement weather and the profile over the river?

*Response:* The grade of the new structure for either a 15' fixed bridge or movable bridge would be within Federal and State accepted guidelines.

- *Question:* Why can't there be a free flow right hand turn coming off the bridge on to Passaic Avenue?

*Response:* The project team engineers will examine this option.

#### 6. Group Discussion on Alternatives – Pros & Cons

Attendees gathered around three table groups to review each of the conceptual alternatives in detail and discuss the benefits and impacts to each alternative. 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:





**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



---

**Input / Comments**

Group 1

- SE quad 274 unit condos - 6' sidewalk
- Bear Stadium high-rise development
- Steakhouse – parking garage, high-rise
- Consider walkway connection – Newark & Harrison
- Higher elevation – would impact properties - greater Right-of-Way (ROW)
- Cross section – shoulders important for bikeway continuity

Group 2

- Detour for construction high concern – time travel issue
- 2 years preference for movable
- Higher clearance – impacts
- Row curb cuts high concern, not favor alts w/impact
- Higher clearance/grades issue for walking – a lot of pedestrians
- 8' shoulder – elevation higher - greater impact

Group 3

- Limit impact to properties and row (right-of-way)
- 10' shoulders – future traffic
- New boats to fire department for fixed bridge less than 16'/18' – look at 12' preferred
- Didn't like new alignment due to Rt. 21 impact & 2 structures
- Proposed cross section – ok by all

7. Closing Comments – Next Steps

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:





**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



---

**Feedback**

- Understand cost & time
  - rehab vs. replace
  - staff to replace/rehab
  - minimize closure disruption
- Raise bridge
  - impact row (right-of-way)
  - caution underneath
- Fastest solution
- Spanish Pavilion - future meeting location option
- Parking deck w/meeting at library – PIC at library
- Condo association – to add to stakeholders
- County looking forward to see comments
- Thank you – valuable input

**Next Steps – Action Items**

- USCG (U.S. Coast Guard) – to review Navigation Impact Report – vertical clearance input
- H&H and project team - complete alternatives comparison matrix
- Project website – community outreach section will post summary reports once approved
- Local officials meeting – discuss PPA once agency review scheduled
- PIC meeting –Fall 2017

**8. Next Steps - Closing Comments**

Both Luis Rodriguez, Essex County Assistant Engineer and Tom Malvasi, Hudson County Engineer, thanked attendees for their comments. 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 Glembocki, Hudson County Project Manager or Luis Rodriguez, Essex County Project Manager or Bruce Riegel, the H&H Project Manager. A meeting summary will be provided and posted to the web site with other project information. If anyone would like to





**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



view the conceptual alternative plans, an appointment can be made Essex County, Hudson County, NJTPA, Hardesty & Hanover or copies are at the local municipalities: Town of Harrison and City of Newark Engineering Traffic & Signals Department.

In closing, the project team thanked attendees for their input. It is another important step to developing improvements for the Bridge Street 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 5:30 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 Essex County, Hudson 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: Harrison High School Library, Town of Harrison, NJ (location to be determined)  
Time: 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. (brief presentation at 6:30pm)  
Location: Public Library, City of Newark, 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 Essex County/ Hudson County Bridge Street Bridge Project Study Team







**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**

---



**Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2**

**Monday, April 24, 2017**

*Harrison High School, Library*  
*401 Kingsland Avenue, Harrison, NJ, 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 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 Bridge Street 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. *ESSEX COUNTY / HUDSON COUNTY BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE OVER THE 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 ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



---

**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2 - REPORT ATTACHMENT**

**Table Discussion Notes - Group 1**

**BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE STAKEHOLDERS MEETING**

4/24/17

The following is a summary of the stakeholder comments from Table 1.

Prepared By Robert Piel,  
Amy S. Greene Environmental Consultants, Inc.

1. Significant discussion took place regarding the proposed public walkway along the Newark side of the Passaic River. It was noted that the walkway was moving forward and will likely be completed before the start of construction of the Bridge Street Bridge. Therefore it was recommended that the design of the bridge take into account the need for at least a 20 foot wide public walkway that would preferably be located under the bridge so the public would not need to leave the walkway when accessing the river.
2. The town of Harrison also has a public walkway envisioned along the river. The design of the bridge should also take this walkway into account.
3. The Lotus Corporation is currently planning a significant highrise development on the site of the existing Newark Bears athletic facility. The additional people and traffic from this development should be considered in the design of the bridge.
4. Construction has started on a 274 unit condominium development on the south side of the existing bridge in Harrison. Comments noted that the buildings would be constructed up to the property line and that a six foot sidewalk would be built between the existing road way and the condominiums. The alignment of the bridge should take this new development into account.
5. Addition of a dedicated bike lane was recommended. If the shoulder is to be used for the bike lane then the shoulder should continue to the intersection of Rt. 21 so that it does not disappear and require bikers to merge onto the roadway.
6. Concern was expressed regarding the duration of construction of the new bridge. Bridge closure should be as short as possible because the closure affects existing businesses.
7. The 12 foot fixed bridge option was encouraged because it did not impact existing businesses.
8. It was noted the 16 foot fixed option would have an effect on existing businesses.
9. The 18 foot fixed bridge was not supported because it would have major impacts on existing businesses.
10. The movable bridge option was supported because it would have no long term impacts on existing traffic or businesses.
11. The timing of construction of the bridge was discussed. Construction on this bridge should not begin until construction of the Clay street bridge is completed.
12. Concept 7 was not supported because it would have too many impacts to existing structures and because it would be too costly.
13. Concept 8 was noted to have some positive benefits to existing parklands however it may be too expensive to build.

