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I. INTRODUCTION

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of Federal undertakings through consultation among the agency official and other parties with an interest in the effects of the undertaking on historic properties. The goal of consultation is to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties [36 CFR 800.1(a)].

This report serves as an addendum to the Kise Franks & Straw Inc. [now Kise Straw & Kolodner (KSK)] “Survey of Historic Architectural Resources: NJ Route 35, MP 9.0-13.0” for the State of New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJ DOT) (1995, Revised February 2002). At the time of the KSK study, the NJ DOT endeavored to correct poor drainage conditions and road surfaces along NJ Route 35; however, the project was in early planning stages and had not yet developed improvement plans. This addendum identifies those above-ground historic properties that may be affected by the improvements associated with the NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 Project (Figures 1A/B and 2), and performs an Analysis of Effect on all resources determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of prior studies.

The project includes the following roadway improvements: full reconstruction of the shoulders and curbs for the entire length of the project; reconstruction or resurfacing of the roadway pavement; provision of crosswalks at signalized intersections; provision of sidewalks on both sides of the roadway for the entire length of the project area; and raising the profile of the roadway, where feasible, to allow for better drainage (Appendix A).

The NJ DOT also proposes to alleviate poor drainage conditions in the following manner: reconstruction of the shoulders with cross slopes to provide additional high and low points along the curb line; provision of curbing to sections where none currently exist and replacement of damaged gutters to improve gutter flow; addition of inlets as needed; replacement and/or resizing of existing deteriorated pipes; addition of tidal back flow prevention devices to systems identified with back flow concerns; reconstruction of approximately seven (7) outfall bulkheads in Bay Head Borough; separation of the local drainage system from the system along NJ Route 35; and elimination of three (3) existing siphons at Strickland, Goetze, and Egbert Streets and replacing them with one (1) new cross drain to Barnegat Bay (Appendix A).

This project passes through the Boroughs of Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant Beach in Ocean County, New Jersey. The entire project area falls in either the Mantoloking Historic District or the Bay Head Historic District (E: March 8, 1996). The KSK study did not delineate a western boundary for these districts; this addendum recommends that Barnegat Bay serve as the western boundary. Falling partially within the Mantoloking Historic District is the Mantoloking Marine Historic District (E: May 5, 1996), the Mantoloking Bridge (E: May 5, 1996), and the Barnegat Bay Class A Racing Catboats Thematic District (E: 5/5/1996). The Mantoloking Yacht Club, one of three marine complexes, falls within the Mantoloking Marine Historic District, and with the western
boundary drawn to Barnegat Bay, it also falls within Mantoloking Historic District. All Saints Church (E: August 31, 2001) and the site of the former Bluffs Hotel (E: June 23, 1995; demolished c. 1996) fall within the Bay Head Historic District.

The NJ DOT, on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration, delineated the Area of Potential Effect (APE). This addendum takes into consideration the findings that resulted from the 1995 KSK survey, as well as the findings of prior surveys within the project area. The APE is formed generally by two scopes of work: 1) roadway improvements to NJ Route 35 between mileposts 9.0 and 12.5 and 2) drainage improvements in twenty-one (21) areas intersecting with and extending west from NJ Route 35 to Barnegat Bay. The APE along the drainage areas includes the street, curbs and grass strips if present, sidewalks, and northwest and southwest corner buildings where the east-west street meets the area of discharge. The APE encompasses all properties, fifty years in age or older, that may be affected visually, audibly, or atmospherically by the improvements associated with this project.

As discussed in an April 2003 field view with the NJ DOT and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, an abbreviated New Jersey Historic Resource Survey form was used to update properties within the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts (Appendix D) since the completion of the KSK survey in 1995. The abbreviated forms were used for those properties that lie immediately adjacent to proposed work that may potentially occur beyond the existing curbline.

Comprehensive archaeological studies were undertaken to determine the likelihood of prehistoric or historic archaeological sites within the APE. The findings of this survey were submitted under separate cover.

This submission contains abbreviated New Jersey Historic Resource Survey forms for each of the properties surveyed in association with the roadway or drainage improvements (Appendix E). It is recommended that the NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 Project will have No Adverse Effect on the Mantoloking Historic District and Bay Head Historic District or the individually eligible resources that lie within them. Pending NJ HPO concurrence with the findings documented in this report, it is recommended that this project will have No Adverse Effect on cultural resources.
Figure 1A

Project Location Map
N.J. Route 35 Pavement Restoration
from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5
Ocean County: Montoloking Borough,
Bay Head Borough, and Point Pleasant Beach Borough
USGS 7.5 Minute Series
Point Pleasant, N.J. Quadrangle
1989
Figure 2a:
Historic Resources Location Map
N.J. Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5

Note: Contributing features were delineated only along N.J. Route 35 and drainage improvement areas.
Note: Contributing features were delineated only along N.J. Route 35 and drainage improvement areas.

Figure 2c:
Historic Resources Location Map
N.J. Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5
All Saints Church
(E: 8/31/2001)

The Bluffs Hotel
(E: 6/23/1995; Demolished)

Figure 2d:
Historic Resources Location Map
N.J. Route 35 Pavement Restoration
from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5

Note: Contributing features were delineated only along N.J. Route 35 and drainage improvement areas.
II. RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Objectives

This submission serves as an addendum to the Kise Franks & Straw Inc. [now Kise Straw & Kolodner (KSK)] “Survey of Historic Architectural Resources: NJ Route 35, MP 9.0-13.0” for the State of New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJ DOT) (1995, Revised February 2002). This addendum identifies those above-ground historic properties that may be affected by the improvements associated with the NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 Project (Figures 1A/B and 2) and offers an analysis of the effect the project will have on them.

B. Research

In 1995, KSK prepared a “Survey of Historic Architectural Resources: NJ Route 35, MP 9.0-13.0” for the NJ DOT. The present report takes into consideration the findings that resulted from the KSK survey and serves as an addendum to it. Because this project area falls entirely within either the Mantoloking Historic District or Bay Head Historic District, those properties that lie immediately adjacent to proposed work that may potentially occur outside the existing curbline have been surveyed as an update to the KSK survey (Appendix E).

The KSK study discovered two (2) prior surveys in a file search at the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) that included information pertinent to the Area of Potential Effect (APE). In January 1995, the NJ HPO reviewed plans for the demolition of the Bluffs Hotel and its replacement with two single-family units. The staff concluded that the remaining portions of the hotel contributed to a proposed Bay Head Historic District. In a letter dated June 23, 1995, the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office stated that the best way to counter the adverse effect of the hotel’s demolition would be to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District.

In 1980, the Ocean County Cultural and Heritage Commission sponsored an architectural survey that included the NJ Route 35 study area: it identified approximately twenty-three (23) resources within the study area, seventeen (17) of which were located in Bay Head and six (6) in Mantoloking. These properties, it was noted, would contribute to a larger, but unidentified, historic district. Indeed, in a letter dated March 8, 1996, the NJ HPO rendered the opinion that the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Research for this study uncovered the Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for the “Replacement of the Mantoloking Road (County Road 528) Bridge over Barnegat Bay and the Intracoastal Waterway (Structure 1506006). This report was completed in December 2000.

This addendum for architectural resources involved a non-comprehensive review of primary and secondary resources, including files held at the state repository, background literature, historic atlases, contemporary subdivision maps, and deed research. State, county, and local
histories provided an overview of the historic context of the APE. Historical maps and atlases provided additional information on development patterns. The field survey for this project involved both windshield and pedestrian techniques.

All above-ground properties within the APE were examined. Each resource was evaluated, making note of its approximate age, condition, function, construction materials, and architectural details. Thirty-five millimeter photographs were taken of facades showing elevations and/or lateral views.

A file search at the NJ HPO revealed the following opinions of NRHP eligibility:

**Mantoloking Borough**
- Mantoloking Bridge: 5/5/1996
  Includes: Beaton’s Boat Yard at 72 Beaton Road in Brick Township; Winter Yacht Basin at 5 Mantoloking Road in Brick Township; and Mantoloking Yacht Club at Block 30/Lot 6 in Mantoloking Borough. Beaton’s Boat Yard is also individually eligible (1/21/1992).

**Bay Head Borough**
- The Bluffs Hotel (demolished c. 1996) 6/23/1995
- Bay Head Historic District 3/8/1996
- All Saints Church 8/31/2001

**Thematic Nomination**
- Barnegat Bay Class A Racing Catboats 5/5/1996

1. **Determination of Significance**

The project area falls entirely within one of two previously determined eligible historic districts: Mantoloking Historic District and Bay Head Historic District (E: March 8, 1996). The eastern portion of the Mantoloking Marine Historic District (E: 5/5/1996) falls within the Mantoloking Historic District, as does the eastern portion of the Mantoloking Bridge. All Saints Church and the site of the former Bluffs Hotel falls within the Bay Head Historic District.

For the purposes of this survey, the research and materials outlined above result in a body of information sufficient to reconstruct the general history of the region and to identify the historic properties within the APE. An abbreviated New Jersey Survey Form was completed to update the features of the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts immediately adjacent to areas of proposed work that may potentially occur beyond the existing curbline.
C. Documentation

1. Use of Abbreviated Survey Form

In an April 2003 field view, an alternative survey methodology was discussed with the NJ HPO and NJ DOT. The consultant presented a one-page survey form that combines most of the elements found on the standard New Jersey Base Form and Building Forms. Because the present report serves as an addendum to the KSK study, this method of evaluation serves as an expedient means to update the findings of that prior survey. The NJ HPO agreed to the use of this abbreviated form, provided an explanation for it was contained within this report (Appendix C).

The abbreviated form was used to update the features of the historic districts along NJ Route 35 since the completion of the KSK study in 1995 (Appendix E). It also was used to document the drainage areas in the following manner: in general, one form was used to document each streetscape and one form each was used to document the westernmost corner properties where the outfall will discharge. In summary, a maximum of three (3) forms will document each drainage area. The NJ HPO agreed to this methodology in the April 2003 field view. Please note that minimal photographs were included with the KSK survey; therefore, the update forms better serve to document present conditions within the districts rather than changes that have occurred within them since 1995.

Like the standard New Jersey Base Form, the contents of the abbreviated form include a black and white 3” x 5” photograph, a USGS map and quadrangle name, address, municipality, county, zip code, tax block and lot number, and surveyor information. The form does not include “Registration and Status Dates.” Like the standard New Jersey Building/Element Attachment, the contents of the abbreviated form include space for the common/historic name, type of ownership, style, year built, physical description, physical condition, level of remaining historic fabric, and presence of outbuildings. The abbreviated form does not include space for an interior or exterior verbal description; however, it does include a space to explain the justification for using it.

D. Delineation of Western Boundary for Historic Districts

The western boundaries of the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts were not delineated as part of the KSK study. For the purposes of this addendum, the western boundaries were drawn to Barnegat Bay, which offers a clear visual barrier. Delineating the boundary in this manner demonstrates a continuity of buildings united historically and aesthetically by physical development (National Register Bulletin: Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties, p. 12). Delineating the boundaries to Barnegat Bay is in keeping with the districts’ statements of significance: each serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. They are representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century.
III. SETTING

A. Natural and Built Environment

Located within the Outer Coastal Plain, the soil of Ocean County is sandy and acidic with little clay or silt. Approximately 15,000 years ago the glacial ice-sheet covering New Jersey retreated north, and the Paleo-Indians of around 11,500 B.C. inhabited an area of “dense oak, spruce, maple, and hemlock forests” (Miller, p. 15). At one time around eighty miles of coastal flatlands were exposed to the east of the present shoreline; the ocean did not reach its present level until approximately 6,000 years ago (Miller, p. 15). With the Atlantic Ocean to the east, the coastline now extends approximately forty-five miles and includes barrier beaches, three estuarine waterways, and miles of salt marshes. Major streams include Manasquan River, Metedeconk River, Toms River, Kettle Creek, Cedar Creek, Oyster Creek, Mill Creek, and Westecunk Creek (KSK Study, p. 14). The Pine Barrens, to the west of the barrier islands, generally “extend southward from the Manasquan River to the Egg Harbor River in Atlantic County and westward from Route 9, the old New York-Atlantic City Highway, into Burlington County,” and incorporate around two-thirds of Ocean county within their borders. The streams within the Pine Barrens empty into Barnegat Bay and serve as the drainage basin for Central New Jersey (Miller, pp. 154-156).

1. Description of Resources with Prior Determination of Eligibility

In 1995, Kise Franks & Straw Inc. [now Kise Straw & Kolodner (KSK)] prepared a “Survey of Historic Architectural Resources: NJ Route 35, MP 9.0-13.0” for the State of New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJ DOT). KSK determined that the Mantoloking Historic District and Bay Head Historic District were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office concurred with this determination in a letter dated March 8, 1996 (Appendices B and D). These districts encompass the project area in its entirety.

a. Mantoloking Historic District

Description: This district has a concentration of buildings dating from the last quarter of the 19th century through the first half of the 20th century. Almost exclusively residential, the majority of buildings embody elements of the Shingle and Colonial Revival style. Generally, these buildings are two and one-half stories high with simple plans and complex roof lines such as multiple gables, hipped roofs, gambrels, and cross gables. First-story and small second-story porches are common. Buildings dating from 1910 to 1920 are generally one and one-half or two stories with rectangular or square plans with simple roof forms; first-story porches are common.

Significance: The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century.
**Boundary:** The boundaries are as follows: the municipal line with Bay Head Borough to the north, the municipal boundary with Brick Township to the south, and the beachfront to the east. The western boundary was not delineated as part of the KSK survey; however, for the purposes of the present survey, it is recommended that the western boundary extend to Barnegat Bay (*Figure 2A through 2D*).

**b. Bay Head Historic District (including All Saints Church and The Bluffs Hotel)**

**Description:** The district contains building stock dating from the last quarter of the 19th century through the first third of the 20th century. Generally homogenous in scale, materials, and massing, the district is largely residential in character with buildings embodying features of the Shingle, Queen Anne, and Colonial Revival styles. Generally, the houses are two and one-half stories with simple plans and shingled exteriors. Most houses have hipped roofs with hipped dormers although some have gable or gambrel roofs. First-floor porches are a common feature. Within the district lies All Saints Church at 500 Lake Avenue (E: 8/31/2001). The Bluffs Hotel had been determined eligible on June 23, 1995, and was demolished c. 1996; it was a contributing feature to a potential Bay Head Historic District. In the June 1995 NJ HPO letter it was stated that the best way to counter the adverse effect of demolition was not HABS documentation, but to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District.

**Significance:** The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century. All Saints Church is eligible under Criteria A and C. It is associated with the early development of Bay Head and is architecturally distinct.

**Boundary:** The boundaries of the district are as follows: the south side of Delaware Avenue and Ocean Avenue in Point Pleasant Beach Borough to the north; the municipal line with Mantoloking Borough to the south; and the beachfront to the east. The western boundary was not delineated as part of the KSK survey; however, for the purposes of the present survey, it is recommended that the western boundary extend to Barnegat Bay (*Figure 2A through 2D*). The survey completed in August 1980 for the All Saints Church states the boundary as follows: “Corner siting, on lot extending from Lake Avenue to Scow Ditch; the municipal parking area is located across the ditch.” For the purposes of this survey, the recommended boundary follows that of the tax parcel (Block 53/Lot 6) to edge of pavement; the northern boundary is Howe Avenue, the southern boundary is the parcel line shared with Block 53/Lot 3, the eastern boundary is Lake Avenue; and the western boundary is the Scow Ditch.
c. Other Resources within Project Area

Within Mantoloking Borough lies the easternmost part of the Mantoloking Bridge (E: 5/5/1996), also known as the structure that carries County Route 528 over Barnegat Bay; it was determined eligible under Criterion C for is embodiment of the single-leaf trunnion bascule design. It is currently being recorded in accordance with HAER guidelines to mitigate its eventual replacement. The Mantoloking Marine Historic District (E: 5/5/1996), eligible under Criteria A and C, encompasses the shore areas on both sides of Barnegat Bay, south of the Mantoloking Bridge, and falls partially within the Mantoloking Historic District. The Mantoloking Marine Historic District encompasses three complexes that represent the continued existence of a vibrant and interconnected marine industry: Beaton’s Boat Yard in Brick Township, Winter Yacht Basin in Brick Township, and Mantoloking Yacht Club in Mantoloking Borough. Beaton’s Boat Yard is individually eligible (E: 1/21/1992), as is the Mantoloking Yacht Club (NJ HPO-sponsored survey in 1980). The thematic nomination of Barnegat Bay Class A Racing Boats was determined eligible on May 5, 1996, under Criterion C.
IV. JUSTIFICATION OF SURVEY BOUNDARIES AND SCOPE

A. Delineation of Area of Potential Effect

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is defined as the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking [36 CFR 800.16(d)].

This project area was surveyed by Kise Franks & Straw Inc. [now Kise Straw Kolodner, Inc. (KSK)] in 1995 (Revised February 2002); the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) rendered an opinion of eligibility regarding the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts in a letter dated March 8, 1996 (Appendices B and D). This report serves as an addendum to the KSK report; it includes an abbreviated update form for those properties that lie immediately adjacent to proposed work that may potentially occur beyond the existing curbline.

1. Verbal Boundary Description of APE

The APE is formed by two scopes of work: 1) roadway improvements to NJ Route 35 between mileposts 9.0 and 12.5 and 2) drainage improvements along twenty-one (21) areas generally extending west from NJ Route 35 (Appendix A).

The APE extends roughly northward along NJ Route 35 from the Brick Township/Mantoloking Borough corporate line to the south side of Delaware Avenue in Point Pleasant Beach Borough. An APE also includes twenty-one (21) drainage areas generally extending west from NJ Route 35. This APE was submitted to the NJ HPO in a letter dated August 11, 2003, which featured thirty (30) drainage improvement areas; the APE that appears as Figure 1B has been revised owing to a reduction in drainage improvement areas. The following drainage improvement areas have been eliminated since the April 11, 2003 APE submission: 1) 512' N of Brick Township corporate line; 2) Carpenter Lane; 3) 160' N of Princeton Avenue; 4) Arnold Street; 5) Old Bridge Street; 6) 380' N of Herbert Street; 7) 1280' N of Herbert Street; 8) 795' N of Lyman Street; and 9) 978' N of Lyman Street.

2. Justification of APE

The boundaries drawn for the proposed APE encompass all properties, fifty years in age or older, that may be affected visually, audibly, or atmospherically by the project (Figures 1A/B and 2). Consideration has been given to the integrity, setting and landscape features, and use of the resources. The boundaries include resources in their entirety, including land that may prove historically associated with the resource. As currently defined, the APE hosts residential and commercial uses.

B. Project Description

The following actions are proposed to improve NJ Route 35 and its vicinity:
1. **Roadway Improvements** *(Photos 1 through 25)*

- full reconstruction of the shoulders and curbs for the entire length of the project;
- reconstruction of the roadway pavement (0.5 – 1.0 mile);
- resurfacing of the roadway pavement (2.5 – 3.0 miles);
- provide crosswalks at all signalized intersections;
- provide sidewalks on both sides for the entire length of the project;
- raising the profile of the roadway where feasible without considerable impact to private property to allow for better drainage; and
- intersection improvements at Herbert Street.

**Table 1: Impact to Properties in Vicinity of Herbert Street Intersection Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Number</th>
<th>Block/Lot</th>
<th>Avg. Distance from Bldg. To Existing Curb (ft)</th>
<th>Avg. Distance from Bldg. To Proposed Curb (ft)</th>
<th>% Reduction in Width of Frontage (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>24/46</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>24/47</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>24/48</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>24/49</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>24/51</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>24/53</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>24/54</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>24/54</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130*</td>
<td>24/56</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200*</td>
<td>27/21</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>27/22</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Right of way acquisition*

For the purpose of adding continuous sidewalks on both sides of NJ Route 35 in the project area, right of way acquisition will occur in front of the following three (3) noncontributing buildings within the Mantoloking Historic District: Block 40/Lot 14; Block 41/Lot 14; and Block 41/Lot 17. Each property will lose approximately .01 acre adjacent to the existing edge of pavement.
Photo 1: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1530 facing northwest.

Photo 2: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1437 facing northeast.
Photo 3: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1409 facing southeast.

Photo 4: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1409 facing north.
Photo 5: NJ Route 35 at Princeton Avenue facing northwest.

Photo 6: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1325 facing south.
Photo 7: NJ Route 35 south of Downer Avenue facing south.

Photo 8: NJ Route 35 at Downer Avenue facing north.
Photo 9: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1216 facing south.

Photo 10: NJ Route 35 at Herbert Street facing southeast.
Photo 11: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1037 facing southeast.

Photo 12: NJ Route 35 at Stephens Place facing south.
Photo 13: NJ Route 35 between Chafey Place and Carrigan Place facing south.

Photo 14: NJ Route 35 at Mathis Street facing south.
Photo 15: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 851 facing south.

Photo 16: NJ Route 35 at Goetz Street facing south.
Photo 17: NJ Route 35 at Johnson Street facing south.

Photo 18: NJ Route 35 north of Johnson Street facing northwest.
Photo 19: NJ Route 35 south of Mount Street facing north.

Photo 20: NJ Route 35 at Howe Street facing north.
Photo 21: NJ Route 35 at Bridge Avenue facing north.

Photo 22: NJ Route 35 at Harris Street facing north.
Photo 23: NJ Route 35 at North Street facing southwest.

Photo 24: NJ Route 35 at Osborne Street facing southwest.
Photo 25: NJ Route 35 at Delaware Avenue facing south
2. **Drainage Improvements (Photos 26 through 32)**

Extending west from NJ Route 35, the APE includes the roadway, curbs, sidewalks, and northeastern- and southeasternmost corner properties along the twenty-one (1) east-west streets and streets listed in Table 2. The improvements include the following actions:

- reconstruction of the shoulders with cross slopes that vary from 2% to 6% to provide additional high and low points along the curb line with minimum 0.3% longitudinal grade along gutters (where feasible);
- provision of curbing to sections where curbing does not exist and replacing damaged curbing to improve gutter flow; possibly using concrete gutter to control vertical profiles and grading;
- spacing of inlets designed to meet current NJ DOT criteria for limit of spread in gutters during a 10-year frequency storm event;
- replacement of and/or re-sizing of existing deteriorated pipe (specifically corrugated metal pipe);
- addition of tidal backflow prevention devices to all proposed outfalls;
- reconstruction of about seven (7) bulkheads at outfalls to Barnegat Bay;
- separation of the local drainage system from NJ Route 35 system; and
- elimination of three (3) existing siphons that discharge NJ Route 35 runoff onto Strickland, Goetze, and Egbert Streets; runoff to be collected along NJ Route 35 and discharged into Barnegat Bay.

It is anticipated that all work will occur from curb to curb; however, the APE extends from the roadway to include curbing, sidewalk materials, and the westernmost properties where the intersecting east-west streets discharge into Barnegat Bay. Drawing this boundary conservatively allows for the following: 1) the potential of visual impacts resulting from installment of the tide flex valves; 2) that temporary staging areas may be necessary; and/or 3) that utilities may require relocation.
### Table 2: Drainage Improvement Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th></th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Albertson Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>370' N of Mathis Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Princeton Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Strickland Street (outfall and removal of siphon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Downer Avenue</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Goetz Street (removal of siphon only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Herbert Street</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Egbert Street (removal of siphon only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>924' N of Herbert Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Johnson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1643' N of Herbert Street</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Forsyth Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1715' S of Lyman Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mount Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1638' S of Lyman Street</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Howe Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>735' S of Lyman Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Harris Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lyman Street</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>North Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bergen Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo 26: Downer Avenue at Barnegat Bay facing southeast.
Photo 27: Herbert Street, east of Mantoloking Bridge facing southwest to Barnegat Bay.