## **Table Discussion Notes - Group 2**

### Bridge Street - Stakeholder Meeting 4/24/2017

#### Table 2 Notes:

Anthony and I went through the alternatives and below are the main topics of discussion that came up.

#### Detours:

Detour of Traffic was a concern. Questions were asked about the time frame of the project, when beginning of construction would be anticipated and the approximate construction duration. The table understood the constraints that partial demolition of the truss was not feasible and the requirements for closing the bridge with a detour. There was representation from University Hospital and another medical facility that had concerns about timeliness of patient transport and EMS / ambulance transport with a detour. They noted in general that traffic would be an issue with a detour. In regards to the medical facilities, off-line without a detour would be beneficial but they did not fully understand the impacts involved with construction on a new alignment.

#### Speedway Business Representatives:

Two reps from the Speedway Gas Station were at Table 2 and were very concerned with losing one of the two curb cut-outs that they have for access. Their gas station with only one curb cut out is not good for getting customers in and out as well as transport fuel trucks. They understand that to make a wider roadway, they may lose a sliver of ROW and can live with that but losing the curb cut is a big issue. We noted that all fixed bridge options raise the profile and will likely impact the curb cut. With these, they would seem to prefer movable bridges without raising the profile. Any off-line alternative would not be good either as it would take away their business.

#### High Level Options:

These are not favored due to impacts as well as many students walk across the bridge and a high level bridge would be felt like an unsafe condition. Also, Speedway noted that they have an issue with homeless people and a high level bridge would attract people to live below the bridge.

## **Table Discussion Notes - Group 3**

### **Bridge Street Bridge April 24, 2017 Stakeholders Meeting**

Bruce Riegel, Sarbjit Kahlon

#### **No Build:**

- The bridge will be closed and traffic will be detoured to Clay St.
- Clay St. is already congested. Bridge needs to be repaired/replaced.

#### **Rehab Alternatives:**

- Historical elements doesn't need to be preserved.
- Long term improvements (a replacement option) is preferred over rehab so that bridge doesn't have to be under construction soon after rehab.
- Need for a shoulder for bicyclists.

#### **Fixed Concepts:**

- 10 ft. shoulders so that it can be used as a traffic lane in the future if needed, but to be used for bicyclists for now.
- Reduce impacts as much as possible to properties at all 4 corners.
- Buy new boats for Newark fire department so that a concept with lower vertical clearance (12' or 16') can be implemented.
- Anything over 16' was not supported due to the impact on businesses and residents.
- Prefer 12' fixed if coast guard will permit it.

#### **New Alignments:**

##### **#7:**

- Takes out Hampton Inn.
- Counties will be maintaining 2 bridges.
- There will be two traffic signals on 21 at close approximately. It will increase congestion.

##### **#8:**

- Counties will have to maintain 2 bridges.
- Will impact the condos in Harrison.
- Will eliminate the route 21 jughandle.

#### **Movable Alternatives:**

- Traffic detour for the entire 3 years of construction duration is a long time.
- Keeps existing alignment and profile with minimal impact to adjacent properties.



**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



**PREFERENCE SURVEY SUMMARY REPORT**

*Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2*

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE: 16

TOTAL PREFERENCE SURVEYS RECEIVED: 12

OPTION	PREFE- RENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
1: <b>NO BUILD</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not a valid option</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> </ul>
2: <b>MAJOR REHABILITATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 6 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't have to preserve historical elements</li> <li>• - 30 - 50 years</li> <li>- no change in capacity → flow</li> <li>- can't address changing off ramps to reduce crashes</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• If it could be done it's great for not affecting traffic</li> </ul>
3: <b>MODIFIED REHABILITATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 5 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must last 30 - 50 years</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> </ul>
4: <b>CONCEPT 1</b> Existing Alignment Fixed Bridge with 12' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	4 4 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fixed bridge with the lowest profile is the most preferred in order to have a minimum impact to local communities and allow for pedestrians &amp; bicycle traffic</li> <li>• With added shoulders for bicycles; sidewalks remain for pedestrians; least cost; fastest to implement</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Prefer this with a wider deck with more lanes</li> <li>• Cost is great to large boats use this river</li> <li>• Fixed bridges limit future use of river</li> <li>• Speedway loses access on Bridge Street</li> </ul>