Photo 28: Lyman Street at Barnegat Bay facing north.
Photo 29: Egbert Street at Clayton Avenue facing west to Barnegat Bay.

Photo 30: At Johnson Street facing west to Barnegat Bay.
Photo 31: Lake Avenue at Forsyth Street facing south.

Photo 32: Lake Avenue at North Street facing south.
V. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The historic overview of the project APE supplements the information provided in the 1995 KSK report for mileposts 9.0 to 13.0.

A. Topography

This three and one-half mile project area lies on the Barnegat Peninsula in Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant Beach Boroughs in Ocean County, New Jersey (Figure 1A/B). Located within the Outer Coastal Plain, the soil of Ocean County is sandy and acidic with little clay or silt. Approximately 15,000 years ago the glacial ice-sheet covering New Jersey retreated north, and the Paleo-Indians of around 11,500 B.C. inhabited an area of “dense oak, spruce, maple, and hemlock forests” (Miller, p. 15). At one time around eighty miles of coastal flatlands were exposed to the east of the present shoreline; the ocean did not reach its present level until approximately 6,000 years ago (Miller, p. 15). With the Atlantic Ocean to the east, the coastline now extends approximately forty-five miles and includes barrier beaches, three estuarine waterways, and miles of salt marshes. Major streams include Manasquan River, Metedeconk River, Toms River, Kettle Creek, Cedar Creek, Oyster Creek, Mill Creek, and Westecunk Creek (KSK Study, p. 14). The Pine Barrens, to the west of the barrier islands, generally “extend southward from the Manasquan River to the Egg Harbor River in Atlantic County and westward from Route 9, the old New York-Atlantic City Highway, into Burlington County,” and incorporate around two-thirds of Ocean county within their borders. The streams within the Pine Barrens empty into Barnegat Bay and serve as the drainage basin for Central New Jersey (Miller, pp. 154-156).

B. Ocean County

The history of the Middle Atlantic region begins with the arrival of the first substantial numbers of European groups to North America. Historical research of New Jersey has identified six distinct time spans within the long course of settlement of the state (Chesler, 1982). In general, the historical past of New Jersey is divided into five significant time periods that span from the arrival of European explorers to the area to modern times. These divisions are: Exploration and Settlement (A.D. 1500 - A.D. 1700), the Initial Colonial Settlement (A.D. 1630 - A.D. 1775), Early Industrialization, Urbanization, and Agricultural Development (A.D. 1750 - A.D. 1860), Immigration and Agricultural, Industrial, Commercial, and Urban Expansion (A.D. 1850 - A.D. 1920), Metropolitan New Jersey (A.D. 1910 - A.D. 1945), and Modern New Jersey (A.D. 1945 - present) (Plates 1 through 4). The following discussion of the regional history of southern New Jersey has been abstracted from several historical works, specifically Chesler (1982), Dorwart (1993), Woolman and Rose (1878), and Salter (1890).

1. Exploration and Settlement (A.D. 1500 - A.D. 1700)

In 1609, Henry Hudson, the captain of the Half Moon, was commissioned by the Dutch East India Company to discover a water route through North America to East India. On this expedition, Hudson discovered the Delaware Bay and, consequently, New Jersey (Dorwart, p. 1). In the fall of 1609, the Half Moon set anchor in Sandy Hook Bay and crew members were
sent ashore to explore the bay and adjacent lands. In his journal, Robert Juet, an officer aboard the ship, described the Navesink Highlands in great detail.

Shortly thereafter, Dutch, English, and Spanish explorers sailed to this region in search of potential trading opportunities. Among these first explorers was Cornelius Jacobsen Mey, the Dutch captain of the *Glad Tidings*. Between 1616 and 1624, Mey, for whom Cape May County is named, sailed around the New Jersey cape numerous times (Cunningham, p. 229). During the same trip, Mey encountered and named two of the bays in present-day Ocean County. These were “Barende-gat” (“Inlet of Breakers”) and or “Eyre Haven” (Egg Harbor) (Cunningham, p. 229).

By 1630, the Dutch established several small trading posts along the Delaware River, then named South River. In comparison, colonization of the area held little interest to the Dutch who focused on more commercial opportunities such as fishing, trade, and fur trapping (Dorwart, p. 2).

Throughout the first half of the 17th century, New Jersey attracted the interest of many entrepreneurs, including several directors of the West India Company, who intended to develop whaling industries (Dorwart, p. 3). In 1633, Swedish and Dutch merchants formed the New Sweden Company under the Swedish Crown. The New Sweden Company financed several endeavors, including the establishment of Fort Christina in present-day Wilmington, Delaware, as well as the purchase of lands between Cape May and Mantua Creek from the Lenape. Between 1641 and 1649, the New Sweden Company continued to pursue opportunities on both sides of the Delaware River and control of the Delaware Valley remained a continuous competition between the Dutch and the Swedes (Cunningham, p. 184-185).

Aside from occasional explorers and settlers, Swedish settlement remained on the Delaware side of the river (Cunningham, p. 195). By 1655, the Dutch finally gained control of the Delaware Valley (Cunningham and Clemens, p. 195); however, owing to their limited colonization efforts, as well as faltering returns in whaling industries, the Dutch stronghold on the Delaware Valley rapidly diminished (Wacker and Clemens, pp. 40-42).
2. Initial Colonial Settlement (A.D. 1630 - A.D. 1775)

Prior to 1660, a handful of predominately Dutch families emigrated from New Amsterdam to the New Jersey Highlands region. Several of these early settlers, including a Richard Stout, established homesteads in the Middletown area (Salter, p. 3). Shortly thereafter, most of these settlements, including that of Stout, were either abandoned or overshadowed by English colonists.

In 1664, the Dutch surrendered control of the Delaware Valley to England (Cunningham, p. 4). King Charles II deeded all the land between the Connecticut and Delaware Rivers to his brother James, the Duke of York (Swanda [1991a], n.p.; Fleming, p. 6). Included in this large expanse of land were present-day Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. Prior to his acquisition of the territory, the Duke of York granted a portion of the claim to Sir George Carteret and Lord John Berkeley (Wacker and Clemens, p. 41).

In March 1664, a coalition of English colonists from Gravesend Long Island purchased the Highlands area from Native American groups (Cunningham, p. 117; Woolman and Rose, p. 31; Salter, pp. 4, 10, 13-17). In the same year, two settlements, one on each side of the Navesink River, were established. On the north side of the river, Baptist families founded Middletown. Quaker families settled the lands south of the Navesink River and established Shrewsbury. In 1665, the Governor of New York, Richard Nicholls recognized the Highland area purchase and a patent was conveyed to the original Gravesend coalition (Woolman and Rose, p. 31). Often referred to as the “Nicholls” or “Monmouth” patent (Woolman and Rose, p. 31; Salter, p. 10), it consisted roughly of a twelve-mile wide strip of land between the coast and the Raritan River (from Sandy Hook westward along the south side of Raritan Bay) (McCormick, pp. 20-21). The “Monmouth” patent included much of present-day Monmouth County and parts of present-day Ocean County.

In 1673, John Berkeley sold his New Jersey interests to John Fenwick and Edward Byllinge (Dorwart and Mackey, p.7). After several disputes with Byllinge, Fenwick finally agreed to ownership of the area of modern-day Salem and Cumberland Counties. Within a year, Byllinge fell into financial hardship (Dorwart and Mackey, pp. 7-8). To rescue Byllinge, a group of Quaker trustees divided Byllinge’s holdings into ninety shares that were then offered for sale to individuals who were interested in creating a Quaker colony (Dorwart and Mackey, p. 8). In 1676, Carteret signed an agreement with Byllinge and the trustees that divided New Jersey into East and West Jersey (Dorwart and Mackey p. 8; McCormick p. 27). The boundary between East and West Jersey was defined by a line running from Little Egg Harbor to the northwest (McCormick, p. 27). Carteret kept East Jersey as his province (McCormick, p. 27).

During the exchange of the Delaware Valley between the Dutch and the English, little attention was given to a growing Swedish population in New Jersey (Cunningham, p. 195). Discouraged by the poor quality of the soil on the Delaware side of the river, Swedish farmers, many of whom were former indentured servants, relocated to farm the more fertile soil in New Jersey (Cunningham, p. 195). From the beginning, Swedish settlers maintained relatively peaceful
relations with the new English Quaker settlers and often served as interpreters in land exchanges between Quaker and Native American groups (Cunningham, p. 195).

In 1667, one of New Jersey’s first legislative meetings was held in Portland Point. Comprised of representatives from Middletown, Shrewsbury, and the host city, this event was organized almost a year earlier than the meeting of the governor, council, and representatives of East Jersey in Elizabethtown (Woolman and Rose, p. 31).

During the 1670s, a charted, but then unnamed, waterway to the Barnegat Bay in present-day northern Ocean County attracted the attention of a man named of Captain William Tom. As an English official, Captain Tom had often traveled through “old” Monmouth County during sojourns between New York and his station at New Castle, Delaware. Eventually, Captain Tom arranged for further exploration of the area. Traditionally, the “Toms River” name is attributed to Captain Tom (Salter, pp. 74-75; Cunningham, p. 229; McMahon, p. 306); however, other reputed namesakes include a Native American named “Tom” who lived near the mouth of the river, and “Tom Lucker,” an early 18th century settler of the area (McMahon, p. 307; Salter, p. 72).

In 1674, James Grover established New Jersey’s first ironworks along the banks of the Shrewsbury River (Swanda [1991b], pp. 2-3). In an effort to promote the iron industry, Colonel Lewis Morris purchased three thousand acres along the Shrewsbury River, including Grover’s ironworks in 1675. Morris named his tract Tintern Manor and variations of this name (e.g., Tinton and Tinton Falls) are still in use presently.

As early as 1675, the general area of Middletown and Shrewsbury was often known as the “County of Nevysink” (Cunningham, p. 217). In 1683, the name was changed to Monmouth, after Colonel Morris’ home in North Wales (Salter, pp. 36-37; Cunningham, p. 217). At the same time, the three other counties of East Jersey, Middlesex, Bergen, and Essex, were also established (Salter, p. 36). During the late 17th century, “old” Monmouth County was considered the wealthiest county in East Jersey and various settlers, investors, and entrepreneurs sought to stake claims.

During this early period relations between Native American groups and European settlers remained tenuous. Around 1678, Richard Hartshorne, a prominent landowner in Middletown, arranged for Native American groups to relinquish all hunting and gathering privileges on his lands (Cunningham, p. 217; Salter, p. 58). Because Hartshorne’s property included all of present-day Sandy Hook, this action significantly altered the future of Native American and European interaction in the area (Cunningham, p. 217).

Although several land patents had been issued as early as the 1670s, one of the first documented European settlers in the portion of Monmouth County that is now present-day Ocean County was Henry Jacobs Falkenburg (aka Henry Jacobs) (Salter LXXXIV; McMahon, pp. 297-298; Cunningham, p. 229). Jacobs, an emigree from Schleswig-Holstein, arrived to the Little Egg Harbor area around 1698. Using some merchandise in his possession as barter, Jacobs acquired approximately eight hundred acres of land around Tuckerton from local Native American groups (McMahon, pp. 297-298).
Throughout the turn of the century, small communities continued to emerge across the Monmouth/Ocean County region. Included among these early settlements were Freehold in 1685, Tuckerton in 1699, and Eatontown in 1730 (McMahon, p. 300; Cunningham, pp. 218, 229; Woolman and Rose, p. 33; Salter, pp. 38-39).

In 1681, the boundaries of Burlington County were recognized in an act passed by the West New Jersey Assembly (Woodward, p. 121; McMahon, p. 80). Although the definition of its northwestern limits were somewhat vague, in its entirety the original Burlington County comprised almost half of New Jersey and extended from the Delaware River to the Atlantic Ocean. To the north, Burlington’s boundary ran between the tip of Long Beach Island to High Point. A line running from Long Beach Island to High Point and to Pennsauken Creek marked the southern boundary of Burlington County (Woodward, pp. 1-2). Encompassed within the bounds of the original Burlington County were the present counties of Burlington, Hunterdon, Morris, Sussex, Warren, as well as much of Mercer and Ocean Counties.

Boundary disputes were common during the early settlement of New Jersey. Landowners continued to play integral roles in the social and political arenas until 1702, when New Jersey became an official colony of England (Dorwart, p. 23). By the middle of the 18th century, many of the small communities of old Monmouth and Burlington Counties reached varying degrees of stability and would contribute in shaping the economic and political growth of Monmouth, Burlington, and Ocean Counties.

3. **Early Industrialization, Urbanization, and Agricultural Development**
(A.D. 1750 - A.D. 1860)

Around the middle of the 18th century, interior lands of southern New Jersey began to attract the attention of businessmen who were eager to harness the bog iron found throughout the pine forests. Ironworks using bog ore, like the one at Tinton Falls, had been established in northern New Jersey as early as the last quarter of the 17th century, and entrepreneurs of the Lower Delaware Valley hoped to match their success. Although small ironworks had already been established at Bordentown and Mount Holly around 1725 and 1730, the rise of South Jersey’s iron industry is often attributed to Charles Read, an entrepreneur and customs officer of Burlington, who is noted for establishing Atsion (c. 1765), Batsto (c. 1766), Etna (c. 1766-67), and Taunton (c. 1767) (Pierce, pp. 16-17). Consequently, the timber industry, already an integral part of South Jersey’s economy, was further perpetuated by the growing iron industry (Sinton, Regensburg, and Wilson, n.p.).

Along the coastline, the majority of the pre-war income was still derived from small agricultural and commercial enterprises. During the early settlement period, fish, oysters, and cranberries were the main products of the area’s economy. Fish and oysters were transported from Toms River and Tuckerton via a combination of water and land routes to larger markets in Mount Holly, Philadelphia, and New York (Cunningham, p. 230; McMahon, p. 295).

During the 18th century, northern Monmouth County became attractive to shipping industries. Navigation along the Shrewsbury, Navesink, Shark, and Manasquan Rivers provided easy
access to New York markets as well as ocean commerce. By the onset of the Revolutionary War, shipping, shipbuilding, and privateering had also grown to become primary industries of the county. These activities quickly encouraged the growth of assorted support industries including sawmilling and ocean salt harvesting.

After considerable petitioning by New York shipping merchants, construction of the Sandy Hook Lighthouse began in 1762 (Roberts and Youmans, pp. 235-236). The lighthouse was completed two years later.

Although the transportation network of southern and coastal New Jersey did include a few roads, these roads were often in poor condition (Dorwart and Mackey, pp. 13-14; Simpson, pp. 69-72; Leap, pp. 23-28). One of the earliest roads established in the area was Old Freehold Road (c. 1767), which ran between Freehold and Tuckerton.

Throughout the Revolutionary War, old Monmouth County was besieged consistently by British troops that landed along its shoreline. In 1778, the Battle of Monmouth, one of the war’s more devastating battles, was fought just outside of Freehold. Included among the battle’s soldiers was Molly Hays, also known as “Molly Pitcher.” Both St. Peter’s Church and Tenant Church in Freehold served as makeshift hospitals to house the many soldiers wounded in this skirmish.

Throughout the war, many of New Jersey’s smaller salt harvesting locales along the coast were destroyed repeatedly and rebuilt (Jahn, p. 34). To protect New Jersey’s salt industry, the Pennsylvania Council of Safety commissioned Thomas Savage to construct a saltworks near Little Egg Harbor in June 1776. Under the program, Savage constructed a saltworks with warehouses and a blockhouse at Shelter Cove, just outside of Toms River. After completion of the facility, salt from other facilities along the coast was shipped to the Toms River facility for safe storage (McMahon, p. 304). In November 1776, the Council sent an officer and twenty-five men to protect the Toms River facility. After the Governor of New Jersey denied a subsequent Continental Congress request for additional supplementary troops, the Navy Board of Pennsylvania responded by sending an armed patrol boat to Cranberry Inlet (McMahon, p. 304). In November 1778, several months after an earlier failed attempt, the British sent a force of over one hundred men to destroy the Toms River facility as well as salt harvesting locales along the Shark River and Squan Beach. This campaign was successful in destroying the Toms River saltworks, but the facility was subsequently rebuilt. After Savage’s death in December 1779, the works came into the protection of the Continental Army after John Thompson of Burlington County purchased the works with Continental money (McMahon, p. 304).

Privateering along the New Jersey coast, especially in Barnegat Bay and Little Egg Harbor, escalated drastically during the years leading up to American Revolution. Eager to take advantage of the political climate, privateers often captured ships under the auspices of patriotism. Stolen British cargo reappeared frequently at Toms River and Tuckerton before heading onward to Philadelphia.

It has been estimated that nearly seventy-seven naval battles along the coastline involved privateers (Jahn, p. 31) and many of the war skirmishes along the Monmouth (Ocean) County coastline were results of the British retaliation against privateering. In addition to a brutal
massacre at Tuckerton in 1778, one of the most notorious of these incidents was led by William Dillon, a British spy living on Dillon Island (present-day Island Heights). After the capture of one of his ships in March 1782, Dillon rallied the Board of Associated Royalists to join him in an anti-privateering campaign. A week after the capture of Dillon’s boat, Lieutenant Blanchard led a night raid comprised of three boats carrying a British troop of eighty men into Cranberry Inlet. The next morning, Blanchard and the troops attacked the Toms River blockhouse and the saltworks. Following the battle, the commander of the blockhouse, Captain Joshua Huddy, and the surviving members of his garrison were taken prisoner (McMahon, pp. 305-306; Salter, pp. 204-207).

Unlike other parts of the country, the Monmouth (Ocean) County coastal economy remained stable. In 1791, Tuckerton became an official port of entry for the approximate thirty miles of coast between Barnegat and Brigantine Inlets. Encouraged by the increasing prosperity of the region’s shipping industry, entrepreneurs soon began to target the coast for new opportunities. By the end of the 18th century, successful shipbuilding enterprises had been established at Waretown, Barnegat, Forked River, and Toms River. Oysters, fish, cranberries, and lumber continued develop as lucrative industries.

In interior portions, the late 18th century expansion of the iron industry into southern Monmouth County (including present-day Ocean County) also contributed to regional growth. Forges established during this time include Manchester (at present-day Lakehurst) (c. 1789), Stafford (at Staffordsville, c. 1797), Butcher (at Laurelton, c. 1808), Bamber (aka Ferago, c. 1810), and Dover (in Berkeley Township near the headwaters of Cedar Creek, c. 1809). During the Early Republic years, many of the forges in southern New Jersey’s iron industry reached their peak, even through changes in ownership. Goods produced at the various south Jersey ironworks ranged from household items to industrial components. The agricultural economy of interior portions of Monmouth (Ocean) County also began to grow. The introduction of adding marl to enhance poor-quality soils around this time further increased production, and by 1840, regional agricultural returns were maximized.

Real estate developers and investors also turned to New Jersey’s central coastline. By the early 19th century, Long Beach and Tucker’s Beach (a resort destination as early as the mid 18th century) began to rival Cape May for Trenton and Philadelphia tourists (Allaback, pp. 6-7).

Shipping industries continued to encourage economic growth. In the northern part of Monmouth County, small port cities such as Red Bank and Keyport, along the region’s drainages and coastline grew rapidly to accommodate vessels en route to New York. In response to the growing demands of traffic along the coastline, several lighthouses, including two at the mouth of the Navesink River (1828), two on Sandy Hook (1842), and one at Barnegat Inlet (1858) were erected throughout the 19th century (Cunningham, p. 232; Robert and Youmans, pp. 236, 244-245).

Other milestones during the first half of the 19th century associated with the region’s water-based heritage include Hazeltan Seaman’s c. 1836 introduction of the “Sneak Box,” a shallow draft boat favored by hunters (Di Iorio, p. 62), and Joseph Francis’ 1844 introduction of an unsinkable life car for rescuing shipwreck victims. This time period also marks the founding of
the United States Lifesaving Service, spearheaded by Dr. William A. Newell, in 1848 (Cunningham, pp. 232-233; Veasey, pp. 75-76; McMahon, p. 315). After witnessing a devastating shipwreck off of Long Beach Island, Newell petitioned for the creation of a sea rescue program. Under this program, which was the precursor to the U.S. Coast Guard, eight boathouses with lifesaving equipment were constructed at various locations along the shore between Sandy Hook and Little Egg Harbor (McMahon, 315; Veasey, pp. 75-77).

During the second quarter of the 19th century, the railroad was introduced to the state as alternate means to transport goods and people, especially for more interior areas. Although transportation along many parts of the Monmouth (Ocean) County shore would continue to rely heavily upon a well-established network of water routes well into the second half of the 19th century, the arrival of the railroad would grow to have lasting effects on the region.

Begun in 1830, the Camden and Amboy Railroad was designed to connect the Delaware River to the Raritan Bay. By 1834, Camden City and South Amboy were established as the railroad’s northern and southern termini, respectively, and had acquired the rights to several other lines in between (WPA, p. 101). The Camden and Amboy continued to increase its holdings. By 1840, with the assistance of the New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company, the Camden and Amboy Railroad had created an all-rail line between Philadelphia and New York. At the time, it was the longest line in the country (WPA, p. 102; Cunningham, p. 134). One of the earliest railroads into Ocean County was the Raritan and Delaware Bay Railroad, which established a station at the Bergen Iron Works in present-day Lakewood in 1861 (Retrieved from www.octrainguy.mybravenet.com/history-MainLine.html, August 2003).

The arrival of the railroad to the New Jersey shore is often attributed to Dr. Jonathan Pitney, who around the 1830s began to actively develop the Absecon Island area. By 1854, also the same year a charter for Atlantic City was obtained, Pitney had been instrumental in acquiring the rights to construct a railroad from Camden to Absecon (Camden and Atlantic Railroad) (McMahon, p. 247; Allaback, p. 23). The growth of the railroad throughout southern New Jersey was important to the development of the resorts of the Jersey Shore. Before the railroad, travel to the shore occurred through a combination of stagecoach and steamship. Up until the end of the first quarter of the 19th century, the shore area remained relatively undeveloped. Aside from a few isolated spots such as Tucker’s and Absecon Islands, resort areas along the shore were limited to destinations around Cape May, Long Branch and northern Monmouth County, both of which had steamship service.


On February 15, 1850, the 480,000 acres of Monmouth County that lay south of the Manasquan River was defined as Ocean County (Woolman and Rose, p. 35; McMahon, p. 296). Within the bounds of the newly formed Ocean County were the townships of Dover, Jackson, Plumsted, Stafford, and Union. During the formation of Ocean County, a sixth township, Brick, was created from portions of Dover and Howell Townships (McMahon, p. 296). Toms River was established as the county seat, and by June 1851, the construction of a new courthouse in Toms River was completed.
Between 1850 and 1920, the Industrial Revolution transformed the country from an agrarian and mercantile based-economy to a modern industrialized nation and New Jersey was no different. The increasing immigrant populations in North America during this time provided the labor force to support fluctuations of supply and demand (Swanda [1991c], p. 1). In addition to rising commerce, the Victorian Era of New Jersey is marked by notable increases in residential populations and the rise of the state’s tourist industry. During this time of rapid socio-economic change, the Jersey shore transformed from a region of small quiet villages to a booming resort area. Between 1897 and 1919, eight substantial ocean resorts were established along the coast (Dorwart, pp. 141-165).