**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



OPTION	PREFE- RENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
5: <b>CONCEPT 2</b> Existing Alignment Fixed Bridge with 16' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 8 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which will likely increase due to resurgence in residential properties universities; other elements that will bring more people to Newark / Harrison</li> <li>• With added shoulders for bicycles; sidewalks remain for pedestrians; least cost; fastest to implement; concern RT impacts to east/west off ramps</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Prefer this with a wider deck with more lanes</li> <li>• Speedway loses access on Bridge Street</li> </ul>
6: <b>CONCEPT 3</b> Existing Alignment Fixed Bridge with 18' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	4 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With added shoulders for bicycles; sidewalks remain for pedestrians; least cost; fastest to implement; concern RT impacts to east/west off ramps</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Would be better to close movable bridge</li> <li>• Speedway loses access on Bridge Street</li> </ul>
7: <b>CONCEPT 4</b> Existing Alignment Fixed Bridge with 35' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to surrounding areas too great</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Too much impact on intersections and to local business; not practical for pedestrian traffic</li> </ul>
8: <b>CONCEPT 5</b> Existing Alignment Fixed Bridge with 135' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to surrounding areas too great</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Too much impact on intersections and to local business; not practical for pedestrian traffic</li> </ul>
9: <b>CONCEPT 6A</b> Existing Alignment Movable bridge with 80' Waterway Channel	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	2 5 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Replacing bridge with limited amount of closing</li> <li>• If access can be granted for new Speedway this could be an option</li> </ul>
10: <b>CONCEPT 6B</b> Existing Alignment Movable bridge with 100' Waterway Channel	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 8 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• The bridge detours cause huge traffic issues. I not only work, but live near by. Fabricate the bridge; take the old one apart &amp; assemble quickly</li> <li>• If access can be granted for new Speedway this could be an option</li> </ul>



**COUNTY OF ESSEX / COUNTY OF HUDSON**  
**Local Concept Development Study for Bridge Street Bridge**  
**over the Passaic River**  
**City of Newark and Town of Harrison, NJ**



OPTION	PREFE- RENCE	TALLY	COMMENTS
11: <b>CONCEPT 6C</b> Existing Alignment Movable bridge with 2 - 80' Waterway Channels	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	1 6 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• The bridge detours cause huge traffic issues. I not only work, but live near by. Fabricate the bridge; take the old one apart &amp; assemble quickly</li> <li>• If access can be granted for new Speedway this could be an option</li> </ul>
12: <b>CONCEPT 7</b> Northern Alignment Fixed Bridge with 12' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	2 1 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant costs off ramps impact; now maintaining 2 bridges (existing &amp; new)</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Like the minimal disruption</li> <li>• Diverts the majority of traffic away from business. Speedway would lose curb cuts on Passaic</li> </ul>
13: <b>CONCEPT 8</b> Southern alignment Fixed Bridge with 12' Vertical Clearance	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/> No Support	3 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant costs off ramps impact; now maintaining 2 bridges (existing &amp; new)</li> <li>• Keep in mind EMS transport</li> <li>• Diverts the majority of traffic from business near bridge</li> </ul>

**Preference Survey Summary Notes**

- *One Survey shows only 2 preferences*
- *Not all surveys are completely filled in*
- *Everyone indicated something must be done; No Build had no support*



---

---

**Bridge Street Bridge over Passaic River LCD Study**  
**Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE**

---

---



**QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY REPORT**

*Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2*

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE : 16      TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED: 12

**1. There are two sidewalks on 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: 6

Comments:

- No decision. Decision should be made based on level of use
- Widen sidewalks
- Maybe wider to accommodate the additional pedestrian traffic coming

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

Yes: 9

No: 1

Comments:

- The increase in residents in Harrison and Newark should take cycling into account
- As long as it's bike lane all the way
- Cycling will only grow. Ensuring safe access from McCarter to bridge is critical

**3. How wide should the outside shoulders be on each side of the bridge to accommodate bicyclists?**

3 feet:       

5 feet: 4

8 feet: 2

10 feet: 4

Comments:

- Makes sense to offer wide path for bicyclist with option to use as a vehicle lane in future
- Need marked bicycle lane and dotted rule to ring bell within passing pedestrians
- Can be used as another car lane for future if needed
- IDK
- 8 or 10 feet





---

---

**Bridge Street Bridge over Passaic River LCD Study**  
**Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE**

---

---



**4. Is the proposed new bridge section acceptable (see existing bridge cross section and proposed bridge cross section)?**

Yes: 10

No:    

Comments:

- Wide enough for future use and expansion
- Only concern is the tapering of the shoulder and its effect on cyclists









**Questionnaire Summary Report Notes:**

- *For some of the surveys handed in, not all questions had responses (some blanks).*





## BSIB


## PREFERENCE SURVEY


NO BUILD	
MAJOR REHABILITATION	
MODIFIED REHABILITATION	
CONCEPT 1	
CONCEPT 2	
CONCEPT 3	
CONCEPT 4	
CONCEPT 5	
CONCEPT 6A	




CONCEPT 6B	
CONCEPT 6C	
CONCEPT 7	
CONCEPT 8	

 : FAVOR IN SUPPORT

 : MAYBE SUPPORT  
MAY NEED ADJUSTMENTS

 : NOT SO MUCH

 : DON'T SUPPORT