Throughout the second half of the 19th century, New Jersey’s railway system continued to expand across the state and into the New Jersey Shore. While steamships continued to be a common means of transport around the northern end of New Jersey’s central coast, travel by rail began to rise in popularity (Roberts and Youmans, pp. 26-50). By the end of the third quarter of the 19th century, the steamship industry had begun to decline.

The addition of extensive railways, such as the New York and Long Branch and Jersey Central Railroads in 1870, the Long Branch and Sea Shore Railroad in 1865, as well as small auxiliary routes, further facilitated transportation of goods and people across the county and to various shore destinations (Allaback, pp. 20-45; Cunningham, p. 235).

One of the turning points in the developmental history of resort areas along New Jersey’s northern-central shoreline was the opening of rail service to Sandy Hook by the Long Branch and Sea Side Railroad Company in 1865. Shortly thereafter, the Jersey Central Railroad began to lay tracks from the station at Horseshoe Cove on Sandy Hook down the coast. By 1875, the tracks of the Jersey Central Railroad’s New York and Long Branch line extended to just beyond Bay Head. The Jersey Central Railroad continued to extend the line southward and added stations at Asbury Park, Ocean Grove, and Spring Lake along the way (Roberts and Youmans, p. 50).

Throughout the 1880s, additional lines were also being constructed to the New Jersey Shore and likewise, these efforts also sparked development of new resort areas. In 1883, the Pennsylvania Railroad extended its Pemberton Line to Toms River. The Pennsylvania Railroad then continued over to Seaside Park and northward to Barnegat Beach Island, Lavellette, Normandy Beach, and Mantoloking, and eventually joined with the New York and Long Branch line (Roberts and Youmans, p. 50; Cunningham, pp. 78-79).

Other railroad companies with vested interests in the area included several parts of the Pennsylvania Railroad including the Philadelphia and Beach Haven Railroad Company, which ran a line between Manahawken to Beach Haven, via Barnegat City Junction; and the Barnegat Railroad Company, which ran a line between Barnegat City Junction to Barnegat City (Retrieved from www.broadway.pennsyrr.com/Rail/Prr/Corphist, August 2003 ).

As various railroad companies continued to expand their operations up and down the Jersey shore, new towns began to develop along their paths. By the end of the century, Barnegat Bay
and many of the barrier islands had established resort areas complete with rail service. Tourist markets for these resorts ranged from religious groups in places like Ocean Grove (c. 1870; Retrieved from www.oceangrovehistory.org, August 2003) and Seaside Park (c. 1876 – Allaback, p. 77) to the upper classes in the Highlands and Mantoloking (ca. 1881 - Retrieved from www.mantoloking.org, August 2003 ) (Cunningham, p. 78; Allaback, p. 37).

In 1884, a bridge from Mantoloking to the mainland was constructed (Retrieved from www.mantoloking.org, August 2003).

The rising tourist trade was no doubt one of the major economic changes of Ocean County during this time; however, many of the established industries such as charcoal burning, boat building, commercial fishing, oystering and salt hay harvesting, continued to contribute to Ocean County’s increasing economy. Products from Ocean County’s interior included chickens, turpentine, and cranberries.

Around the middle of the 19th century, John Webb drained a swamp near Cassville for the purposes of large-scale cranberry production. Encouraged by Webbs’ financial success in regional markets, others established similar operations. After a short-lived national cranberry craze that resulted in the driving up of land prices and the draining of much of the county’s swampland, prices collapsed in 1863 (Cunningham, p. 234).

In 1891, Little Egg Harbor Township was taken from Burlington County and added to Ocean County, thus forming the County’s current boundaries (Cunningham, p. 236).


The counties that form New Jersey’s Atlantic Coast continued to develop as resort areas. While railroads continued to remain popular means of transportation to the shore since the opening of the Camden and Atlantic Railroad in 1854, the introduction of the automobile into mainstream life further added to the increasing amount of tourism (Karshner, p. 2; Dorwart, pp. 222-248). Causeways across the Intracoastal Waterway to accommodate automobile traffic, usually built of timber and placed parallel to railroad lines, were also constructed.

Several large-scale construction projects were undertaken in Ocean County. The first paved road down the coast was constructed in 1909. This road ran between Point Pleasant and Seaside Park, and instigated development of Seaside Heights. In 1915, the Island Heights and Seaside Heights Bridge Company completed construction of a bridge across the Barnegat Bay. This bridge, the first toll bridge across Barnegat Bay, linked Seaside Heights to Toms River (Retrieved from www.seasideheights.org, August 2003; Retrieved from www.palmvillaseaside.com, August 2003). Prices of the tolls varied depending on the type of vehicle and the number of passengers and/or livestock (Retrieved from www.palmvillaseaside.com, August 2003).

Several military installations were also conducted in the Monmouth-Ocean-Burlington County region during the WWI-WWII Era. In 1917, Fort Monmouth was established as a military
communications research center. The impact of this installation is still evident in the various electronics firms still headquartered in Monmouth County.

That same year, the United States Army constructed Camp Dix near Wrightsville. Encompassing roughly 6,000 acres, Camp Dix functioned as a major training facility during World War I. In 1940, Camp Dix was renamed Fort Dix. After World War II, the US Airforce became a separate branch of the US Armed Forces and the US Army airforce base at Fort Dix was changed to McGuire Air Force Base. Since World War II, the facility has served in the Korean and Vietnam Wars, and remains an active military airbase. Currently, McGuire Air Force Base stretches across roughly 32,605 Federally owned acres (Cunningham, pp. 211-212).

During World War I, a chemical warfare training ground was established at Lakehurst. After the war, this facility became the US Navy's Lighter Than Air (LTA) aeronautical base. The first dirigible manufactured in the US, the USS Shenandoah (ZR-1) was assembled at Lakehurst and launched from the base in 1922. Several subsequent crafts were assembled and launched at Lakehurst with moderate success; however, the 1937 mid-air explosion of the German vessel, the Hindenburg, over Lakehurst all but ended any additional endeavors. Currently, the US Navy maintains the base as a Naval Air Systems Command facility (NAVAIR) (Retrieved from www.lakehurst.navy.mil, August 2003; Cunningham, pp. 211-212).

Due to its geographic setting, the Navesink Highlands became a favored locale for illegal alcohol enterprises. During the prohibition years, this area served as a major supplier for much of the eastern seaboard (Cunningham, p. 225). In Ocean County, the area around Brick and Point Pleasant Townships was a popular rumrunner destination (Angott, Chapter 33).

During the 1920s, chicken farming also began to expand in Ocean County. By 1925, the Toms River area was regarded as one of the county’s most progressive poultry centers. The poultry industry continued to flourish until the 1970s.

Because of its dependence on tourism, the depression years severely affected the economic stability of the resort-oriented counties of New Jersey. By the early 1930s, development of the shore had virtually ceased and several of the larger resort towns, such as Ocean City and Wildwood, defaulted on payment of county taxes (Dorwart, pp. 206, 213).

Between 1930 and 1940, Federally funded projects such as the WPA and CCC, were undertaken in New Jersey. A wide variety of activities ranging from archaeological surveys (Cross Survey, 1941) to mosquito-control efforts were conducted throughout the county.

6. Modern New Jersey (A.D. 1945 - present)

The postwar era of New Jersey is marked by several noted events. After World War II, many of the New Jersey’s shore counties experienced a surge growth and development. Schools and other public buildings were constructed in response to the rising population of permanent residences. During this time, the New Jersey shore area also rose in popularity as favorite retirement locale. In 1950, the original bridge to Seaside Heights was replaced with the Thomas A. Mathis Bridge. In 1953, a second span, the Joseph Stanley Tunney Bridge, was added.
In 1952, the New Jersey legislature passed a Parkway Bond to build a four-lane toll road from Fort Lee, Bergen County to the southernmost point of Cape May (Dorwart, p. 234). Two years later, the Garden State Parkway was opened. By 1960, about six years after completion of the Garden State Parkway, the population of Ocean County had doubled from its 1950s population of about 57,000 residents (Cunningham, p. 238).

Concerted efforts were also undertaken to preserve the natural heritage of the New Jersey coastline. In 1954, over 3,000 acres at the south end of Barnegat Beach Island were set aside to form Island Beach State Park, a wildlife habitat and recreational area (Cunningham, p. 239; Retrieved from www.state.nj.us, August 2003)

Despite the general trend of continuing urban growth, some parts of the shore were less prosperous. For example, around the mid-1960s, Atlantic City and its neighboring communities began to decline. Various efforts, such as the legalization of gambling within the city limits of Atlantic City in 1978, were undertaken to promote a resurgence of such communities.

Since the 1970s development has continued to increase throughout Ocean County. The tourist trade continues to remain an integral part of Ocean County’s economy. In 1974, Great Adventure, the country’s first combined amusement and safari park was constructed in Jackson Township (Cunningham, p. 239). Since the construction of Great Adventure, Jackson Township’s residential population has increased nearly five times from its 1960s count of roughly six thousand (Cunningham, p. 239). In response to the popularity of the park, a dedicated exit was added to the Garden State Parkway in the late 1990s.

Although subdivisions and commercial properties have replaced much of Ocean County’s open space, remnants of its historic past can still be found. Many of the resort communities, such as Mantoloking and Bay Head still retain their turn of the 19th to 20th century resort character. Small agricultural communities can also be found in Ocean County’s interior lands.

The following summaries of the historical development of the municipalities within the project area have been abstracted from the KSK study and supplemented with additional information deemed pertinent to this development through the course of research for this addendum.

a. Mantoloking Borough

Mantoloking developed in the latter part of the 19th century; the name has been variously translated to “place of living timber,” “land of frogs,” or “sand place.” Circa 1875, land acquisition in the area started under the direction of Frederick W. Downer approximately two miles south of Bay Head. As the Princeton Bank & Trust Company of Bay Head did nearby, Downer cleared the land of bayberry, sumac, catbrier, and poison ivy, and graded it. After making the area habitable, Downer formed two land companies, the Seashore Land Company and the Seashore Improvement Company.
In 1882, the town was divided into ninety-six lots of varying sizes, which extended south from Herbert Avenue to approximately 700 feet south of Ashton (Downer) Avenue. Lots near the ocean were generally larger than those by the bay. By 1883, approximately fifty acres had been graded but the area between Mantoloking and Bay Head remained as dunes. Also in 1883, the Pennsylvania Railroad completed a line from Seaside Park through Mantoloking to Bay Head; the Mantoloking station was constructed that year. In 1884, a bridge connected Mantoloking to the mainland at Bridge Street.

Development occurred slowly. By 1905, the resort area still had only fifty buildings, in part because of larger lots requiring a wealthier clientele and Downer “[screening] prospective residents.” Larger growth occurred during the second and third decades of the 20th century, and the area from Lyman Avenue to the southern border of Bay Head developed more densely. By the 1930s, although Mantoloking was still less built up than Bay Head or Point Pleasant, development extended the length of the borough and was dense between the bay and the ocean.

b. Bay Head Borough

In 1877, Bay Head began its development as a summer resort. The Princeton Bank & Trust Company made the initial purchase of forty-five acres of land and leveled the rolling sand dunes capped by heather and grasses on the landmass between the bay and ocean. Initial development occurred on the blocks bounded by Bridge Avenue to the north, Mount Street to the south, the ocean to the east, and Lake Avenue to the west, the houses generally fronted the ocean, with the rears facing the street.

In 1879, the Bay Head Land Company purchased an additional one hundred twelve acres of two hundred eighty six lots, most measuring 50 x 100 feet. The Bellevue, Bay Head’s first hotel (now demolished), was constructed in 1881 at the northwest corner of Bridge and Main Streets. The New York & Long Branch Railroad was completed as far as neighboring Point Pleasant, and by 1880 the Philadelphia & Long Branch Railroad entered Bay Head from the south and connected with the New York Branch in Point Pleasant.

By 1886, Bay Head hosted approximately thirteen oceanfront houses, a hotel, a drug store, the land office, a bathing pavilion, and scattered cottages, located primarily south of Bridge Street. Also in 1886, Bay Head Borough was formed from a portion of Brick Township. By 1888, Bay Head had approximately fifty buildings, fifteen of which were located on the oceanfront. Bay Head also had numerous boat yards fashioning pleasure bots, such as Hance’s, Loveland’s, Johnson Brothers’, and Slade Dale (Miller, p. 459)

A trolley line was constructed in 1903 along Lake Avenue, and by 1905 the Borough of Bay Head (established 1886) had at least five hotels that served as summer resorts and social centers. By 1940, development extended from its border with Mantoloking to the north to Point Pleasant and Point Pleasant Beach to the south; a small commercial area developed along Main Avenue near Mount Street.
c. Point Pleasant Beach Borough

The northernmost of the barrier beaches, Point Pleasant Beach Borough fell under the jurisdiction of Point Pleasant Borough until 1920. Settlement of the area was encouraged by its proximity to the Atlantic Ocean, Barnegat Bay, and the Manasquan and Metedeconk Rivers as well as to woodland and rich farmland (Kralik, n.p.). This area separated from Brick Township in 1866. Although European settlement occurred as early as the 18th century, it was not well populated until John Arnold planned the first improvements and development in the 1880s with lots that were 50 x 100' (Martin, p. 29). His development, called Arnold City, was sited north of the current alignment of Arnold Avenue and east of the railroad to the current alignment of Bay Avenue.

The Point Pleasant Land Company, established in 1878 by investors from Trenton, developed the area west of Arnold City within the boundaries of the former Forman Farm and called it Point Pleasant City. This later became the center of Point Pleasant Beach. The city was managed from Philadelphia and laid out in a grid for easy sale and developed in two phases: north of Washington Avenue in 1877 and south of it in 1878. The Point Pleasant Land Company stated the following in an advertising brochure: "...These advantages are: its marked and well established healthfulness: its close proximity to the best fishing and gunning grounds between Sandy Hook and Cape May; its splendid boating and sailing facilities; its convenience of access from the great cities; its beautiful lawns and noble forests; its magnificent ocean strand, and unrivalled bathing. Today these attractions and advantages have been immeasurably increased and enhanced by the improvements made by the present owners, and the building of two railroads by which it is placed in direct communication with all the large cities. The remarkable healthfulness of this place has been known to the leading physicians of the country for more than half a century, and they have been in the habit of sending their patients hither to breathe its pure and life-giving air, and to rebuild their shattered systems on its tonic and bracing conditions. The complete isolation of the place from all possible deleterious odors or emanations, the pure and wholesome water, and the combination of the sea air on one side, and untainted country air on the other, are no doubt the causes of the remarkable healthfulness of this locality (Martin, p. 29)."

By the early 20th century, Point Pleasant Beach hosted businesses that served its residents as well as those of Bay Head and Mantoloking. It had a bank, library, and the first fire company in Ocean County (Kralik, n.p.). Point Pleasant Beach also had an amusement area, Clark’s Landing, as early as 1879; it featured picnic grounds, a merry-go-round, boats for hire, and cottages for rent. Circa 1915, the Point Pleasant Boardwalk was built, but in response to the Great Depression, the oceanfront was sold to individual owners. Profit-making bathhouses and pavilions, such as Johnson’s, Risden’s and Jenkinson’s, and restaurants, arcades, and standard rides lined the beachfront (Kralik, n.p.). The area just north of the Bay Head corporate line along Main Avenue lay undeveloped until c. 1920. The area west of Main Avenue remained undeveloped until the 1950s and 1960s when apartment buildings, hotels, and commercial buildings were erected (Kralik, n.p.).
Railroads Serving Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant Beach

Railroad speculators faced many odds when contemplating laying track from established inland cities to the barrier beaches: winter ice in the coves and bays could easily break the bridge pilings; hurricanes and winter storms coming from the Atlantic Ocean could "erase a right-of-way in a single night"; stretches of sedges lay as traps between the beaches and mainland; and a nagging fear that if they built it, no one would come since Americans of the post-Civil War era had become much more frugal. However, not much time passed before a calculated chance was taken and the unpopulated beaches became coastal resorts. Promoters started by creating changes in recreational and spending habits, and transportation-for-pleasure became the key marketing ploy (Cunningham [1997], pp. 204-205).

The New York & Long Branch (NY&LB) was not catering to the vacationers, but it still became an important commuting railroad for summertime visitors as well as year-round residents traveling to New York or Newark. Chartered in 1868, its goal was to displace the Raritan & Delaware Bay Railroad's steamboat ride to and from New York City. The NY&LB formed a partnership with New Jersey Central Railroad to build a bridge over Newark Bay in 1864, and in 1875 a span crossed the Raritan Bay. The first train ran on June 25, 1875, from Jersey City and arrived in Long Branch two and one-half hours later. By 1876, the railroad reached as far as Sea Girt and by June 1880, tracks spanned the Manasquan Inlet into Point Pleasant. Not long after, there was an extension into Bay Head, the terminus of the railroad. Towns emerged along this route with developers having carefully laid streets with uniform lots (Cunningham [1997], pp. 206-209).

The Pennsylvania Railroad had already laid tracks from Philadelphia through the Pine Barrens, but by 1879 it had intentions to expand the line to Bay Head, which would rival the NY&LB. It purchased the Pemberton & New York Railroad, an 18-mile branch constructed by the New Jersey Southern Railroad from Whiting in the Pine Barrens to Pemberton, and it already had a link to Camden and Philadelphia via the Camden & Burlington County Railroad Company. The Pennsylvania Railroad then planned to work with the Tuckerton Railroad to gain support for the tracks to cross the Barnegat Bay to the barrier island; however, it instead built a route to Toms River that ended at Good Luck Point. This terminus required a 7,000-foot span across the bay and marshland to the barrier island but by July 1881, the first passenger train landed in Seaside Park. The railroad company laid tracks to Bay Head, and there it connected with the NY&LB in 1882. This relationship continued until the 1970s (Cunningham [1997], pp. 209-211).
VI. DATA SUMMARY

The following discussion presents the results of field investigations for the addendum to the "Survey of Historic Architectural Resources: NJ Route 35, MP 9.0-13.0," which was completed in 1995 (revise 2001) by Kise Franks & Straw Inc [now Kise Straw & Kolodner (KSK)].

A. Previously Identified Resources

1. Mantoloking Historic District

Description: This district has a concentration of buildings dating from the last quarter of the 19th century through the first half of the 20th century. Almost exclusively residential, the majority of buildings embody elements of the Shingle and Colonial Revival style. Generally, these buildings are two and one-half stories high with simple plans and complex roof lines such as multiple gables, hipped roofs, gambrels, and cross gables. First-story and small second-story porches are common. Buildings dating from 1910 to 1920 are generally one and one-half or two stories with rectangular or square plans with simple roof forms; first-story porches are common.

Significance: The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century.

Boundary: The boundaries are as follows: the municipal line with Bay Head Borough to the north, the municipal boundary with Brick Township to the south, and the beachfront to the east. The western boundary was not delineated as part of the KSK survey; however, for the purposes of the present survey, it is recommended that the western boundary extend to Barnegat Bay (Figure 2A through 2D).

2. Bay Head Historic District (including All Saints Church and The Bluffs Hotel)

Description: The district contains building stock dating from the last quarter of the 19th century through the first third of the 20th century. Generally homogenous in scale, materials, and massing, the district is largely residential in character with buildings embodying features of the Shingle, Queen Anne, and Colonial Revival styles. Generally, the houses are two and one-half stories with simple plans and shingled exteriors. Most houses have hipped roofs with hipped dormers although some have gable or gambrel roofs. First-floor porches are a common feature. Within the district lies All Saints Church at 500 Lake Avenue (E: 8/31/2001). The Bluffs Hotel had been determined eligible on June 23, 1995, and was demolished c. 1996; it was a contributing feature to a potential Bay Head Historic District. In the June 1995 NJ HPO letter it was stated that the best way to counter the adverse effect of
demolition was not HABS documentation, but to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District.

Significance: The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century. All Saints Church is eligible under Criteria A and C. It is associated with the early development of Bay Head and is architecturally distinct.

Boundary: The boundaries of the district are as follows: the south side of Delaware Avenue and Ocean Avenue in Point Pleasant Beach Borough to the north; the municipal line with Mantoloking Borough to the south; and the beachfront to the east. The western boundary was not delineated as part of the KSK survey; however, for the purposes of the present survey, it is recommended that the western boundary extend to Barnegat Bay (Figure 2A through 2D). The survey completed in August 1980 for the All Saints Church states, “Corner sitting, on lot extending from Lake Avenue to Scow Ditch; the municipal parking area is located across the ditch.” For the purposes of this survey, the recommended boundary follows that of the tax parcel (Block 53/Lot 6) to edge of pavement; the northern boundary is Howe Avenue, the southern boundary is the parcel line shared with Block 53/Lot 3, the eastern boundary is Lake Avenue; and the western boundary is the Scow Ditch.

3. Other Resources within Project Area

Within Mantoloking Borough lies the Mantoloking Bridge (E: 5/5/1996), also known as the structure that carries County Route 528 over Barnegat Bay; it was determined eligible under Criterion C for is embodiment of the single-leaf trunnion bascule design. The Mantoloking Marine Historic District (E: 5/5/1996), eligible under Criteria A and C, encompasses the shore areas on both sides of Barnegat Bay, south of the Mantoloking Bridge, and falls partially within the Mantoloking Historic District. It is currently being recorded in accordance with HAER guidelines to mitigate its eventual replacement. The Mantoloking Marine Historic District encompasses three complexes that represent the continued existence of a vibrant and interconnected marine industry: Beaton’s Boat Yard in Brick Township, Winter Yacht Basin in Brick Township, and Mantoloking Yacht Club in Mantoloking Borough. Beaton’s Boat Yard is individually eligible (E: 1/21/1992), as is the Mantoloking Yacht Club (NJ HPO-sponsored survey in 1980). The thematic nomination of Barnegat Bay Class A Racing Boats was determined eligible on May 5, 1996, under Criterion C.

B. Summary of Update Forms Completed for the Mantoloking and Bay Head Historic Districts, September 2003

Table 1: Summary of Update Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Street Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-42</td>
<td>1101 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-44</td>
<td>1105 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-45</td>
<td>1106 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-44</td>
<td>1107 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-46</td>
<td>1108 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-47</td>
<td>1110 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-48</td>
<td>1112 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-49</td>
<td>1116 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-51</td>
<td>1119 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-51</td>
<td>1120 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-52</td>
<td>1121 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-53</td>
<td>1123 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-54</td>
<td>1124 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-53</td>
<td>1125 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-55</td>
<td>1126 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-54</td>
<td>1127 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-55</td>
<td>1129 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-56</td>
<td>1130 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-21</td>
<td>1133 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>1200 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ROW acquisition: 577 sq ft/.012 acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1201 Ocean Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvement Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Albertson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Princeton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Downer Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Herbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>924’ N of Herbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1643’ N or Herbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1715’ S of Lyman Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1638’ S of Lyman Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>735’ S of Lyman Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Lyman Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Bergen Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>370’ N of Mathis Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Strickland Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Goetz Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Egbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Johnson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Forsyth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Mount Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Howe Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Harris Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>North Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ROW Acquisition for Sidewalks | 1548 Ocean Avenue  
(ROW acquisition: 584 sq ft/0.013 acre) |
| 40-14    | 1551 Ocean Avenue  
(ROW acquisition: 520 sq ft acre/.011 acre) |
| 41-17    | 1557 Ocean Avenue  
(ROW acquisition: 540 sq ft acre/.012 acre) |
| Western Boundary | Mantoloking Historic District |
| Multiple | Bay Head Historic District |
VII. EFFECT ANALYSIS

A. Potential Direct and Indirect Effect

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, and implementing regulations 36 CFR 800, the results of effect evaluation and criteria of adverse effect were applied to the above-ground historic resources identified in the APE (Tables 1A through 2B).

Definition of Effect: An effect to a historic property “...means alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register” [36 CFR 800.16(d)].

Criteria of Adverse Effect: An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualifies it for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of a property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association [36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)].

Examples of adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to [36 CFR 800.5(2)]:

1. physical alteration or damage to all or part of the property;
2. alteration of a property including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for the treatment of historic properties and applicable guidelines;
3. the removal of the property from its historic location;
4. change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;
5. introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;
6. neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and/or
7. transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate, legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure the long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

The following four (4) tables discuss the results of effect evaluation and criteria of adverse effect to the resources recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places within the project area: Mantoloking Historic District (and the Mantoloking Marine Historic District/Mantoloking Yacht Club and the Mantoloking Bridge which lie therein) and the Bay Head Historic District (and All Saints Church which lies therein).
Table 1A: Results of Effect Evaluation for Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Marine Historic District, and Mantoloking Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register [36 CFR 800.16(i)].</td>
<td>The Mantoloking Historic District is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Mantoloking Marine Historic District is eligible under Criteria A and C. The three complexes that form this district (Beaton Boat Yard, Winter Yacht Basin, and Mantoloking Yacht Club) represent the continued existence of a vibrant and interconnected marine industry. With the proposed western boundary extending to Barnegat Bay, the Mantoloking Marine Historic District falls within the Mantoloking Historic District; the Mantoloking Yacht Club, as part of the Marine Historic District, also falls within the Mantoloking Historic District with the western boundary drawn to Barnegat Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Mantoloking Bridge is eligible under Criteria C for embodying the characteristics of a single-leaf trunnion bascule. With the proposed western boundary extending to Barnegat Bay, the eastern approach to the Mantoloking Bridge falls within the Mantoloking Historic District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Mantoloking Historic District, the intersection improvements at Herbert Street as well as full reconstruction of the curbs, reconstruction or resurfacing of the roadway pavement, provision of crosswalks at all signalized intersections, provision of sidewalks where none currently exist, and raising the profile of the roadway for better drainage will cause a physical and visual effect to the historic district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The installation required for drainage improvements will cause a temporary visual and audible effect with the removal of pavement to lay pipes and reconstruction of the roadway pavement. The introduction of new inlets and backflow prevention devices will cause a minimal visual impact to these resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDING:** This project will have an effect on the National Register eligible Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Marine Historic District, and Mantoloking Bridge.

*Following Table 1B and 2B are site plans and photos to illustrate the proposed action; each historic district has a key site plan map with focus areas to represent the proposed action.*
Table 1B: Application of the Criteria of Adverse Effect for Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Marine Historic District, and Mantoloking Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative [36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Adverse Effects pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Roadway Improvements:</strong> Along NJ Route 35, in the vicinity of Herbert Street, there will be strip takes along the northeast quadrant of the intersection ranging from 0.3% at No. 1204 to 12.9% at No. 1126 NJ Route 35 to allow for the introduction of a slightly widened roadway with curbing, a grass buffer, and sidewalks (Chapter IV, Table 1, p. 16). Two of these properties, Nos. 1126 and 1130, are contributing features to the district with strip takes of 12.9% and 12.3%, respectively. Along the entire project area, curbs will be reconstructed in kind or installed where none currently exist, the roadway will be reconstructed or resurfaced in asphalt, sidewalks will be added where none currently exist, crosswalks will be striped at signalized intersections, and where feasible, the roadway profile will be raised to allow for better drainage (Site Plans 1A &amp; 1B). <strong>Drainage Improvements:</strong> Shoulders will be reconstructed in kind with slopes that vary from 2-6%; curbing will be repaired or introduced where none currently exist; and new inlets will be added as needed. To repair and/or lay new pipes, the existing pavement materials will be removed and replaced with asphalt. The proposed pipes may need to accommodate increased flow by either adding pipes of the same size along an existing pipe or by increasing the size of the existing pipe by one 6&quot; increment. At most, an 18&quot; - 30&quot; pipe would move up one size or an 18&quot; - 24&quot; pipe could become three (3) pipes. At the end of each pipe, tidal back flow prevention devices will be installed (Site Plans 1A &amp; 1C).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:** Only two contributing properties will be impacted physically by the Herbert Street intersection improvements along NJ Route 35, a minimal intrusion to a district that encompasses an entire borough. Historically, sidewalks and curbs have been a part of the Mantoloking streetscape. The presence of bituminous shoulders (8-12’) will diminish the impact of replacing the NJ Route 35’s concrete pavement, and the east-west streets area already a bituminous material. The roadway profile will change to allow for a 4-8” curbline; 4” is required for pavement design. Street trees and other landscaping will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe. |
(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access that is not consistent with the Secretary’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (36 CFR 68) and applicable guidelines;  

While alterations will occur with the rehabilitation and repair of the roadway and drainage system, measures are being taken to remain consistent with the Secretary’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The resource will maintain its historic use and character; the features, spaces, and spatial relationships will remain largely in tact; and the new work will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion. Only two contributing properties will be impacted physically by the Herbert Street intersection improvements along NJ Route 35, a minimal intrusion to a district that encompasses an entire borough. Historically, sidewalks and curbs have been a part of the Mantoloking streetscape. The presence of bituminous shoulders (8-12’) will diminish the impact of replacing the NJ Route 35’s concrete pavement, and the east-west streets area already a bituminous material. The roadway profile will change to allow for a 4-8” curbline; 4” is required for pavement design. Street trees and other landscaping will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe.

(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;  

No property within this resource will be removed from its historic location.

(iv) Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;  

The resource will maintain its historic use and character; the features, spaces, and spatial relationships will remain largely in tact; and the new work will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion. Landscape features such as street trees and buffers between the curb and sidewalk will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe.

(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;  

The Mantoloking Historic District is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century. The Mantoloking Marine Historic District is eligible under Criteria A and C. The three complexes that form this district (Beaton Boat Yard, Winter Yacht Basin, and Mantoloking Yacht Club) represent the continued existence of a vibrant and interconnected marine industry. With the proposed western boundary extending to Barnegat Bay, the Mantoloking Marine Historic District falls within the Mantoloking Historic District. The Mantoloking Bridge is eligible under Criteria C for embodying the characteristics of a single-leaf trunnion bascule. With the proposed western boundary extending to Barnegat Bay, the eastern approach to the Mantoloking Bridge falls within the Mantoloking Historic District.

The introduction of the above roadway and drainage elements will not diminish the integrity of the resource’s significant historic features. Only two contributing properties will be
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organizations; and

This resource has not been subject to neglect.

(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

This resource is not subject to the transfer, lease, or sale out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

OTHER:

There will be no other effects associated with this project.

FINDING:

This project will have No Adverse Effect on the Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Marine Historic District, and Mantoloking Bridge.
Photo 1: NJ Route 35 south of Princeton Avenue facing north.

Photo 2: NJ Route 35 at Princeton Avenue facing south.
Photo 3: NJ Route 35 at Princeton Avenue facing northwest.

Photo 4: Princeton Avenue at NJ Route 35 facing west to Barnegat Bay.
Photo 5: Bay Avenue at Princeton Avenue facing southwest toward 1336 Bay Avenue.

Photo 6: Bay Avenue at Barnegat Bay facing southeast.
Photo 1: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1234 facing south.

Photo 2: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1216 facing south.
Photo 3: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1204 facing south.

Photo 4: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1125 facing south to Herbert Street.
Photo 5: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1120 facing south.

Photo 6: Herbert Street, east of Mantoloking Bridge, facing northeast.
Photo 7: At Old Bridge Road and Barnegat Bay facing northeast.

Photo 8: At Old Bridge Road and Barnegat Bay facing southeast.
Photo 9: At Downer Avenue and Barnegat Bay facing southeast.
NOT TO SCALE
SITE PLAN 1C
MANTOLOKING HISTORIC DISTRICT
Photo 1: Lyman Street at Barnegat Bay facing north.

Photo 2: Lyman Street at Barnegat Bay facing south.
Photo 3: At 976 Barnegat Lane facing west.
Table 2A: Results of Effect Evaluation for Bay Head Historic District and All Saints Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register [36 CFR 800.16(i)].</td>
<td>The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century. All Saints Church is eligible under Criteria A and C and contributes to the Bay Head Historic District. It is associated with the early development of Bay Head and is architecturally distinct. The Bluffs Hotel (Block 66/Lot 16), which was determined eligible on June 23, 1995 was demolished c. 1996; the NJ HPO letter of 1996 stated that the best way to counter the adverse effect of demolition would be to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District instead of simply completing HABS recordation. Full reconstruction of the curbs, reconstruction or resurfacing of the roadway pavement, provision of crosswalks at all signalized intersections, provision of sidewalks where none currently exist, and raising the profile of the roadway for better drainage will cause a visual effect to the historic district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINDING: This project will have an effect on the National Register eligible Bay Head Historic District and All Saints Church.

*Following Table 1B and 2B are site plans and photos to illustrate the proposed action; each historic district has a key site plan map with focus areas to represent the proposed action.
Table 2B: Application of the Criteria of Adverse Effect for Bay Head Historic District (including All Saints Church)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative [36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Adverse Effects pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **(i) Physical destruction of, or damage to, all or part of the property;** | **Roadway Improvements:** Along the entire project area, curbs will be reconstructed in kind or installed where none currently exist, the roadway will be reconstructed or resurfaced in asphalt, sidewalks will be added where none currently exist, crosswalks will be striped at signalized intersections, and where feasible, the roadway profile will be raised to allow for better drainage.  
**Drainage Improvements:** Shoulders will be reconstructed in kind with slopes that vary from 2-6%; curbing will be repaired or introduced where none currently exist; and new inlets will be added as needed. To repair and/or lay new pipes, the existing pavement materials will be removed and replaced with asphalt. The proposed pipes may need to accommodate increased flow by either adding pipes of the same size along an existing pipe or by increasing the size of the existing pipe by one 6” increment. At most, an 18” – 30” pipe would move up one size or an 18” – 24” pipe could become three (3) pipes. At the end of each pipe, tidal back flow prevention devices will be installed. Approximately seven (7) bulkheads will be replaced in kind.  
**Evaluation:** Historically, sidewalks and curbs have been a part of the Bay Head streetscape. The presence of bituminous shoulders (8-12”) will diminish the impact of replacing the NJ Route 35’s concrete pavement, and the east-west streets are already a bituminous material. The roadway profile will change to allow for a 4-8” curbl ine; 4” is required for pavement design. Street trees and other landscaping will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe (Site Plans, 2A & 2B). |
<p>| <strong>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68) and applicable guidelines;</strong> | <strong>While alterations will occur with the rehabilitation and repair of the roadway and drainage system, measures are being taken to remain consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The resource will maintain its historic use and character; the features, spaces, and spatial relationships will remain largely in tact; and the new work will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion. Historically, sidewalks and curbs have been a</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</td>
<td>No property within this district will be removed from its historic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features</td>
<td>The resource will maintain its historic use and character; the features, spaces, and spatial relationships will remain largely in tact; and the new work will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion. Landscape features such as street trees and buffers between the curb and sidewalk will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish</td>
<td>The district is eligible under Criteria A and C. It serves as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the 19th century with continued development through the first half of the 20th century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County’s tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the 19th century. All Saints Church is eligible under Criteria A and C and contributes to the Bay Head Historic District. It is associated with the early development of Bay Head and is architecturally distinct. The Bluffs Hotel (Block 66/Lot 16), which was determined eligible on June 23, 1995 was demolished c. 1996; the NJ HPO letter of 1996 stated that the best way to counter the adverse effect of demolition would be to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District instead of simply completing HABS recordation. The introduction of the above roadway and drainage elements will not diminish the integrity of the resource’s significant historic features. Historically, sidewalks and curbs have been a part of the Bay Head streetscape. The presence of bituminous shoulders (8-12”) will diminish the impact of replacing the NJ Route 35’s concrete pavement, and the east-west streets area already a bituminous material. The roadway profile will change to allow for a 4-8” curbline; 4” is required for pavement design. Street trees and other landscaping will be replaced in kind. The installation required to lay the pipe(s) will cause a temporary visual and audible effect. The tidal back flow device will be affixed to the end of the pipe and extend approximately 3’ from the edge of pipe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such</td>
<td>This resource has not been subject to neglect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations; and</td>
<td>This resource is not subject to the transfer, lease, or sale out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.</td>
<td>OTHER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be no other effects associated with this project.</td>
<td>FINDING:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project will have No Adverse Effect on Bay Head Historic District and All Saints Church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photo 1: Lake Avenue at Mount Street facing northeast.

Photo 2: Mount Avenue at Lake Avenue facing west.
Photo 3: Lake Avenue at Howe Street facing northeast.

Photo 4: Howe Avenue at Lake Street facing west.
Photo 5: Lake Avenue at Harris Street facing south.

Photo 6: NJ Route 35 at Mount Street facing north.
Photo 7: NJ Route 35 between Howe and Mount Streets facing north.

Photo 8: NJ Route 35 between Howe and Mount Streets facing south.
Photo 9: NJ Route 35 at Howe Street facing southeast.

Photo 10: NJ Route 35 at Harris Street facing northwest.
Photo 1: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 851 facing south.

Photo 2: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 851 facing south.
Photo 3: At Mantoloking/Bay Head corporate line facing southeast along NJ Route 35.

Photo 4: In vicinity of No. 856 Clayton Street facing southwest to Barnegat Bay.
Photo 5: In vicinity of No. 856 Clayton Street facing southwest.
B. Summary of Effects Analysis

This Determination of Effect Analysis evaluates the potential impacts of the NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 on the identified above-ground historic properties situated within the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

1. Historic Architectural Resources

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and implementing regulations 36 CFR 800.5, the New Jersey Department of Transportation, in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration, stated the Results of the Effect Evaluation and applied the Criteria of Adverse Effect for the following above-ground properties that fall within the APE: Mantoloking Historic District (and the Mantoloking Marine Historic District/Mantoloking Yacht Club and the Mantoloking Bridge which lie therein) and the Bay Head Historic District (and All Saints Church which lies therein). The NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 will have No Adverse Effect on the following resources: Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Marine Historic District, Mantoloking Bridge, Bay Head Historic District, and All Saints Church. The finding of the effect to the eligible above-ground resources within the project area is No Adverse Effect.

2. Archaeology

Based on the dearth of artifacts recovered, absence of any intact artifact-bearing soil horizons or subsurface cultural features, and the absence of any discernable artifact concentrations, the Route 35 Mileposts 9.0 - 12.5 project APE has been concluded to contain no archaeological resources. No further testing is required in this portion of the Route 35 Mileposts 9.0 - 12.5 project APE.

The overall finding of the effect to the eligible resources within the project area is No Adverse Effect.

C. Recommendations for NJ Route 35 Corridor

The following reproductions of historic plates illustrate the roadway, sidewalks, curbs, lighting, fencing and landscaping along the NJ Route 35 corridor (Plates 1 through 15). They are placed roughly in chronological order; the photo legends draw the reader to points of note. Some photos fall outside of the Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant municipalities in an attempt to achieve a unified approach when addressing the design of future landscape elements along the entire corridor.

Points to consider include the following:
- the roadway began as gravel but was paved in concrete c. 1928;
- historically, lighting has been attached to utility poles;
- the oldest fencing was made of wood posts with two metal beams; and
- minimal residential landscaping occurred at the time of construction; low, wild grasses generally appeared in public and private open spaces amid the sandy terrain.
The photos that follow are present-day images of several communities along NJ Route 35. The photos illustrate road materials, lighting, fencing, and landscaping along the corridor (Photos 1 through 18). The landscaping and fencing are the most variable features of the streetscape. Historic photos show wild, low, natural grasses; when possible, new, planned, landscaping should integrate vegetation that is from the region. Historic photos show wood posts supporting two metal beams along NJ Route 35; recommended fencing options should be unpainted wood, no higher than four feet, and maintain some degree of openness between the slats.
One of the oldest pictures of Seaside Park, taken approximately 1897. This photo documents the existence of wooden boardwalks surrounding the earliest buildings. Looking west from the oceanfront. "Sea Side Park: Memories and Rememberances" A.J. Anderson and D.G. Anderson, © 1998

Plate 1

Bridge Street in Mantoloking, c. 1898. Note the presence of sidewalks with a border of wild grasses. "An Exercise in Nostalgia: Mantoloking 1880-1920" Frederick R. Cole © 1970

Plate 2
Seaside Park at North Avenue looking west from Ocean Avenue, c. 1900
Note the gooseneck electric light attached to corner utility pole.
"The Seventy-five Years of Seaside Park: 1898-1973" © 1973

The first road to Seaside Park, completed in 1911.
"Sea Side Park: Memories and Rememberances"
Mantoloking, c. 1910:
Note the condition of the road prior to its paving c. 1928.
Also take note of the simple post and beam fence that lines Ocean Avenue.
Ocean Avenue looking south from Herbert Street
"Mantoloking: Through the Lens"
Anne L. Benedict, © 2001
Plate 5

Seaside Park, c. 1890s
Note that the simple light fixture is mounted on the utility pole.
This image also depicts the roadway condition prior to its paving c. 1928
"Images of America: Seaside Park"
Andrew J. Anderson, © 1998
Plate 6
Mantoloking, c. 1914
Looking east to 1312 Ocean Avenue.
Note the post and beam fence and lack of residential landscaping.
'Mantoloking: Through the Lens'
Anne L. Benedict © 2001

Plate 7

Seaside Park in the vicinity of Fifth Street, c. 1917.
Note the simple post and beam fencing.
"Seaside Park: Memories and Rememberances"

Plate 8
Seaside Park, c. 1925
Note that the simple light fixture is mounted on the utility pole.
"Images of America: Sea Side Park"
Andrew J. Anderson, © 1998

Plate 9

As built plans, 1928
Seaside Park at southwest corner of Central and Fifth Avenues, c. 1928
Note the concrete curbs and sidewalks separated by a border of native, wild grasses.
"Seaside Park: Memories and Remembrances"

Plate 11

Mantoloking, c. 1930:
Note the newly paved roadway and sidewalks.
Looking south from below Downer Avenue
"Mantoloking: Through the Lens"
Anne L. Benedict, © 2001

Plate 12
Seaside Park, c. 1950
Southwest corner of Porter Avenue and Bay Boulevard
Note that the light is affixed to a utility pole.
"Images of America: Seaside Park"
Andrew J. Anderson © 1998

Seaside Park in the vicinity of 11th and Central Avenues, c. 1955.
Note the simple post and beam fencing; although the beam materials differ from
the early fencing, which had metal beams, it is similar in style.
"Sea Side Park: Memories and Remembrance"
Bay and Trenton Avenues, Point Pleasant, c. 1954:
Note that the simple light fixture is mounted on the utility pole.
"Images of America: Point Pleasant"
Jerry A. Woolley, © 1995
Plate 15
Photo 1: At intersection of NJ Route 35 and 11th Avenue in Seaside Park facing southwest. This photo shows the conditions of the roadway and features an example of wood post and beam fencing. This fencing is similar in materials and style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is a recommended option for use along the corridor.

Photo 2: At intersection of NJ Route 35 and North Avenue facing northwest in Seaside Park. This photo shows the conditions of the roadway and features an example of plastic picket fencing. This fencing is not similar in materials or style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 3: At intersection of NJ Route 35 and C Street facing north in Seaside Park. This photo shows the roadway conditioning and landscaping typically found in the median of the divided highway.

Photo 4: At intersection of NJ Route 35 and Fremont Avenue facing south in Dover Township. This photo shows the roadway conditions and cobrahead light attached to a utility pole; it also features an example of wood post and beam fencing. This fencing is similar in materials and style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 5: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1521 facing northeast in Mantoloking Borough. This photo features an example of wood post and beam fencing. This fencing is similar in materials and style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is a recommended option for use along the corridor.

Photo 6: NJ Route 35, south of Princeton Avenue, facing north in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows a graveled buffer between the sidewalk and curb; it also features a wood fence. This fencing, while not similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically, may be an option for use along the corridor owing to its rustic nature, particularly if a lower height is installed.
Photo 7: NJ Route 35 at Downer Avenue facing northeast in Mantoloking Borough. This photo offers another example of wood fencing along the corridor. This fencing in the middle ground on the right, while not similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically, is an option for use along the corridor owing to its rustic nature.

Photo 8: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1216 facing south in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows a graveled and grass buffer between the sidewalk and curb; it also features a wood post and beam fence. This fencing is similar in materials and style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 9: NJ Route 35 at Herbert Street facing west in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows another variety of plastic picket fencing along the corridor. This fencing is not similar in materials or style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not a recommended option for use along the corridor.

Photo 10: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 1035 facing northeast in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows another example of wood fencing along the corridor. This fencing, while not similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically, is an option for use along the corridor owing to its rustic nature.
Photo 11: NJ Route 35 at Stephens Place facing south in Mantoloking Borough. This photo juxtaposes two types of fencing along the corridor. The natural wood fencing on the left may be an option for use along the corridor owing to its low height and more rustic quality, whereas the painted fencing on the right is not a similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically.

Photo 12: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of No. 960 facing east in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows another type of plastic fencing along the corridor. This fencing is not similar in materials or style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 13: NJ Route 35 at Mathis Place facing southeast in Mantoloking Borough. This photo shows another type of wood fencing along the corridor. This fencing, while not similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically, is an option for use along the corridor owing to its rustic nature.

Photo 14: NJ Route 35 south of Mount Street facing southeast in Bay Head Borough. This photo shows the asphalt shoulders with the concrete vehicle lanes as well as wood post and beam fencing. This fencing is similar in materials and style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 15: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of Bridge Street facing northeast in Bay Head Borough. This photo shows another type of wood fencing used in the corridor. This fencing, while not similar style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically, may be an option for use along the corridor owing to its rustic nature.

Photo 16: NJ Route 35 at intersection of Harris Street facing west in Bay Head Borough. This photo shows the roadway condition as well as another example of a wood picket fence along the corridor. This fencing is not similar in style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not a recommended option for use along the corridor.
Photo 17: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of Harris Street facing southwest in Bay Head Borough. This photo juxtaposes the use of two different types of fencing in the corridor. The fencing on the left is not similar in style to that which lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not recommended as a fencing option along the corridor; the low portion of the fencing on the right, while still not stylistically similar to the historic fence, is more rustic in character and may serve as a recommended option along the corridor.

Photo 18: NJ Route 35 in vicinity of Karge Street facing south in Bay Head Borough. This photo shows a cobrahead light affixed to a utility pole and another type of plastic fencing used in the corridor. This fencing is not similar in materials or style to the fencing that lined NJ Route 35 historically and is not a recommended option for use along the corridor.
VIII. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL CONSULTING PARTIES

A. Public Involvement

The views of the public are essential to informed Federal decision-making in the Section 106 process. The agency official shall seek and consider the views of the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the undertaking and its effects on historic properties; the likely interest of the public in the effects on historic properties; confidentiality concerns of private individuals and businesses; and the relationship of the Federal involvement to the undertaking [36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(1)].

1. Outreach to Local Community for Information

Appendix B contains letters mailed or emailed to government agencies and private organizations that may have had background information pertinent to the research for this study; responses are also included in this appendix. Three (3) responses were received: one from Ocean County Cultural & Heritage Commission (email, July 8, 2003), one from the Borough of Mantoloking (letter, July 16, 2003), and one from Bay Head Historical Society (letter, August 1, 2003).

2. Public Meetings

A public officials meeting took place on August 18, 2003 to discuss details of the NJ Route 35 Pavement Restoration from Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5 Project. In addition, a mailing list of residents who live within two hundred feet of proposed construction was created, including those who live adjacent to the proposed drainage improvements. Approximately 1,000 property owners received an 11 x 17” information sheet, which provided the plans for Herbert Street intersection improvements, proposed outfalls to Barnegat Bay, and a typical roadway section. This information sheet also provided an explanation of existing conditions in relation to the proposed works. A Public Information Center is scheduled for September 17, 2003.

B. Potential Consulting Parties

As part of the Section 106 process, a list of potential consulting parties was developed throughout the identification phase of this study. The NJ DOT, in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration, will finalize this list and involve those selected in accordance with the law.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public Agencies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Special Interest Groups</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Ocean County Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Division Office</td>
<td>26 Hadley Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840 Bear Tavern Road, Suite 310</td>
<td>PO Box 2191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Trenton, NJ 08628</td>
<td>Toms River, NJ 08754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609.637.4200</td>
<td>732.341.1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact: Barbara Rivolta, Curator/Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NJDOT                                  | Bay Head Historical Society                    |
| Division of Project Management         | Bridge and Bay Avenues                          |
| E&O Building, 3rd Floor                | PO Box 127                                      |
| 1035 Parkway Avenue, PO Box 600        | Bay Head, NJ 08742                              |
| Trenton, NJ 08625                      | 732.892.0223                                    |
| Contact: Evalyn Shippee, Trustee       |                                                |

| NJHPO                                  | Ocean County Cultural and Heritage Commission   |
| Department of Environmental Protection | 101 Hooper Avenue                               |
| Division of Parks and Forestry         | Toms River, NJ 08754                            |
| Historic Preservation Office           | 908.929.4779                                    |
| Trenton, NJ 08625                      | Contact: Cynthia Smith, Administrator           |

| Borough of Mantoloking                 | Borough of Bay Head                             |
| Downer Avenue                          | 81 Bridge Avenue                                |
| PO Box 247                             | Bay Head, NJ 08742                              |
| Mantoloking, NJ 08738                  | 732.899.6600                                    |
| 732.892.0636                           | Contact: Patricia Applegate, Borough Clerk      |
| Contact: William Dunbar, Mayor OR Anne L. Benedict, Historian |
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Correspondence
Hello,

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mccormicktaylor.com
Keith Doms email: krdoms@mccormicktaylor.com

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 20, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
Senior Archaeologist

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Drive
Suite 200
Mount Laurel, NJ 08042

Telephone: (856) 793-0800
Fax: (856) 793-0814

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com
Dear Mr. Doms,

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request.

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mccormicktaylor.com.  
Keith Doms email: krdoms@mccormicktaylor.com

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 18, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
Senior Archaeologist

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Drive
Suite 200
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

Telephone: (856) 793-0800  
Fax: (856) 793-0814

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com
Hello,

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mccormicktaylor.com.
Keith Doms email: krdoms@mccormicktaylor.com

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 20, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
Senior Archaeologist

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Drive
Suite 200
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

Telephone: (856) 793-0800
Fax: (856) 793-0814

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com
From: Silber, Barbara  
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2003 4:11 PM  
To: Point Pleasant Historical Society (E-mail)  
Cc: Doms, Keith  
Subject: Route 35 Drainage Improvements Project

Hello,

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mccormicktaylor.com
Keith Doms email: krdoms@mccormicktaylor.com

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 18, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber  
Senior Archaeologist

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.  
700 East Gate Drive  
Suite 200  
Mount Laurel, NJ 08002

Telephone: (856) 793-0800  
Fax: (856) 793-0814

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com
Hello,

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mccormicktaylor.com.
Keith Doms email: krdoms@mccormicktaylor.com

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 18, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
Senior Archaeologist

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Drive
Suite 200
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

Telephone: (856) 793-0800
Fax: (856) 793-0814

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com
Bay Head Historical Society  
Bridge & Bay Avenues  
P. O. Box 127  
Bay Head, NJ 08742

REFERENCE:  
NJ Route 35, M.P. 9-12.5  
Boroughs of Mantoloking, Bay Head and  
Point Pleasant Beach, Ocean County, NJ  
MTA Project No. 4704

To Whom It May Concern:

McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Barbara Silber. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Keith Doms email: krdoms@mta.biz  
Barbara Silber email: bchsilber@mta.biz

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 20, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

MCCORMICK, TAYLOR AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Keith R. Doms  
Archaeologist

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com

printed on recycled paper
McMornick, Taylor & Associates, Inc.

July 11, 2003

Borough of Bay Head
81 Bridge Ave.
Bay Head, NJ 08742

REFERENCE: NJ Route 35, M.P. 9-12.5
Boroughs of Mantoloking, Bay Head and
Point Pleasant Beach, Ocean County, NJ
MTA Project No. 4704

To Whom It May Concern:

McMornick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.

We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!

I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Barbara Silber. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:

Keith Doms email: krdoms@mta.biz
Barbara Silber email: bcsilber@mta.biz

If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 20, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.

Sincerely,

McCORMICK, TAYLOR AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Keith R. Doms
Archaeologist

visit MTA on the web: www.mccormicktaylor.com

printed on recycled paper
Liz and Francine and anyone else working on Route 35...

Just a quick note to let you know that intro emails to the various organizations for Route 35 0-4 were sent last Wednesday. I will fax or send hard copies to you today or tomorrow.

Below is a reply email that I received today from the OC Cultural and Heritage Commission.

Also, last Thursday afternoon (July 3, 2003) I received a phone call from Linda Kay, a library at the Ocean County Historical Society. She noted that they don't have the staff to actually do the work for us. I reassured her that we weren't asking the OCHS to do heavy duty research for us but if they if they happened to know of anything obscure off hand that we would welcome the info. I also let her know that some MTA's may be stopping in in the next few weeks. I also asked her if the MTA-ers happen to have any questions regarding OCHS library materials would it be ok if they looked for her? Ms. Kay said no problem, she's in during the week between 1-4 pm and would welcome visitors to the library.

I'll keep you posted of any additional replies,

Barb

-----Original Message-----
From: CulturalHeritage/CUL/OCG%OCEAN_COUNTY@co.ocean.nj.us
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2003 12:49 PM
To: Silber, Barbara
Subject: Re: Route 35 Drainage Improvements Project

I have forwarded your request for information to the Ocean County Historical Society [Barbara Rivolta, Curator/Director]. Due to space constraints, the Ocean County Cultural & Heritage Commission's maps (and some other resources) have been transferred to the Society where they can be better preserved and maintained for research and accessibility.

You may contact Ms. Rivolta directly at:

Ocean County Museum (26 Hadley Avenue., PO Box 2191, Toms River, NJ 08754-2191)
732-341-1880 [phone]
732-341-4372 [fax]
barbara.rivolta@verizon.net

Cynthia H. Smith
Administrator
Ocean County Cultural & Heritage Commission
101 Hooper Avenue, P. O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08753-2191
732- 929-4779 - 1-800-722-0291 - 732-288-7871
"Silber, Barbara"  
To:  "Ocean County Cultural and  
Heritage Commission  
(E-mail)"  
taylor.com>  
cc:  <krdms@mcormicktaylor.com>  
<culturalheritage@co.ocean.nj.us>  
07/02/2003 02:50 PM  
Subject: Route 35 Drainage Improvements

> Hello,
> 
> McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc., an engineering and planning firm based in Mount Laurel (NJ), has been retained by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to conduct various environmental studies in your community for the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.
> 
> As part of the environmental studies, MTA is conducting a Cultural Resources Survey, which includes an historic architectural study and an archaeological assessment.
> 
> We would greatly appreciate any background information you may have regarding the history and development of your community. If it is convenient, we can also arrange to have one of our researchers meet you to review files or materials that you feel may assist us in our Cultural Resources Survey. If you feel that other individuals in your organization may also be able to assist us, please feel free to forward our request!
> 
> I thank you for your attention to this matter. Should any questions or concerns arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or Keith Doms. We can be reached by telephone at 856-793-0800 or via email at:
> 
> Barbara Silber email: bchsiler@mcormicktaylor.com.
> Keith Doms email: krdms@mcormicktaylor.com
> 
> If you have any questions or information that you would like to share with us, a response by July 18, 2003 would be greatly appreciated by our research team.
> 
> Sincerely,
> 
> Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
> Senior Archaeologist
> 
> McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
> 700 East Gate Drive
> Suite 200
> Mount Laurel, NJ 08046
> 
> Telephone: (856) 793-0800
> Fax: (856) 793-0814
> 
> visit MTA on the web: www.mcormicktaylor.com
July 16, 2003

Barbara Chi Hsiao Silber
Senior Archaeologist
McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Dr., Suite 200
Mount Laurel, N.J. 08054

Re: Your e-mail of July 10, 2003
Rt. 35 Drainage Improvements Project

Dear Ms. Silber:

In response to your request as per our telephone conversation of July 15, 2003, the following is my background information regarding the history and development of the Borough of Mantoloking.

The Church of St. Simons-by-the-Sea is located on the West Side of Ocean Avenue (Route 35), between Downer and Princeton Avenues. (Block 34, Lot 19 & 20) On the South Side of the church there is a Memorial Garden where ashes are interred. The garden is located between the church building and the south property line. The remains of loved ones have been interred in the Memorial Garden since 1982. These ashes cannot be removed. The garden does not contain caskets or urns.

The other old buildings on Ocean Avenue (Route 35) are 1238, 1312, 1328 and 1332. Capt. Arnold, who built the first Mantoloking Bridge in 1887, built the houses at 1238 and 1312.

We hope the highway department will not damage the Borough of Mantoloking.

Sincerely,

Anne L. Benedict
Historian of the Borough of Mantoloking

ALB/ehl
C: Mayor William K. Dunbar, III
   Council Members
   Irene H. Ryan, Municipal Clerk
   Edwin J. O'Malley, Jr., Esq., Borough Attorney
   William C. Sullivan, Jr., Esq., Special Counsel
   Thomas S. Guldin, P.E., Borough Engineer
   G. Sandy Dichtl, III, President-Bd. of Trustees, The Church of St. Simon-by-the-Sea
Bay Head Historical Society

Received
Mc Cormick, Taylor & Assoc

P.O. Box 127, Bay Head, NJ 08742

August 1, 2002

Mc Cormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
700 East Gate Drive, Suite 201
Mt. Laurel, NJ 08054

ATTN: Keith R. Doms, Archaeologist

RE: NJ Route 35, M. P. 9-12.5

Dear Mr. Doms:

I am writing in response to your letter of July 11, 2003 to the Bay Head Historical Society. We understand from your letter that you are requesting background information regarding the history and development of our community as part of the Cultural Resources Survey that you are undertaking in conjunction with the proposed Route 35 Drainage Improvements project.

The Borough of Bay Head was incorporated in 1886. Much of Main Avenue, which is Highway 35, was developed starting in the mid-1880's. The professional historic architectural survey conducted in Bay Head in 1995 shows that most of Main Avenue (Highway 35) is within the proposed historic district of Bay Head. The paperwork for official recognition of Bay Head in the New Jersey Registration of Historic Places is already in process.

As the historic society for Bay Head, we feel that any work done within our historic areas should try to maintain status quo in appearance. While we acknowledge that work needs to be done, we would hope that the look (streetscape) after completion of the project would be the same as before the start of the project and that any major changes (i.e. trees or other visuals) be replaced to look as before.

As to engineering matters or technical approaches to the project, we would defer to the governing body of the Borough.

Thank you for contacting us. If you need any further information, please contact me by telephone at 732-392-0223 or at my work address 56 Bridge Avenue, Bay Head.

Sincerely,

Evalyn Skipper, Trustee
Bay Head Historical Society

Bay Head, New Jersey • Incorporated 1886
Mr. Andras Fekete, Manager
Bureau of Environmental Analysis
New Jersey Department of Transportation
CN 600
1035 Parkway Avenue
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0600

Dear Mr. Fekete:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register on 2 September 1986 (51 FR 31115-31125), I am providing consultation comments for the following project:

Route 35 M.P. 9.9-13.0
Mantoloking, Bay Head, Point Pleasant
Ocean County

SUMMARY: The Historic Architectural Survey has identified two (2) historic districts within the area of potential effects (APE). Effects, however, have not been assessed. This determination is based on the information contained in the report submitted for review. (See 800.4 Identifying Historic Properties and 800.5 Assessing Effects below.)

These comments are in response to your letter of January 30, 1996, received at this office January 31, 1996, requesting Section 106 review and concurrence for the architectural inventory and evaluation report for this roadway improvements project. The reviewed report is:

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources, New Jersey Route 35, From Milepost 9.0 to Milepost 13.0, Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant Beach Boroughs, Ocean County, New Jersey, Prepared for: State of New Jersey Department of Transportation, Bureau of

800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

The architectural inventory and evaluation efforts described in this report were adequate to identify two (2) eligible historic architectural properties within the AFE.

I concur with the submitted report that Bay Head Historic District, Bay Head Borough, Ocean County, is eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under National Register Criteria A and C. Bay Head Historic District is significant as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the nineteenth century with continued development through the first half of the twentieth century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The boundaries of Bay Head Historic District are: North - South side of Delaware Avenue and Ocean Avenue, Pt. Pleasant Beach Borough; South - the southern boundary of Bay Head Borough; East - the beach front; and West - West of Main Avenue (NJ Route 35) but undefined for purposes of this survey.

I concur with the submitted report that Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Borough, Ocean County, is eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under National Register Criteria A & C. Mantoloking Historic District is significant as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the nineteenth century with continued development through the first half of the twentieth century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The boundaries of Mantoloking Historic District are: North - boundary between Mantoloking and Bay Head Boroughs; South - boundary between Mantoloking and Brick Township; East - the beach front; and West - West of Ocean Avenue (NJ Route 35) but undefined for purposes of this survey.
800.5 Assessing Effects

Plans for this improvements project have not yet been developed. Effects, therefore, have not been assessed.

If you have questions concerning this project review please contact HPO staff Carl Nittinger for architecture at 609/292-2023.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dorothy P. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

DPC/cn
Log #96-777
C:\WP51\cen.gen\106.REV\HPO-C96.046
c. Timothy Chandler, FHWA
   Robin Schroeder, FHWA
   Miriam Crum, NJDOT
Mr. Andras Fekete, Manager
Bureau of Environmental Analysis
New Jersey Department of Transportation
CN 600
1035 Parkway Avenue
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0600

Dear Mr. Fekete:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register on 2 September 1986 (51 FR 31115-31125), I am providing consultation comments for the following project:

Route 35 M.P. 9.0-13.0
Mantoloking, Bay Head, Point Pleasant
Ocean County

SUMMARY: The Historic Architectural Survey has identified two (2) historic districts within the area of potential effects (APE). Effects, however, have not been assessed. This determination is based on the information contained in the report submitted for review. (See 800.4 Identifying Historic Properties and 800.5 Assessing Effects below.)

These comments are in response to your letter of January 30, 1996, received at this office January 31, 1996, requesting Section 106 review and concurrence for the architectural inventory and evaluation report for this roadway improvements project. The reviewed report is:

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources, New Jersey Route 35, From Milepost 9.0 to Milepost 13.0, Mantoloking, Bay Head, and Point Pleasant Beach Boroughs, Ocean County, New Jersey, Prepared for: State of New Jersey Department of Transportation, Bureau of
800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

The architectural inventory and evaluation efforts described in this report were adequate to identify two (2) eligible historic architectural properties within the APE.

I concur with the submitted report that Bay Head Historic District, Bay Head Borough, Ocean County, is eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under National Register Criteria A and C. Bay Head Historic District is significant as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the nineteenth century with continued development through the first half of the twentieth century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The boundaries of Bay Head Historic District are: North - South side of Delaware Avenue and Ocean Avenue, Pt. Pleasant Beach Borough; South - the southern boundary of Bay Head Borough; East - the beach front; and West - West of Main Avenue (NJ Route 35) but undefined for purposes of this survey.

I concur with the submitted report that Mantoloking Historic District, Mantoloking Borough, Ocean County, is eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under National Register Criteria A & C. Mantoloking Historic District is significant as a cohesive example of a New Jersey coastal summer resort town dating from the later half of the nineteenth century with continued development through the first half of the twentieth century. It is representative of the seaside resort movement significant to the development of Ocean County's tourism economy, begun during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The boundaries of Mantoloking Historic District are: North - boundary between Mantoloking and Bay Head Boroughs; South - boundary between Mantoloking and Brick Township; East - the beach front; and West - West of Ocean Avenue (NJ Route 35) but undefined for purposes of this survey.
800.5 Assessing Effects

Plans for this improvements project have not yet been developed. Effects, therefore, have not been assessed.

If you have questions concerning this project review please contact HPO staff Carl Nittinger for architecture at 609/292-2023.

Sincerely,

Dorothy P. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

DPG/cn
Log #96-777
C:\wp51\cen.gen\106.REV\HPO-C96.046
C. Timothy Chandler, FHWA
Robin Schroeder, FHWA
Miriam Crum, NJDOT
May 5, 1996
HPO-D96-51

Andras Fekete, Manager
Bureau of Environmental Analysis
New Jersey Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Avenue
CN 600
Trenton, NJ 08625-0600

Dear Mr. Fekete:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register on September 2, 1986 (51, 169, 31115-31125), I am providing additional consultation comments for the following project:

Ocean County, Brick Township & Mantoloking Borough
Mantoloking Road (CR 528) Bridge over Barnegat Bay and Intracoastal Waterway (Str. #1506006)
Bridge Replacement Project
NJDOT Project #4510-095

These comments are in response to your letter of January 25, 1996 requesting Historic Preservation Office (HPO) consultation comments. My comments are based on the following reports:

"An Archaeological Survey (Level of Action Assessment [LOAA]) in Connection with the Proposed Replacement of the Mantoloking Road Bridge, Brick Township, Ocean County, New Jersey," by Hunter Research for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc. Inc. (June 1995).

"Replacement of Mantoloking Bridge, County Route 528 over Barnegat Bay, Brick Township and Mantoloking Borough, Ocean County, New Jersey, Historic Resources Survey," by Historical Perspectives, Inc. for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc., Inc. (December 1995).

These reports were augmented by an addendum to the architectural survey report received at the Historic Preservation Office on February 26, 1996.
SUMMARY: There are three architectural properties within the APE which are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The project will have an Adverse Effect on cultural resources. I look forward to working with you and your staff on ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate the effect of your project on cultural resources.

800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

The reported investigation was adequate to identify archaeological historic properties in the APE, if any had been present. I agree with the conclusion of the archaeological report that there are no archaeological historic properties in the APE. No further archaeological identification efforts are recommended.

As Deputy Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, I concur with the recommendation of the New Jersey Historic Bridge Survey that Str. #1506006 is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C as embodying the characteristics of a distinctive type (single leaf trunnion bascule).

The Mantoloking Historic District was previously identified as eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places by my opinion dated April 8, 1996. Please note that the boundaries of the historic district delineated by that opinion are different than those identified by the reviewed report. The boundaries of the eligible historic district, given in the context of your project to widen Route 35, include most of the borough. These boundaries are applicable to this project and should be used for all future planning.

The Lotus was listed on the New Jersey Register of Historic Places on July 9, 1985 as part of a multi-property designation for type 'A' catboats; also listed were the Bat, the Mary Ann, and the Spy. All four of these boats are individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Ghost is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places for the same reasons as the other type 'A' catboats as described in the New Jersey Register application.

It is also my opinion that the following resources are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A & C as the Mantoloking Marine Historic District: the Beaton Boat Yard, located at 72 Beaton Road in Brick Township; the Winter Yacht Basin, located at 5 Mantoloking Road in Brick Township; and the Mantoloking Yacht Club, located on Block 30 Lot 6 in Mantoloking Borough. Together these three complexes represent the continued existence of a vibrant and
interconnected marine industry. At these locations, important developments in boat building occurred, resulting in important regional boat designs such as the type "A" catboat. The surviving type "A" catboats currently maintained at the Beaton Boat Yard — the Lotus and the Ghost — contribute to the significance of this historic district.

800.5 Assessing Effects

The demolition of Str. #1506006, an eligible resource, will be an Adverse Effect. The new structure should be designed to be compatible with the two adjacent historic districts. Conversations between our staffs indicate that the replacement bridge will be a bascule design, somewhat higher in elevation than existing. This is an important, and much appreciated, step towards compatibility. However, I encourage you to explore architectural treatments for the bridge (such as balustrade design and substructure aesthetics) to further enhance compatibility with its surroundings. I look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff on this project.

Report Comments

REGARDING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT:

We would like to have either a final report with original photos or a set of original photos to mount on the photo figure pages.

REGARDING THE ARCHITECTURE REPORT:

Under Section 106 the Federal Agency has an obligation to offer firm eligibility opinions on evaluated resources for SHPO comment. The language used in the reviewed report to describe the eligibility of evaluated resources was at times inconclusive; phrases such as "could be eligible" or "might be eligible" were used. This language unnecessarily complicates the review process resulting in longer review times.

Architectural survey reports are much more clear, persuasive, and easy to review when the architectural description, eligibility assessment, and photographs are organized by individual property rather than as separate sections of the report. In fact the entire report would have benefited from a better integration of text and visuals.

On a more positive note, the reviewed report contained excellent quality photographs; clearly and consistently identified properties by street address, block and lot numbers, and name when appropriate; and contained an interesting and well-written history of catboats.
Should you have any questions, please contact Mike Gregg for archaeology or Andrea Tingey for architecture at (609) 292-2028.

Sincerely,

Dorothy P. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Robin Schroeder, FHWA
    T.J. Chandler, FHWA
    Helene Cook, FHWA
    ACHP
    Lauralee Rappleye-Marsett, NJDOT, BEA
    Janet Fittipaldi, NJDOT, BEA

DG:AT (C:\wpwin\96-729)
Mr. Frank J. Cianfrani  
Chief, Regulatory Branch  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Philadelphia District CENAP-OP-R  
Custom House- 2nd and Chestnut Streets  
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2991

Dear Mr. Cianfrani:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register, 2 September 1986 (Volume 51, Number 169, pages 31115-31125), I am commenting officially on

Public Notice No. CENAP-OP-R-199101700-39

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966, as amended

SECTION 106: SHPO Consultation and Comments (36 CFR Part 800)

PROJECT TITLE: Ocean County, New Jersey  
Brick Township and Mantoloking Borough  
34.5 kV Submarine Cable Crossing of Barnegat Bay  
Jersey Central Power and Light Company  
Section 10, Rivers and Harbors Act

FEDERAL AGENCY: Philadelphia District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
I. 800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

I have identified the vessel Lotus (1925), berthed in 1985 at Beaton's Boat Works, West Mantoloking, as an object eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C. The boat was entered on 9 July 1985 in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places under a Thematic Nomination of Barnegat Class A Racing Catboats, 1922-1925.

I am of the opinion that Beaton's Boat Works is eligible for inclusion in the National Register under Criteria B and C, for its significance on a regional scale.

II. 800.5 Assessing Effects

I am of the opinion that the proposed undertaking will not have an effect upon the Lotus and that there are no other cultural resources on or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in the project's potential environmental impact zone.

Inasmuch as Beaton's Boat Works is not situated in the project's potential environmental impact zone, it will not be subject to effects from construction.

Additional Comments:

If you have any questions, you may contact me or the project reviewer, Mr. Jonathan Gell, at (609) 292-2023.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James F. Hall
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

JFH/VS

c. Mr. Michael Swanda, Environmental Resources

Code#92-358
Disk#4A:\A92-8
State of New Jersey
Department of Environmental Protection
DIVISION OF PARKS AND FORESTRY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
CN-404
TRENTON, N.J. 08625-0404
TEL: (609) 292-2023
FAX: (609) 984-0578

May 5, 1996
HPO-D96-51

Andras Fekete, Manager
Bureau of Environmental Analysis
New Jersey Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Avenue
CN 600
Trenton, NJ 08625-0600

Dear Mr. Fekete:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register on September 2, 1986 (51, 169, 31115-31125), I am providing Additional Consultation Comments for the following project:

Ocean County, Brick Township & Mantoloking Borough
Mantoloking Road (CR 528) Bridge over Barnegat Bay and Intracoastal Waterway (Str. #1506006)
Bridge Replacement Project
NJDOT Project #4510-095

These comments are in response to your letter of January 25, 1996 requesting Historic Preservation Office (HPO) consultation comments. My comments are based on the following reports:

"An Archaeological Survey (Level of Action Assessment (LOAA)) in Connection with the Proposed Replacement of the Mantoloking Road Bridge, Brick Township, Ocean County, New Jersey," by Hunter Research for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc., Inc. (June 1995).

"Replacement of Mantoloking Bridge, County Route 528 over Barnegat Bay, Brick Township and Mantoloking Borough, Ocean County, New Jersey, Historic Resources Survey," by historical Perspectives, Inc. for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc., Inc. (December 1995).

These reports were augmented by an addendum to the architectural survey report received at the Historic Preservation Office on February 26, 1996.
SUMMARY: There are three architectural properties within the APE which are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The project will have an Adverse Effect on cultural resources. I look forward to working with you and your staff on ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate the effect of your project on cultural resources.

800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

The reported investigation was adequate to identify archaeological historic properties in the APE, if any had been present. I agree with the conclusion of the archaeological report that there are no archaeological historic properties in the APE. No further archaeological identification efforts are recommended.

As Deputy Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, I concur with the recommendation of the New Jersey Historic Bridge Survey that Str. #1506006 is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C as embodying the characteristics of a distinctive type (single leaf trunnion bascule).

The Mantoloking Historic District was previously identified as eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places by my opinion dated April 8, 1996. Please note that the boundaries of the historic district delineated by that opinion are different than those identified by the reviewed report. The boundaries of the eligible historic district, given in the context of your project to widen Route 35, include most of the borough. These boundaries are applicable to this project and should be used for all future planning.

The Lotus was listed on the New Jersey Register of Historic Places on July 9, 1985 as part of a multi-property designation for type 'A' catboats; also listed were the Bat, the Mary Ann, and the Spy. All four of these boats are individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Ghost is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places for the same reasons as the other type 'A' catboats as described in the New Jersey Register application.

It is also my opinion that the following resources are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A & C as the Mantoloking Marine Historic District: the Beaton Boat Yard, located at 72 Beaton Road in Brick Township; the Winter Yacht Basin, located at 5 Mantoloking Road in Brick Township; and the Mantoloking Yacht Club, located on Block 30 Lot 6 in Mantoloking Borough. Together these three complexes represent the continued existence of a vibrant and
interconnected marine industry. At these locations important developments in boat building occurred, resulting in important regional boat designs such as the type ‘A’ catboat. The surviving type ‘A’ catboats currently maintained at the Beaton Boat Yard as the Lotus and the Ghost... contribute to the significance of this historic district.

800.5 Assessing Effects

The demolition of Str. #1506006, an eligible resource, will be an Adverse Effect. The new structure should be designed to be compatible with the two adjacent historic districts. Conversations between our staffs indicate that the replacement bridge will be a bascule design, somewhat higher in elevation than existing. This is an important, and much appreciated, step towards compatibility. However, I encourage you to explore architectural treatments for the bridge (such as balustrade design and substructure aesthetics) to further enhance compatibility with its surroundings. I look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff on this project.

Report Comments

REGARDING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT:

We would like to have either a final report with original photos or a set of original photos to mount on the photo figure pages.

REGARDING THE ARCHITECTURE REPORT:

Under Section 106 the Federal Agency has an obligation to offer firm eligibility opinions on evaluated resources for SHPO comment. The language used in the reviewed report to describe the eligibility of evaluated resources was at times inconclusive; phrases such as ‘could be eligible’ or ‘might be eligible’ were used. This language unnecessarily complicates the review process resulting in longer review times.

Architectural survey reports are much more clear, persuasive, and easy to review when the architectural description, eligibility assessment, and photographs are organized by individual property rather than as separate sections of the report. In fact the entire report would have benefitted from a better integration of text and visuals.

On a more positive note, the reviewed report contained excellent quality photographs; clearly and consistently identified properties by street address, block and lot numbers; and name when appropriate; and contained an interesting and well written history of catboats.
Should you have any questions, please contact Mike Szczec for archaeology or Andrea Tingey for architecture at (609) 292-3012.

Sincerely,

Dorothy F. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Robin Schroeder, FHWA
    T.J. Chandler, FHWA
    Helene Cook, FHWA
    ACHP
    Lauralee Rappleye-Marsett, NJDOT, BEA
    Janet Fitipaldi, NJDOT, BEA

DG:AT (C:\wpwin\96-729)
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS  
A.G. LICHTENSTEIN  
& ASSOCIATES, INC.

NEW JERSEY HISTORIC BRIDGE SURVEY

STRUCTURE #: 1506006  COUNTY: OCEAN  OWNER: COUNTY  ROUTE: 9015
MILEPOINT: 000000  TOWNSHIP: BRICK TOWNSHIP
FACILITY CARRIED: MANTOLOKING ROAD (CR 528)
NAME/FEATURE INTERSECTED: MANTOLOKING ROAD (CR 528) OVER BARNEGAT BAY

TYPE: SINGLE LEAF BASCULE  
DESIGN: TRUNNION
MATERIAL: STEEL  
# SPANS: 041  
LENGTH: 001120  
WIDTH: 0280
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1938  
ALTERATION: 1975  
SOURCE: PLAQUE
DESIGNER/PATENT: ASH-HOWARD-NEEDLES & TAMMEN  
BUILDER: EASTERN ENGINEERING CO

SETTING/CONTEXT: The two-lane bridge with sidewalk spans the northern tip of picturesque Barnegat Bay between Mantoloking Neck on the mainland, and Mantoloking Borough on Island Beach. Mantoloking Borough has many well-preserved early-20th century cedar-shingled bungalows next to and south of the bridge. On the mainland side of the bridge are numerous marinas. The bridge’s two main spans cross the Intercoastal Waterway.

CURRENT NATIONAL REGISTER STATUS: Previously Not Evaluated

NATIONAL REGISTER RECOMMENDATION: Eligible

SUMMARY: The main span of the 41-span bridge is a single leaf trunnion bascule haunched deck girder with floor beams. It is matched by a fixed haunched deck girder on the west approach, and the other approach spans are T-beams on timber pile bents. The operating mechanism with open gear sets and enclosed differential are original but worn. The bridge, one of the best examples of its type in the region, is historically and technologically significant.

PHOTO: 414:1-5,43-44  REVIEWED BY: JPH/AGL  DATE: 06/28/92  QUAD: Point Pleasant

Physical Description: The 1120'-long bridge over Barnegat Bay is composed of a single-leaf trunnion bascule haunched deck girder main span, a matching haunched deck girder to the west, and 39 other concrete T-beam approach spans, 15 to the west and 24 to the east. The T-beam spans are supported on concrete pile bents. They are finished with concrete post-and-rail railings. The moveable span is 58' toe-to trunnion, and is 28' wide with an open steel grate deck. The cantilevered sidewalk with a modern metal railing is on the south side. Modern crash gates have been installed, and the fender system is wood.

The operating controls and drive mechanism are housed in an three-story hexagonal-shaped concrete tenders house with a standing seam metal roof and double-hung windows. The operating mechanism appears to be relatively unaltered. The original trolley-like controls were replaced with a modern panel in 1975, but the gearing, with an enclosed primary reducer and open gear sets for the secondary reducer and drive gear, is original as are the trunnions and built up trunnion tower. The gears are worn, and the track and pinion are thin. The concrete counterweight is fixed to the tail end of the moveable leaf.

Historical and Technological Significance: The 1938 Mataloking Bridge is historically and technologically distinguished as one of the most complete examples of the Ash, Howard, Needles, & Tammen-design that is common in the region. With the expiration of the Strauss patents for moveable bridges in the 1920s, other designs gained currency, especially the A-H-N-T trunnion bridge with a counterweight fixed to the tail end and a span support that incorporated patented details (1927 patent #1633565). The technology used in the design, which is well represented in southern New Jersey where over 10 similar spans were built in the 1930s and early 1940s, is not innovative as the trunnion bridge was perfected in the 1910s. The Mataloking span is notable because, with the exception of the control panel, replaced in 1975, and a steel grid deck on the moveable span, it is a well-preserved example of a moveable bridge type of which over 10 remain in the region. It is more complete than other examples, but it is a well worn bridge with worn gears and a thin rack and pinion.

The 1938 span replaced a 7-panel Warren truss swing span, probably built ca. 1915. The 1938 bridge was designed for the county by Howard, Ash, Needles, and Tammen, consulting engineers from Kansas City. It was built by the Eastern Engineering Corporation and was paid for in part by federal Depression-era work relief program funds, a common arrangement for 1930s bridges in the state.

Boundary Description & Justification: The bridge is evaluated as individually significant. The boundary is limited to the substructure and superstructure and to the related operating machinery and structures, like the operator's house.
Mr. Frank J. Cianfrani
Chief, Regulatory Branch
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Philadelphia District CENAP-OP-R
Custom House- 2nd and Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2991

Dear Mr. Cianfrani:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register, 2 September 1986 (Volume 51, Number 169, pages 31115-31125), I am commenting officially on

Public Notice No. CENAP-OP-R-199101700-39

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966, as amended

SECTION 106: SHPO Consultation and Comments (36 CFR Part 800)

PROJECT TITLE: Ocean County, New Jersey
               Brick Township and Mantoloking Borough
               34.5 kV Submarine Cable Crossing of
               Barnegat Bay
               Jersey Central Power and Light Company
               Section 10, Rivers and Harbors Act

FEDERAL AGENCY: Philadelphia District
                 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
I. 800.4 Identifying Historic Properties

I have identified the vessel Lotus (1925), berthed in 1985 at Beaton's Boat Works, West Manstoloking, as an object eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C. The boat was entered on 9 July 1985 in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places under a Thematic Nomination of Barnegat Class A Racing Catboats, 1922-1925.

I am of the opinion that Beaton's Boat Works is eligible for inclusion in the National Register under Criteria B and C, for its significance on a regional scale.

II. 800.5 Assessing Effects

I am of the opinion that the proposed undertaking will not have an effect upon the Lotus and that there are no other cultural resources on are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in the project's potential environmental impact zone.

Inasmuch as Beaton's Boat Works is not situated in the project's potential environmental impact zone, it will not be subject to effects from construction.

Additional Comments:

If you have any questions, you may contact me or the project reviewer, Mr. Jonathan Gell, at (609) 292-2023.

Sincerely,

James F. Hall
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

JFH/vs

c. Mr. Michael Swanda, Environmental Resources

Code#92-358
Disk#4A:\A92-8
Andras Fekete, Manager
Bureau of Environmental Analysis
New Jersey Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Avenue
CN 600
Trenton, NJ 08625-0600

Dear Mr. Fekete:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the Federal Register on September 3, 1986 (51, 169, 31115-31125), I am providing additional consultation comments for the following project:

Ocean County, Brick Township & Mantoloking Borough
Mantoloking Road (CR 528) Bridge over Barnegat Bay and Intracoastal Waterway (Str. #1506006)
Bridge Replacement Project
NJDOT Project #4518-095

These comments are in response to your letter of January 25, 1996 requesting Historic Preservation Office (HPO) consultation comments. My comments are based on the following reports:

"An Archaeological Survey (Level of Action Assessment [LOAA]) in Connection with the Proposed Replacement of the Mantoloking Road Bridge, Brick Township, Ocean County, New Jersey," by Hunter Research for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc., Inc. (June 1995).

"Replacement of Mantoloking Bridge, County Route 528 over Barnegat Bay, Brick Township and Mantoloking Borough, Ocean County, New Jersey, Historic Resources Survey," by historical Perspectives, Inc. for McCormick, Taylor & Assoc., Inc. (December 1995).

These reports were alphabetized by an addendum to the architectural survey report received at the Historic Preservation Office on February 26, 1996.
SUMMARY: There are three architectural properties within the APE which are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. These project will have an adverse effect on cultural resources. I look forward to working with you and your staff on ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate the effect of your project on cultural resources.

400.4 Identifying Historic Properties

The reported investigation was adequate to identify archaeological historic properties in the APE, if any had been present. I agree with the conclusion of the archaeological report that there are no archaeological historic properties in the APE. No further archaeological identification efforts are recommended.

As Deputy Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, I concur with the recommendation of the New Jersey Historic Bridge Survey that Str. #1506006 is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C as embodying the characteristics of a distinctive type (single leaf trunnion bascule).

The Mantoloking Historic District was previously identified as eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places by my opinion dated April 8, 1996. Please note that the boundaries of the historic district delineated by that opinion are different than those identified by the reviewed report. The boundaries of the eligible historic district, given in the context of your project to widen Route 35, include most of the borough. These boundaries are applicable to this project and should be used for all future planning.

The Lotus was listed on the New Jersey Register of Historic Places on July 9, 1985 as part of a multi-property designation for type 'A' catboats; also listed were the Bat, the Mary Ann, and the Spy. All four of these boats are individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Ghost is individually eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places for the same reasons as the other type 'A' catboats as described in the New Jersey Register application.

It is also my opinion that the following resources are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A & C as the Mantoloking Marine Historic District: the Beaton Boat Yard, located at 72 Beaton Road in Brick Township; the Winter Yacht Basin, located at 5 Mantoloking Road in Brick Township; and the Mantoloking Yacht Club, located on Block 30, Lot 6 in Mantoloking Borough. Together these three complexes represent the continued existence of a vibrant and
interconnected marine industry. At these locations important developments in boat building occurred, resulting in important regional boat designs such as the type A catboat. The surviving type A catboats currently maintained at the Beaton Boat Yard, the Lotus, and the Ghost, contribute to the significance of this historic district.

800.5 Assessing Effects

The demolition of str. #1506806, an eligible resource, will be an Adverse Effect. The new structure should be designed to be compatible with the two adjacent historic districts. Conversations between our staffs indicate that the replacement bridge will be a bascule design, somewhat higher in elevation than existing. This is an important, yet much appreciated step towards compatibility. However, I encourage you to explore architectural treatments for the bridge (such as balustrade design and substructure aesthetics) to further enhance compatibility with its surroundings. I look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff on this project.

Report Comments

REGARDING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT:

We would like to have either a final report with original photos or a set of original photos to mount on the photo figure pages.

REGARDING THE ARCHITECTURE REPORT:

Under Section 106 the Federal Agency has an obligation to offer firm eligibility opinions on evaluated resources for SHPO comment. The language used in the reviewed report to describe the eligibility of evaluated resources was at times inconclusive; phrases such as 'could be eligible' or 'might be eligible' were used. This language unnecessarily complicates the review process resulting in longer review times.

Architectural survey reports are much more clear, persuasive, and easy to review when the architectural description, eligibility assessment, and photographs are organized by individual property rather than as separate sections of the report. In fact the entire report would have benefitted from a better integration of text and visuals.

On a more positive note, the reviewed report contained excellent quality photographs; clearly and consistently identified properties by street address, block and lot numbers, and name when appropriate; and contained an interesting and well-written history of catboats.
Should you have any questions, please contact Mike Gregg for archaeology or Andrea Tingey for architecture at (609) 292-2026.

sincerely,

Dorothy P. Guzzo
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

CC: Robin Schroeder, FHWA
    T.J. Chandler, FHWA
    Helene Cook, FHWA
    ACHP
    Lauralee Rappleye-Marsett, NJDOT, BEA
    Janet Fittipaldi, NJDOT, BEA

DG: AT (C:\wpwin\96-729)
United States Department of the Interior  
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service  
National Register of Historic Places  
Inventory—Nomination Form  

See Instructions in How to Complete National Register Forms  
Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic Barnegat Bay Class A racing catboats (1922-1925)
and/or common "A-cats"

2. Location

n/a The boats are stored and moored in and around Barnegat Bay

city, town Multiple
street & number NA
vicinity of NA  not for publication

state New Jersey code 034
county Ocean code 029

3. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Present Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>district</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>unoccupied</td>
<td>educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>work in progress</td>
<td>entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>na, in process</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X, yes: restricted</td>
<td>industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes: unrestricted</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Owner of Property

name Multiple

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc.

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>title</th>
<th>Ocean County Historic Boats Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>1982-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.J. Historic Sites Inventory: has this property been determined eligible? yes  X no

depository for survey records Dept. of Environmental Protection, Office of New Jersey Heritage

city, town CN402, Trenton state New Jersey 08625
7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Check one</th>
<th>Check one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> excellent</td>
<td><em>x</em> unaltered</td>
<td>u/c original site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>blanks</td>
<td>altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>blanks</td>
<td>moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus being repaired</td>
<td></td>
<td>date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

The four racing catboats included in this nomination were all built in the early 1920s for Ocean County (N.J.) owners specifically for competition for the Toms River Challenge Cup and the associated Barnegat Bay races for larger sailboats. They were all designed by Charles D. Mower, a well-known New York City naval architect, and built in the Morton Johnson yard at Bay Head by local craftsman using local cedar and oak. They have been continuously raced in Barnegat Bay, with occasional short interruptions, since they were built. They are still locally owned and maintained.

These racing catboats, called "A-Cats", are a technical and aesthetic achievement in the development of the Barnegat Bay catboat first introduced to Ocean County waters in 1855. Barnegat Bay is a shallow sheltered waterway with access to the ocean through inlets cut by nature in barrier islands. Since the time of the American Revolution its waters have been noted as resources for recreation and commerce.

The traditional 19th Century catboat was a single masted gaff-rigged fore- and-aft sailboat with its short unstayed mast stepped close to the bow. The foot of the sail was laced to a boom as long as the deck, and its head carried by a large gaff about 2/3 the length of the boom. In light winds the gaff could be hauled nearly vertical far above the mast-head, stretching the sail high above the deck. In heavy weather sail area could be reduced and the center of pressure on the sail lowered by reefing the foot and lowering the gaff, without extensive shifts in the trim of the boat. The catboat rig, with its single mast forward, also offered a large unobstructed open cockpit for pleasure craft or working fishermen.

In Barnegat Bay the type developed a very distinctive hull, with a wide beam about 1/3 the overall length, very low freeboard, long gentle sheer, plumb stem, and sharp rounded bilge with minimal deadrise. The hull of the larger catboats on the bay rarely drew more than 2½ feet of water, and it was provided with a centerboard with a maximum draft of about 5 feet. Most had a flat winchless transom slightly raked. The boats went very well before the wind. Fishermen and pleasure boaters could reach or run with the prevailing westerlies during the day, and return with the usual on-shore afternoon south-easterly, during the summer.

Mid-nineteenth century pictures of Barnegat Bay show catboats being used for pleasure and work in Barnegat inlet and on Long Beach Island.

Several of the traditional gaff-rigged catboats of 28 feet or longer still survive on Barnegat Bay, including "Kitty" (1875), "Myth" (1890), "Vim" (1900), and "Silent Maid" (1925). They are no longer competitive for racing purposes and do not have the design characteristics which identify the thematic group of "A-Cats" here nominated.
**PRESENT NAME:** Spy  
**FORMER OR ORIGINAL NAME(S):**  
**SAIL #** original # S11, now # IH 78  
**REGISTRATION #**  

**PRESENT OWNER / ADDRESS:** Charles Cox and Roy Wilkins  
Island Heights Yacht Club  

**DESCRIPTION**  
**Boat Type:** Barnegat Bay Catboat  
**Place of Construction:** Morton Johnson Boat Yard, Bay Head  
**Builder:** Morton Johnson  
**Designer (Naval Architect):** Charles D. Mower  
**Date of Construction:** 1924  
**Source of Date:** Edwin J. Schoettle  
**Sailing Craft, 1937, p.101**  
**Engine:**  
**Steering:** Wheel  
**Tiller X Other**  
**Draft:**  
(Company down)  
**Sail Area:**  
**Spar Lengths:** mast 44', boom 28'  
**Keel Shape:**  
**Displacement:**  
**Ballast:** lbs. Exterior _Interior_  
**Hull Form (for power boats):**  
**Planking Type**  
**Fastenings:**  
**Frames:** oak  
**Planks:** Jersey white cedar  
**Keel:** oak  
**Deck:**  
**Interior:** mahogany trim  
**Spars:** sitka spruce  

**Additional Description or other Equipment (i.e. sails)**

---

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:**  
Excellent (X) Fair ( ) Poor ( )  
Restored (X) Adapted ( )  

**COMMENTS (note alterations):**  
Originally gaff rigged with short 9' "Swedish" gaff, but rerigged first year to a Marconi rig.
INDIVIDUAL BOAT SURVEY FORM # LC-8

PRESENT NAME: Lotus
PRESEN'T OWNER / ADDRESS: Nelson R. Hartranft
   Beachwood

DESCRIPTION

Boat Type: A-Class catboat
Builder: Morton Johnson
Designer (Naval Architect): Charles D. Mower
Date of Construction: 1925

Source of Date: Ed Crabbe and owner
Length: 28'
Beam: 10'
Rig: marconi
Materials

Fastenings: copper rivets, bronze screws, iron spikes, etc.
Frames: oak
Planks: cedar
Keel: oak
Deck: cedar
Interior: trunk cabin with circular coaming
Spar: spruce

Place of Construction: Bayhead
Engine:
Steering: Wheel X Tiller Other
Draft: 2½' (Centerboard down 5½')
Sail Area: 605
Spar Lengths: mast 45'; boom 28'
Keel Shape: deadwood skeg
Displacement:
Ballast: lbs. Exterior ______ Interior ______

Hull Form (for power boats):
Planking Type
Carvel X
Lapstrake
Strip __
Other

Additional Description or other Equipment (i.e. sails)

Photo: Negative File # LC-8

PHYSICAL CONDITION:
Excellent ( ) Fair ( ) Poor (X)
Restored ( ) Adapted ( )

COMMENTS (note alterations):
INDIVIDUAL BOAT SURVEY FORM # LC-7

PRESENT NAME: Mary Ann
FORMER OR ORIGINAL NAME(S):

PRESENT OWNER / ADDRESS:
Marshall Warner
Nelson's Marine Basin, Island Heights

DESCRIPTION
Boat Type: A Class catboat
Place of Construction: Bay Head
Builder: Morton Johnson
Designer (Naval Architect): Charles D. Mower
Date of Construction: July 1, 1922
Engine:
Source of Date: owner and The New Jersey Courier, July 7, 1922
Length: 28'
Beam: 10'
Rig: marconi
Materials
Fastenings: copper nails, bronze screws, some iron spikes
Frames: oak
Planks: cedar
Keel: oak
Deck: cedar
Interior: trunk cabin with round spruce
Spars: coaming of mahogany

Steering: Wheel X Tiller Other
Draft: 2½'
(SCenterboard down 5½')

Sail Area: 605
Spar Lengths: mast 45', boom 28'

Fiftext:
Displacement:
Ballast: lbs. Exterior Interior
Hull Form (for power boats):
Planking Type Carvel X
Lapstrake Strip

Other

Additional Description or other Equipment (i.e. sails)
The deck and cabin tops have been fiberglassed.

PHYSICAL CONDITION: Good
Excellent () Fair () Poor ()
Restored () Adapted ()

COMMENTS (note alterations):
INDIVIDUAL BOAT SURVEY FORM # LC-7

PRESENT NAME: BAT
FORMER OR ORIGINAL NAME(S): Edward Crabbe

PRESENT OWNER / ADDRESS: Nelson Hartman
Ocean Gate, New Jersey

SAIL #
REGISTRATION #

DESCRIPTION

Boat Type: A-Class Catboat
Builder: Morton Johnson
Designer (Naval Architect): Charles Mower

Date of Construction: 1923
Source of Date: Original owner, Edward Crabbe

Length: 28'
Beam: 10'

Rig:

Materials
Fastenings:    
Frames: oak  
Planks: cedar  
Keel: oak   
Deck: Cedar  
Interior: trunk cabin with circular coaming  
Spar(s): spruce

Engine:
Steering: Wheel __ Tiller X Other ______
Draft: 2'6" (Centerboard down 5'1"
Sail Area:
Spar Lengths: mast 45', boom 28'

Keel Shape:
Displacement:
Ballast: 1 lbs. Exterior __ Interior ___
Hull Form (for power boats):
Planking Type
Carvel X
Lapstrake __
Strip __
Other ________

Additional Description or other Equipment (i.e. sails)

Photo: Negative File # LC-7

PHYSICAL CONDITION:
Excellent (X) Fair () Poor ()
Restored () Adapted ()

COMMENTS (note alterations):
In 1922, in an effort to capture the Toms River Challenge Cup, Federal Judge Charles McKeen of Toms River commissioned famed New York City naval architect Charles D. Mower to design a 28 foot catboat using contemporary ideas of hull and sail configuration. The project was kept relatively quiet, and the "Mary Ann," launched at the Morton Johnson yard in Bay Head on July 1, 1922, surprised the fleet two days later, showing "a clean pair of heels" to the traditional boats to take the cup.

The "Mary Ann" incorporated a "Marconi rig," and deeply raked stem, and a cutaway forefoot, innovations that caused controversy on the bay. The Marconi rig eliminated the large gaff, and ran a huge triangular sail straight up to the head of a 45 foot mast. The tall mast was supported by shrouds and forestays. This not only produced better performance to windward, but created a boat of surpassing beauty. The following year four more new catboats were built. Of these, two, "Helen" and "Foresome," were unsuccessful and were not raced again. The "Bat," designed by Mower for Edward Crabbe of Toms River, did race well and is still sailing. The "Tamwoc," designed by Francis Sweiguth for F. P. Larkin of Seaside Park, was successful but burned in a boatyard fire in 1941.

These four new boats competed against "Mary Ann" in 1923 with a small six foot gaff at the masthead, called a "Swedish rig," but the "Mary Ann" won again. In 1924 the gaff was discarded completely, and thereafter the "A-cats," as the new class was called, sailed with Marconi rigs.

In 1924 the "Spy" was built by Morton Johnson from the plans of the "Mary Ann" for Frank Thatcher of Seaside Park. In 1925 the "Lotus", also a sister of "Mary Ann", was built by Johnson for J.P. Truitt, Jr., of Island Heights.

These four Mowers designed "A-cats," the "Mary Ann" (1922), the "Bat" (1923), the "Spy" (1924), and the "Lotus" (1925) are still sailing, and form the thematic group of this nomination. Each has had its share of victories in Challenge Cup competition over the years. This year (1983) the "Mary Ann" defeated a brand new "A-cat" built to the specifications of the burned "Tamwoc," and won the bay championship in her 61st year.

All the "A-cats" are 28 feet overall, 22 feet on the waterline, 11 feet 8 inches at widest beam, 2 3/4 feet draft with centerboard to 4 1/4 feet, and 45 feet high in the mast with 605 square feet of sail area. They are "built to last" not "made light for racing." They are all plank and frame construction, with 5/4" saw oak frames and 5/16" cedar planks. The keel is heavy white oak. It is because of this strong construction they have survived for 60 years. The other
ingredient is the affection and time consuming labor of a series of local owners. The survival of the "A-cats" is an instance of historic preservation undertaken for the love of it by ordinary citizens, without help from public funds.

A detailed description of each boat is contained in the Ocean County Historic Boat Survey. "Mary Ann" is form #LC-6, "Bat" is form #LC-7, "Spy" is form #LC-2, and "Lotus" is form #LC-8.

This survey was done by Dr. George R. Petty, Jr., a Professor of Medieval English at Montclair State College (N.J.), and a classic wooden boat owner, mechanic, and journalist. A detailed discussion of the survey methodology is contained in a report submitted to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Office of New Jersey Heritage, October 31, 1983. The surveyor visited Ocean County boat yards during the spring and summer of 1983, identified indigenous antique boats and classic boats built outside the County, recorded physical data, and accepted owner or local information about historical data. For specially identified craft, such as the "A-cats" discussed here, more detailed historical data was found from better informed local sources. For the "A-cats" the surveyor interviewed all the present owners, several past owners, and especially Commodore Edward Crabbe, 84, of Toms River, the first owner of the "Bat." Technical information about the "A-cats" was obtained from Lachlin Beaton, owner of David Beaton and Sons Boat Works, Mantoloking, N.J., who has been responsible for all major maintenance of the boats. His father, David Beaton, worked for Morton Johnson at the time when the "A-cats" were built.

Endnotes:

1. Joseph K. Ridgway, "When the Catboat Came to Barnegat," New Jersey Courier, Friday, December 27, 1912. This is a personal reminiscence by a local bayman.


4. New Jersey Courier, Friday, July 7, 1922.

6 Crabbe

7 G. Petty. Interview with Lachlin Beaton, April, 1983.

8 For line drawings of "Mary Ann," see Appendix A heretao.

The Ocean County Historic Boat Survey forms are included at the end of this nomination.
8. Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Areas of Significance—Check and justify below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prehistoric</td>
<td>archeology-prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1499</td>
<td>archeology-historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1599</td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1699</td>
<td>architecture (naval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1799</td>
<td>art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1899</td>
<td>commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 1900-</td>
<td>communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landscape architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>humanitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>politics/government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X. other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific dates</td>
<td>1922-1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder/Architect</td>
<td>Charles D. Mower, naval arch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Significance (In one paragraph)

Significance

The four "A-cat" racing sailboats herein nominated represent the culmination of a tradition of catboat sailing on Barnegat Bay that dates back at least to 1855. They are examples of the finest local craftsmanship and native materials no longer available. At the same time they exhibit a striking development in naval architecture of the period (1922-1925). Their sturdy construction, excellent performance, and surpassing beauty have encouraged local owners to preserve them and the sailing tradition that goes with them.

The Barnegat Bay "A Class" catboats are private, individually owned and maintained racing sailboats. They were built between 1922 and 1925 specifically to compete for the Tomo River Challenge Cup and other Barnegat Bay racing trophies.

The boats included in this thematic group are the "Mary Ann" (1922), the "Bait" (1923), the "Spy" (1924), and the "Lotus" (1925). They were all designed by well known New York City naval architect Charles D. Mower, and intended for racing in the relatively shallow and sheltered waters of Barnegat Bay and its tributary rivers. They were built in the Horton Johnson boat yard in Bay Head, Ocean County, New Jersey, for local owners, by local craftsmen, using local white cedar and oak.

These "A-cats" are the culmination of a history of catboat sailing in Barnegat Bay which can be traced back to the introduction of the catboats into these waters from New York City in 1855. According to Joseph K. Ridgway, a local boatman from Barnegat who in 1912 recalled the incident, the first catboat was brought to Barnegat Bay from New York City in 1855 by Captain Samuel Birsdall of Waretown. It was 20 feet overall, with a curved stern. Its single unstayed mast was stepped in the bow of the boat and carried on gaff-rigged sail. That it was intended for pleasure and not commercial use is indicated by its name, the "Lounge." In the following year local builder Benjamin Seaman, of West Creek, built another catboat 18 feet along the keel, called the "Little Frank", which still survived in 1912. Seaman then built a 20 foot catboat "for a racing boat" according to Ridgway.

Ridgway's account shows that early catboats on the bay were thought of as pleasure and racing crafts. However, because of its broad, open unobstructed cockpit and the ease of handling the single sail, the catboat was quickly adapted to the uses of local fishermen. A cover engraving for an article on Jersey Shore fishing in Appleton's Journal of Saturday, June 24, 1871 (Vol. V, #117) shows
five gaff-rigged catboats of 20 to 24 feet fishing in Barnegat inlet. They have a plumb stem, the unstayed mast stepped far forward, low freeboard, wide beam, shallow cockpit, and an overhung and slightly raked stern with a wineglass transom and underslung rudder. Two of the pictured boats have centerboard trunks visible in the cockpit. These characteristics of the Barnegat Bay catboats are constant in all nineteenth century pictures and descriptions, and can be taken as evidence that a special type had evolved for use in Barnegat Bay waters.

Catboat racing remained popular on Barnegat Bay through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1871 the Toms River Yacht Club was formed and the Toms River Challenge Cup first offered to catboats and sloops. Local yachtsmen claim this cup is the oldest continuously contested small boat racing trophy in the United States. In the course of this competition racing catboats by famous designers were brought into Barnegat Bay early in the twentieth century. In 1900 the Bouquet, designed by Carey Smith, was built in Forked River, and the Scat, a winning catboat on Long Island Sound designed and built by Wilton Crosby in 1896 was brought to Barnegat Bay by Edwin Schoettle.

In 1922 federal Judge Charles McKeenan of Toms River arranged to have a catboat designed by Charles Mower of New York City built at the Morton Johnson yard in Bay Head. From the start, the purpose of the design was to capture the Toms River Challenge Cup, and the project was kept from the other competitors. The boat, called the "Mary Ann," was launched July 1, 1922, and surprised the bay by winning the cup race handily two days later.

The "Mary Ann" showed some innovations in design which caused controversy among yachtsmen on the bay. Instead of the plumb or nearly plumb stem and full bows of traditional catboats, it had a sharply raked stem and cutaway forefoot. Instead of the traditional short mast and large gaff it had a 45 foot hollow box spruce mast and a "Marconi rig."

The Marconi rig, with its triangular sail, and its leading edge held tightly against the mast from deck to masthead was the important innovation. It presented a clean, unobstructed airfoil section to the wind on a beat, and permitted the "Mary Ann" to point higher and sail faster when going into the wind.

The following year, four new catboats were built to compete with the "Mary Ann." The "Helen," "Foresome," and "Tamwock" were designed by Francis Swelsguth, and the "Bat" was a Charles Mower design. All carried "Swedish rigs," with a short six foot gaff at the mast head. One traditionalist, unconvinced about the
value of all the new design features, bought the "Vapor", a previous champion, and completely refitted her, including a new gaff rigged sail, for the 1923 campaign. It was all in vain; the "Mary Ann", with her Marconi rig, beat them all again.

The competitors finally conceded the point, and in 1924 all the new catboats were changed to the tall masted Marconi rig, producing the fast and beautiful "A-cat". The "Spy," was built from the plans of the "Mary Ann" for Frank Thatcher of Seaside Park, and in 1925 the "Lotus", also a sister of the "Mary Ann," was built for J.P. Truitt, Jr., of Island Heights. The "Helen" and the "Foresome" were unsuccessful and were sold, but the "Tamwock" competed very well until it was burned in a boat yard fire in 1941. The four old "A-cats" still competing today are the "Mary Ann" (1922), the "Bat" (1923), the "Spy" (1924), and the "Lotus" (1925).

These four boats have been kept alive over the years by a succession of local Barnegat Bay owners. The "Spy," for example, beat the "Mary Ann" in 1925 and was purchased by Edwin Schoettle. Schoettle campaigned her until after the second World War. She was purchased by Donald Sayla of Seaside Park in 1953 and with a new sail produced a championship in 1954. The "Spy" is now owned by Roy Wilkins, a local school teacher, and James Reynolds, a businessman. She was last raced in 1982. After nearly sixty years of racing, fixing and repairing were no longer enough for her. A complete refabrication was needed, and she is now in the David Beaton and Sons yard in Mantoloking, being fitted with a new keel, stem, frames and deck. She will be launched this spring in time for the 1984 season.

Following the "Spy" in the Beaton shop, the "Lotus," now owned by Nelson Hartranft of Beachwood, will be completely remade. Hartranft, a local businessman, has been the leader in a recent revival of interest in the "A-cats." He has built a completely new "A-cat" from the plans of the burned "Tamwock." His son now owns and races the "Bat."

The "Mary Ann," now owned by Marshall Warner of Brick Township on Barnegat Bay, is still sailing, and last year won the Bay Championship over Nelson Hartranft's new boat.

In 1984, three of the old "A-cats" will be racing, the "Mary Ann," the "Spy," and the "Bat." By 1985, the Lotus will be ready, and all four will be campaigned for the first time since 1978. They are still the queens of the bay, and to the sailing community they represent the greatest achievement of the long tradition of Barnegat Bay boating.
Endnotes:


2 Joseph K. Ridgway, "When the Catboat came to Barnegat Bay," New Jersey Courier, Friday, December 12, 1912.

3 See Appendix B


7 New Jersey Courier, Friday, July 7, 1922.

8 See Appendix C for photographs of previous competitions.
9. Major Bibliographical References
Howard I. Chapelle, American Small Sailing Craft, New York, 1951
New Jersey Courier, files in the Toms River Library

10. Geographical Data
n/a Boats are moored and stored around Barnegat B.
Acreage of nominated property
Quadrangle name Point Pleasant (A-"Lotus"), Toms River (B-"Bat")
UMT References (C-"Mary Ann"), Seaside Park (D-"Spy")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>5 81 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 14 1 0</td>
<td>1 4 3 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 18 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>5 7 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1 4 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>5 7 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 6 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 6 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>5 7 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 6 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 4 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal boundary description and justification
n/a

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>state</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>county</th>
<th>code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Dr. George R. Petty, Jr., Researcher
organization Ocean County Cultural and Heritage Commis- sion
date 12/28/83

street & number 38 Hadley Ave.
telephone (201) 244-2121, ext. 2200

city or town Toms River
state New Jersey
08753

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

national
state
local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer signature

For HCRS use only
I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register.

date

Keeper of the National Register

Attest:

Chief of Registration
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joanne Davis, Project Review Officer
   NJ DEP, LUR, Bureau of Coastal Regulation

FROM: Dorothy P. Guzzo, Administrator, Historic Preservation Office (HPO),
      and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

DATE: August 31, 2001

SUBJECT: Ocean County, Bay Head Borough
         All Saints Church--Addition
         LUR file 1502-01-0005.2, CAFRA

This memo is in reply to the project information and request for review and comment regarding historic and archaeological resources, received in the Historic Preservation Office (HPO) on August 2, 2001.

Identifying Historic Properties

The All Saints Church, located at 684 Lake Avenue, is situated within the Bay Head Historic District, which received a SHPO Opinion of Eligibility on June 23, 1995. The Ocean County Historic Preservation Grant Fund Survey of 1980 (encl.) also identified the Church as individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Photographs submitted with the application indicate that the Church retains its integrity of historic fabric and conveys the historic character and associations that make it eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It is my opinion as Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer that the All Saints Church is a contributing building in the Bay Head Historic District and is individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its associations with the early development of Bay Head, and Criterion C for its architectural distinction. This is a new SHPO Opinion of Eligibility.

Assessing Effects

In order for our office to assess the effect that the proposed addition will have on the character of the All Saints Church and the Bay Head Historic District, we will need to review the following items:
• Additional photographs showing the area of the proposed addition and the character of the streetscape and area around the project property.

• Elevation drawings for the project showing the new addition in relation to the existing church.

Thank you for providing the HPO an opportunity to comment on the potential for this project to affect historic properties. If you have any questions please contact Kurt Leasure of my staff at (609) 777-3930.

w/encl.

C:\my documents\...\01-2733_Bay Head.doc
DG/kl
NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION SECTION
INDIVIDUAL STRUCTURE SURVEY FORM

HISTORIC NAME: All Saints Church
LOCATION: 684 Lake Avenue
MUNICIPALITY: Bay Head
USGS QUAD: 
OWNER/ADDRESS: All Saints Church
684 Lake Avenue, Bay Head

COMMON NAME: All Saints
BLOCK/LOT 55/2
COUNTY: Ocean
UTM REFERENCES: Zone/Northing/Easting

DESCRIPTION
Construction Date: 1889
Source of Date: Wm. C. Schoettle
Architect: 
Builder: Wyckhoff Applegate
Style: Shingle style
Form/Plan Type: cruciform
Number of Stories: 1
Foundation:
Exterior Wall Fabric: natural shingle

Fenestration: square and lancet shapes, stained glass windows (non-pictorial) most are paired or triple
Roof/Chimneys: hipped roof, covered with natural shakes
hipped roof on belfry and central tower
Additional Architectural Description: The original outlines are still visible; as built, All Saints was a four-bay meetinghouse, with an entrance located to the side, facing north. This portion still stands, running east and west to the rear of the lot. A transept with square tower at the crossing was added at a later time; it is the apse area which presently fronts Lake Avenue. The belfry was built to the northwest corner in 1905, and 1980 marks the construction of Bristol Hall, a social hall in a highly compatible style, to the south of the church structure. The church presents a very simple, well proportioned appearance both inside and out. Detail is evident only in the dark stained wood trim, in the infilled area of the belfry and in the portico, which opens through a trefoil-shaped space, and is framed by an arcade of lancet openings. Incised cross carvings, panels, and a triglyph band decorate the belfry which has louvered lancets. Six plain, exterior crosses mark the roof peaks.

PHOTO Negative File No. 1502-17

Map (Indicate North)
SITING, BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION, AND RELATED STRUCTURES:

Corner sitting, on lot extending from Lake Avenue to Scow Ditch; the municipal parking area is located across the ditch.

SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT: Urban ☐ Suburban ☐ Scattered Buildings ☐
Open Space ☐ Woodland ☐ Residential ☑ Agricultural ☐ Village ☐
Industrial ☐ Downtown Commercial ☐ Highway Commercial ☐ Other ☑ Water-Scow Ditch

SIGNIFICANCE:

All Saints was founded in 1889 and has early associations with the Hall and Studdiford families. It is the oldest church in Bay Head, and the one with the greatest significance, despite its seasonal calendar. It has made considerable contribution to the charity of the borough, including continuing donations to St. Paul's, a year-round congregation.

Many of the weddings and other events which have affected the local history have taken place here.

Ties with Princeton have been continuously maintained through this church.

ORIGINAL USE: ☑
PRESENT USE:

PHYSICAL CONDITION: Excellent ☑ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐
REGISTER ELIGIBILITY: Yes ☑ Possible ☐ No ☐ Part of District ☐
THREATS TO SITE: Roads ☐ Development ☐ Zoning ☐ Deterioration ☐
                      No Threat ☑ Other ☐

COMMENTS:

REFERENCES:
Downey, Antoinette M. and Schoettle, William C. pictorial album of Bay Head, New Jersey. Toms River, New Jersey, the Ocean County Historical Society, 1971
Mary Westin, interview by M.R. Kralik; Bay Head, July 1980
Schoettle, William C. Bay Head, 1879-1911. Bay Head, New Jersey, 1966
Schoettle, William C. "Bay Head, Then and Now" slide presentation, 1980
William C. Schoettle, interview by M.R. Kralik, Bay Head, July 1980

RECORDED BY: M.R. Kralik  DATE: 8/80
ORGANIZATION: O.C. Cultural and Heritage Comm.
MEMORANDUM

TO:            Ernie Hahn, Administrator
               Land Use Regulation Program

FROM:          C. Terry Broutz, Supervisor, Technical Review
               Section, Historic Preservation Office

SUBJECT:       Ocean County, Borough of Bay Head
               The Bluffs Hotel: 575 East Avenue
               Proposed demolition and construction of two single
               family units
               Lot 16  Block 66: c. 150 X 357 feet
               Review of additional information
               CAFRA 1502-90-0007.3

ATTN:          Mark Godfrey, Project Review Officer, Bureau of
               Coastal Regulation, Land Use Regulation Program

I have received the additional information requested in
my January 1995 memorandum from the applicant's consultant,
John Keenan of the Environmental Evaluation Group on May 22,
1995. The report, Historic Architectural Investigation of
the Bluffs Hotel by The Cultural Resource Consulting Group
(CRCG), is thorough and professionally prepared. It provides
good documentation of the existing conditions and history of
the Bluffs structures. I agree with the report's findings
that the existing Bluffs structures contribute to a Bay Head
Historic District, the boundaries of which are being
professionally determined through survey work commissioned by
the Bay Head Historical Society. As I mentioned in my
earlier letter, the demolition of contributing structures has
an adverse affect on historic districts. In addition, as Mr.
Keenan also suggested in his recent letter, the design of new
construction within an historic district is a matter for
review and should be compatible with the surrounding historic
character.

The CRCG report recommends that Historic American
Building Survey recordation (i.e. measured drawings and
additional photography) of the structures be done if
demolition is proposed. This is a standard part of cultural
resource mitigation for demolition. However, as the report
concludes, the historic significance of the remaining Bluffs
structures is derived primarily from contributing to the historic district. Additional recordation to HABS standards would not be the most effective way to mitigate the loss of integrity to the historic district. Instead, I feel that the best way to counter the loss and contribute something meaningful to the historic character of Bay Head would be to nominate and register the Bay Head Historic District. Listing on the National and New Jersey Registers of Historic Places would provide recognition and a measure of protection to the remaining structures of the historic district.

Rehabilitation of the existing structures and adaptive re-use as residences appears not to be feasible per John Keenan's June 20, 1995 letter to Lyssa Papazian. Therefore, consistent with the Rules on Coastal Zone Management (7:7E-3.36), I recommend the following conditions be placed on the permit to mitigate the effects of demolition and new construction on the historic district:

1. Permitee shall pay the cost of hiring a professional survey consultant to upgrade the Bay Head Historical Society's current survey work into a formal National and New Jersey Register Nomination for the Bay Head Historic District. The total cost for preparation of a nomination is customarily established in advance with a contract for the work. The costs would include some additional photography and maps, upgrading the statement of significance, a list of included property owners, and the preparation and processing of the nomination forms themselves.

2. The design of the new construction planned for the site shall be visually compatible with the character of the historic district including size, scale, materials (i.e. wood shingle siding) and style (i.e. traditional design). The design(s) shall be submitted to the Historic Preservation Office for review and approval prior to construction.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Lyssa Papazian of my staff.

C.T.P.

CTP/LP:95-1441
c: John Keenan
  Stacy Spies
  Evalyn Shippee
NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION SECTION
INDIVIDUAL STRUCTURE SURVEY FORM

| HISTORIC NAME: | The Bluffs Hotel | COMMON NAME: |
| LOCATION: | 575 East Avenue | BLOCK/LOT | 66/16, 16a |
| MUNICIPALITY: | Bay Head | COUNTY: | Ocean |
| USGS QUAD: | | UTM REFERENCES: | Zone/Northing/Easting |
| OWNER/ADDRESS: | Alfred Johnson | 575 East Avenue, Bay Head, N.J. 08742 |

DESCRIPTION

Construction Date: c.1890
Source of Date: stylistic
Builder:

Style: Shingle
Form/Plan Type: rectangle

Number of Stories: 3
Foundation: brick

Exterior Wall Fabric: natural shingle

Fenestration: dhs, some paired - 6 bay

Roof/Chimneys: gable/1 interior brick chimney, center

Additional Architectural Description:

The Bluffs Hotel is located in the center of several related outbuildings. Part A, described above, was originally the bachelor quarters, but was moved to replace the much larger, original hotel structure which was demolished, after hurricane damage, in 1953. This symmetrical construction has a two story open veranda, on the north, east, south sides. Veranda roof flares to north and south. Paired roof gables, east and west.

Part B, outbuilding to the south, appears unchanged from early twentieth century postcard view. Two stories high, hipped roof, natural shingle. First and second floor porches to east.

PHOTO

Map (Indicate North)

WRONG PHOTO (THIS IS NOT THE BLUFFS)
SITING, BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION, AND RELATED STRUCTURES:

The hotel is part of a large oceanfront tract. The founders' cottages are sited to the north, and old life saving station to the south. This site marks the old south line of development in Bay Head. The Bluffs Hotel property includes bathhouse, across East Avenue.

SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT:  
Urban ☐  Suburban ☐  Scattered Buildings ☑  
Open Space ☑  Woodland ☐  Residential ☐  Agricultural ☐  Village ☐  
Industrial ☐  Downtown Commercial ☐  Highway Commercial ☐  Other ☑  Ocean ☐

SIGNIFICANCE:

The Bluffs was the largest and most prominent of all the Bay Head hotels. Originally, it involved many buildings, of which four remain in some form. The history of the Bluffs is accounted for in William C. Schoettle's Bay Head 1879-1911.

In recent years, it has maintained a loyal local following as a bar, which is still managed by a member of the Johnson (founding) family.

ORIGINAL USE:  
PRESENT USE:  
PHYSICAL CONDITION:  Excellent ☐  Good ☑  Fair ☐  Poor ☐
REGISTER ELIGIBILITY: Yes ☐  Possible ☐  No ☐  Part of District ☑
THREATS TO SITE:  Roads ☐  Development ☑  Zoning ☐  Deterioration ☐
No Threat ☐  Other ☐

COMMENTS:

REFERENCES:

Schoettle, William C. Bay Head, 1879-1911. Bay Head, New Jersey, 1966

RECORDED BY: M.R. Kralik  DATE: 8/10/80
ORGANIZATION: O.C. Cultural and Heritage Comm.
APPENDIX C
Meeting Minutes

*The proposal to use an abbreviated survey form for the NJ Route 35 projects from mileposts 0-4 and 9-12.5 occurred during the field view held on April 16, 2003. Representatives from the New Jersey Department of Transportation and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office were participants in this discussion. The conditions for using the form are presented on page 3.
MEETING REPORT
Route 35, Mileposts 9.0 to 12.5

DATE: April 16, 2003

PLACE: Saint Simon's by the Sea Church, NJ Route 35 north of Princeton Avenue, Borough of Mantoloking

TIME: 10:00 AM

PURPOSE: 1) Familiarize NJ HPO with the project area between Herbert and Downer Streets; 2) introduce the NJ HPO to the drainage component of this proposal; 3) receive guidance from NJ HPO regarding documentation of: previously undelineated western boundaries of Bay Head and Mantoloking Historic Districts; demolished or highly altered resources within the districts; and drainage areas; and 4) feasibility of Conditional No Adverse Effect

Attendees
Dennis DeGregory
Charles Scott
Andre’ Luboff
Amnon Peleg
Jim DiVietro
Francine Arnold
Eiizabeth Harvey

Representing
NJ DOT – Environmental Specialist
NJDEP – Historic Preservation
Parsons Transportation Group
Parsons Transportation Group
McCormick Taylor Associates
McCormick Taylor Associates
McCormick Taylor Associates

Tel. No.
(609)-530-2827
(609)-292-2023
(732)-537-3506
(732)-537-3624
(856)-793-0800
(215)-592-4200
(215)-592-4200

DISCUSSION:

1. Intersection Improvements between Herbert Street and Downer Avenue

According to Mr. Luboff, two conditions necessitate the intersection improvements between 900' north of Herbert Street and 500' south of Downer Avenue in the Mantoloking Historic District: 1) the existing substandard operations and intersection geometry at the signal at Herbert Street, and 2) existing queuing extending from the area southward into Brick Township (approximately MP 8.5), as described by the Township and as discussed at the Kickoff Meeting for improvements between MP 4.0-9.0.

To alleviate these conditions, Parsons recommends an auxiliary lane from Milepost 9.6 extending north to beyond where much of the northbound traffic turns onto Herbert Street. Additional queuing starting at the Bay Head borough line is not viewed by that community as so serious a concern as to warrant roadway widening. Some citizens within Bay Head prefer the lower corridor speed resulting from this congestion.
Roadway Paving, Curbs, Sidewalks/Grass Strip, Utility Poles/Lighting

Owing to the proposed right-of-way widening for the proposed auxiliary lane, features within that right-of-way, such as the proposed ROW line curbs, sidewalks/grass strip, and utility poles/lighting, may be shifted eastward up to 19".

At present, the project area hosts two 10' concrete travel lanes, constructed of slabs with joints, and 10' asphalt shoulders. The overall existing right-of-way width is 60' south of Herbert Street and 70' north of Herbert Street. The concrete travel lanes will be overlaid with asphalt or reconstructed at full depth. At a prior meeting with NJ DOT and the NJ HPO (March 20, 2003), Mr. Scott stated that some communities have expressed an interest in having concrete streets paved with asphalt owing to the noise created by the joints. (Note: The recommendation for overlay or replacement of existing slabs is based upon technical requirements and the condition of the pavement and its subgrade, and is unrelated to the "road noise" created by tires riding over joints.) He noted that while the effect of changing a concrete road to asphalt must be a consideration both for diminishment of this resource and for the visual effect, the overall effect must be balanced with community concern and present conditions. That the shoulders in these districts are already asphalt is one consideration. Furthermore, the materials of this road have changed from gravel to concrete in about 1928 during the period of significance (1890-1940).

Faux stone crosswalks are not recommended as a mitigation measure as they are not associated with the Bay Head and Mantoloking Historic Districts.

Existing curbs in Mantoloking are concrete and have a low profile of typically about 4". Mr. Scott recommended that the curbs be replaced in kind to the degree possible allowed by code and design. Mr. Luboff noted that drain inlets, currently having a 9" curb reveal that creates a localized raise in the top of curb elevation, can be designed without an elevated bump (lower curb piece, or without a curb piece); therefore, it should be possible to design curbs that are no higher than 4".

Existing sidewalks south of Herbert Street are concrete and most are 4' wide between a 3' grassed snow clearance strip and a 3' buffer to the ROW line; they will be replaced in kind. New sidewalks will be introduced where none currently exist and will match the existing 4' sidewalks. North of Herbert Street, where a 15' frontage is provided, sidewalks are as wide as 5' located between 5' grassed snow clearance strips and buffers; to minimize property takes, those sidewalks will be replaced with a 4' width within a 10' frontage to match the sidewalks elsewhere in the district. Owing to safety and geometric standards, this width of 4' cannot be further reduced.

Existing grass strips behind curbs are approximately 3' wide. According to Mr. Luboff, this feature will be replaced in kind; it should not be reduced in width or eliminated owing to safety standards and its use for snow removal.

Utility poles will be moved and replaced in kind along the edge of road in accordance with state highway and utility agency criteria. The lighting mast arms and luminaries are currently
intended to be replaced in kind. Based on historic photos, it can be seen that lighting was affixed to telephone poles in a similar manner as seen today on the utility poles.

_Fencing and Plantings_

Owing to the proposed right-of-way widening for the auxiliary lane, landscape features such as fencing and planting would be relocated up to 19 feet.

In anticipation of the proposed right-of-way acquisition for roadway improvements causing existing fences to be removed, Mr. Scott recommended that MTA suggest fencing alternatives, should the affected owners wish to replace them. Mr. Scott recommended that the portion of post fencing that remains in front of Saint Simon’s by the Sea Church be a guideline given that this is the last remaining evidence of the fencing that had existed along both sides of Route 35 c. 1928.

At present, it is not anticipated that the road would be widened in front of Saint Simon’s by the Sea Church; however, should the fence be affected by frontage re-grading, the post fencing will be avoided or replaced in kind.

Property owners will be compensated by the NJDOT for the loss of vegetation that occurs behind the existing ROW line and within the proposed right-of-way; however, how or whether the vegetation will be replaced is a decision of the property owner. Existing fencing or vegetation located on the State ROW (as legally defined) would be removed without compensation as these conditions represent illegal encroachments.

2. _Drainage Issues_

The project area hosts approximately 25-30 streets that will include drainage line improvements, including storm line and/or outfall improvements.

Bulkheads are not recommended at every location. Mr. Luboff noted that in Mantoloking, the borough engineer (Thomas Guldin) indicated that local residents would likely indicate their opposition to new bulkheads. Where appropriate, Mr. Scott recommended keeping the rustic nature around the bulkheads in mind when designing the drainage areas; if or where possible, avoid the construction of bulkheads.

3. _Documentation of Resources_

MTA prepared a draft abbreviated Historic Resource Survey Form that features the information required on the NJ HPO base, building, and district forms. Mr. Scott agreed to the use of this form as long as an explanation for it is given in the Methodology section of the Cultural Resource Survey Report. MTA will use this form to document the following: 1) western boundaries of the Bay Head and Mantoloking Historic Districts; 2) demolished or highly altered resources within those districts; and 3) streetscapes of outfall areas and properties at the end of those streets closest to Barnegat Bay.
4. **Feasibility of Conditional No Adverse Effect**

The extension of the proposed right-of-way is estimated at approximately 19 feet to accommodate an auxiliary lane between 900' north of Herbert Street and 500' south of Downer Avenue. The proposed widening will cause the removal and replacement of curbs, sidewalks/grass strips, utility poles/lighting, fences, and vegetation. Owing to these proposed impacts, it is not feasible to employ a Conditional No Adverse Effect for this project.

Mr. Luboff described the limits and impacts of the original IPA as developed by the Department, presented to the local community and as shown in the Feasibility Assessment Report dated June 1999. Mr. Luboff noted that the June 1999 IPA had begun about 300' north of Downer Avenue, ended about 1000' north of Herbert Street, and resulted in property acquisitions of up to 14' (vs. 19') along the east side of Route 35. IPA impacts along the west side of Route 35 north of Herbert Street (for the southbound RT lane) were previously greater for the original IPA than for the current Recommended Alternative. On this basis, Mr. Scott noted that the June 1999/FAR IPA would also **NOT** qualify for a Conditional No Adverse Effect funding.

In the Initially Preferred Alternative (IPA), approximately 5' less would be required than in this current proposal. Mr. Scott stated that impacts would be similar under the IPA and, therefore, would still be considered an adverse effect. In summary, the current Recommended Alternative (Alt. 9C) and the IPA would both be considered an adverse effect to the Mantoloking Historic District.

5. **Wetlands**

A visit was made to the JCP&L Mantoloking Substation and to wetlands areas along state-owned former ROW along the east side of Clayton Avenue (Bay Head), both potential sites for drainage improvements. It was agreed that the type of measures contemplated at each site would not adversely affect the Historic District designation.

**FOLLOW-UP ITEMS**

**McCormick Taylor Associates**

- Photograph outfall areas added to original Parsons table (approximately 8 streets).
- Complete abbreviated NJ survey forms for properties located at the end of outfalls and for drainage area streetscapes.
- Determine what changes have occurred within the Mantoloking Historic District between Herbert Street and Downer Avenue since the KSK survey (1996; revised 2002) and document those changes using abbreviated NJ survey forms.
- Delineate and document the western boundaries for Bay Head and Mantoloking Historic Districts.
- Research fencing alternatives for the community that would be in keeping with the Bay Head and Mantoloking Historic Districts.
• Develop mitigation measures for the adverse effect of this project on the Mantoloking Historic District.

Parsons Transportation Group

• Subsequent to this field meeting, Parsons met with NJ DOT representatives (Mr. Verner, Mr. DeGregory (briefly), Mr. Rana and Mr. Lavelle) on April 24 and 30, 2003, to review project status and decisions about alternatives in the vicinity of Downer Avenue/Herbert Street. At the April 30 meeting, Mr. Verner directed the Consultant team to advance Alternative 9D as the Recommended Alternative for presentation to the communities and public officials.

• On this basis, Parsons will update the tabulation of distances, offsets and property acquisition impacts prepared for MTA's historic significance studies.

Minutes of Meeting prepared by E. Harvey, McCormick, Taylor Associates, with editing by A. Luboff, Parsons Transportation Group
APPENDIX E
Request for Proposal
EXPRESSION OF INTEREST
STANDARD PROJECT
EOI #232R

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Route 35 Improvements
MP 9.60 to 12.50
Boroughs of Mantoloking and Bay Head; Ocean County

This Expression of Interest is being solicited for Final Scope Development, Initial/Final Design and Construction Engineering Services. However, services under the original Agreement shall be limited to Final Scope Development only, with Initial/Final Design and Construction Engineering Services (Shop Drawing reviews, etc.) to be initiated at a later date at the sole discretion of the State.

Concept plans are also available for viewing only from 9:00AM to 3:00PM on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays in the office of Professional Services until the closing date of the EOI. Viewing this document will be by appointment only and is limited to a duration of one hour so that all interested firms may have an opportunity to view this document. To arrange for an appointment please call for your appointment request (date and time) to Jack Boylan, Professional Services 609-530-2452. Do not contact the Project Manager by any other means to arrange for an appointment.

DATE OF SOLICITATION: September 16, 1999 CLOSING DATE: October 15, 1999

Firms must be prequalified with the NJDOT in the following discipline(s) and level of service prior to the closing date of this Expression of Interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE(S)</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>Level B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Level A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>Level B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firms wanting to Joint Venture may do so by completing and returning the attached Statement of Joint Venture with the submission of their Expression of Interest. However, firms doing so must be prequalified with the NJDOT and by joint venture meet the discipline(s) and level of service(s) requirements for this project.

The expression of interest shall be no more than three typed, single sided, 8-1/2" x 11" sheets in length using Times New Roman #11 or #12 font size. Anything in excess of this page limitation will not be read or considered. The expression of interest must contain the following information:

✓ 1. A statement that your firm is interested in performing the work described in the attached scope.

✓ 2. The address of the office in which the work would be performed.

✓ 3. The name, title, and ASCE grade of the individual who would be assigned as your project manager.

✓ 4. A listing of work areas you would subcontract out to other firms, the names of the firms you would anticipate using as subconsultants, and the subconsultant project manager.

✓ 5. A narrative demonstrating your understanding of the project work and detailing your firm's particular ability to perform this work.

✓ 6. A statement certifying that the Consultant will make a good faith effort to meet the established goals.

✓ 7. An Organization Chart should be attached (utilizing a single sided 8 1/2 " X 11" sheet) to reflect Team Makeup, Project Manager, Task Leaders and QA Function. Subconsultant(s) staff should be noted.

✓ 8. The staff you propose (Project Manager and Key Staff) in an Expression of Interest MUST be used in the
performance of the project. When proposing same staffing in multiple Expressions of Interest, please disclose the following: A. Confirm all projects utilizing same staff will be completed on time (or) B. Selection for one project would mean voluntary withdrawal from consideration for other projects utilizing same staff.

9. If you list a key person or persons that is(are) not currently employed by your firm on your EOI, you need to enclose with the EOI a letter of commitment from the individual indicating that the individual or individuals will be available at the start of the project and throughout the duration of the project.

The letter of commitment shall contain either a sworn affidavit that is notarized or a statement certifying to the truth of the statements in the letter and acknowledging that willful falsehoods will subject the signer of the letter to penalties and punishment.

Resumes of key personnel must be attached to the Expression of Interest. Each resume shall be a maximum of two, single sided, 8-1/2" x 11" sheets in length and should highlight education, professional credentials, and work performance on projects similar to that described in the attached scope. You must include the resume of the project manager, and the resume(s) of your Key Staff, as well as the resumes of the Subconsultant’s Project Manager and Key Staff.

Your Expression of Interest must be received by the NJDOT no later than the close of business on October 15, 1999 to be considered for evaluation. Five (5) copies of the Expression of Interest should be sent to:
Robert Verner
Project Manager
New Jersey Department of Transportation
PO Box 600
1635 Parkway Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08625

If your firm is not interested in performing this work for any reason, please notify the NJDOT Project Manager of this fact. If your firm does not respond to this request for an Expression of Interest by the due date set forth above, it will be concluded that you are not interested in performing the work for this project.

Expressions of Interest will be reviewed and evaluated. Attached is a copy of the Rating Sheet with weights indicated. Recommendations to the Consultant Selection Committee to solicit technical proposals from a limited number of consultants will be based on these evaluations, as well as your statement to meet established goals for this project.

The Goal for this project is 16% (Federal 16%)*. An updated DBE list may be obtained by contacting the Bureau of Professional Services at (609) 530-2452. Failure to meet the established goal may be cause for canceling negotiations with a selected firm and selecting a new firm.

We anticipate approval of a short list for solicitation of technical proposals during the month of December, 1999.

If you have any questions regarding any aspect of this project, you may call the NJDOT Project Manager identified above.

If awarded a contract your company will be required to comply with the Affirmative Action requirements of P.L. 1975,c.127(N.J.A.C. 17:27).

Prior to execution of an Agreement you will be required to submit one of the following documents disclosing Affirmative Action evidence:


*Goals for Federally funded projects shall be a total of 16% min. consisting of: DBE's and/or WBE's to satisfy the goal.

ROUTE 35 IMPROVEMENTS
BOROUGHS OF MANTOLOKING BAY HEAD & Pt. PLEASANT
Milepost 9.00 to 12.50

SCOPE OF WORK
EOI #232R

Project Background: For this project, the NJDOT is proposing improvements to NJ Route 35 between Curtis Point Drive (M.P. 9.00) and Delaware Avenue (M.P. 12.50). Located in the Boroughs of Bay Head and Mantoloking.

Initially Preferred Alternative: The IPA includes rubblization of the existing Portland Cement Concrete pavement with a nominal 6-inch bituminous concrete overlay. Drainage improvements will include the addition of inlets and new piping in specific problem areas, one (1) new outfall, reconstruction of six (6) outfalls, resetting of existing inlets, construction of drainage appurtenances and reconstruction/reprofiling of the shoulders.

Additional pavement testing will be required to determine the existing condition for the entire project limits.

Minor structures will include new Timber Bulkheads, extension of existing Bulkheads and new Headwalls.

Improvements to the intersection of County Route 528 include lengthening and widening of the left and right turn lanes on Route 25 to accommodate traffic volumes, lengthening approach tapers to current standards, and the installation of a new traffic signal.

Sidewalk will be added to areas where it is currently non-existent to provide a continuous walkway.

R.O.W. acquisition is only required for the County Route 528 intersection improvements. The limits are along NJ Route 35 NB from the vicinity of Downer Avenue to just north of Herbert Street and at the north west corner of County Route 528. R.O.W. acquisition will include small strips of land totaling approximately 0.34 acres.

Existing 10' wide travel lanes along NJ Route 35 do not meet current NJDOT standards. However, it has been determined that to maintain parking and pedestrian safety, from MP 11.21 to 12.5, no widening of the existing lane widths or roadway section within these limits is proposed. The MP 9.0 to 11.21 section of this project will be brought up to NJDOT standards of 12' travel lanes and 8' shoulders since parking is prohibited in this section. This will be accomplished within the existing 40' roadway width.

Environmental permits will be required. A Categorical Exclusion Document is anticipated.
## EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

### RATING FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>WEIGHT*</th>
<th>POINTS*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Project Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Key Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Understanding of Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Particular Ability to Perform Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including Prior Experience and, Appropriateness and Ability of Subconsultant)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Special innovative concepts or benefits to bring to the project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

*USE WHOLE NUMBERS ONLY AS INDICATED BELOW.*

**POINTS** - **High** = 5  **Weighting** - **Most Important** = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low** = 1 **Least Important** = 1
STATEMENT OF JOINT VENTURE

STATE OF NEW JERSEY )
                ) SS:
COUNTY OF     

We, the undersigned, being duly sworn according to law, upon our respective oaths depose and say that:

1. Each of the following named Consultants are pre-qualified with the New Jersey Department Of Transportation to respond to expressions of interest for work of that Department.

   (A) ________________;                  ________________;                  ________________;
       ( ) Individual                  ( ) Partnership                 ( ) Corporation

   (B) ________________;                  ________________;                  ________________;
       ( ) Individual                  ( ) Partnership                 ( ) Corporation

   (C) ________________;                  ________________;                  ________________;
       ( ) Individual                  ( ) Partnership                 ( ) Corporation

2. The Consultants listed in paragraph 1, above, have entered into a joint venture agreement for the special purpose of carrying on the work hereinafter described in paragraph 5 of this Statement.

3. Under the terms of the joint venture agreement, the assets of each of the Consultants named in paragraph 1, above, will be available for the performance of the work of the joint venture and for the satisfaction of any obligation or liability incurred by the joint venture. If any of the Consultants named above is a partnership, the assets of the individual members of such partnership will also be available to satisfy any obligations or liability of the joint venture.

4. This statement of joint venture is executed so that the named Consultants may under such joint venture, compete for the work described in paragraph 5 of this Statement. If the joint venture is selected to perform the work, the contract for the work shall be executed by any person authorized to bind any Consultant to this joint venture, and when so executed shall bind this joint venture and each and every Consultant named herein, severally and jointly.
5. The work for which this joint venture has been entered into is identified as:


6. Each person signing this Statement of Joint Venture is duly authorized and empowered to execute this Statement in the name of and on behalf of the Consultant as stated in the attached Authorization of Signature, and each person signing this Statement and each Consultant represents under penalty of law that the facts set forth herein is true and correct to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me this _____________ Day of ____________________, 19__

_________________________________________

(A) ____________________________

(Name of Consultant)

By ____________________________

(Type or Print)

Subscribed and Sworn to before me this _____________ Day of ____________________, 19__

_________________________________________

(B) ____________________________

(Name of Consultant)

BY ____________________________

(Type or Print)

Subscribed and Sworn to before me this _____________ Day of ____________________, 19__

_________________________________________

(C) ____________________________

(Name of Consultant)

BY ____________________________

(Type or Print)
TO BE EXECUTED BY EACH JOINT VENTURER

SIGNATURE AUTHORIZATION
STATEMENT OF JOINT VENTURE

(A) ______________________ hereby certifies that
(Name of Consultant)
_____________________________ has been and is hereby empowered
(Name of Representative)

to sign the foregoing Statement of Joint Venture as the
authorized representative of ______________________ for the special
(Name of Consultant)
purpose therein expressed.

ATTEST
(Corporate Secretary, (Seal necessary if Corporation) If Corporation)

(B) ______________________ hereby certifies that
(Name of Consultant)
_____________________________ has been and is hereby empowered
(Name of Representative)

to sign the foregoing Statement of Joint Venture as the
authorized representative of ______________________ for the
(Name of Consultant)
special purpose therein expressed.

ATTEST
(Corporate Secretary, (Seal necessary if Corporation) if Corporation)

(C) ______________________ hereby certifies that
(Name of Consultant)
_____________________________ has been and is hereby empowered
(Name of Representative)

to sign the foregoing statement of joint Venture as the
authorized representative ______________________ for the special
(Name of Consultant)
therein expressed.

ATTEST
(Corporate Secretary, (Seal necessary if corporation) if Corporation)
PAST PERFORMANCE OF THE FIRM

List below a minimum of 2, maximum of 4 projects that are ongoing or completed within the past 2 years that are similar to or provided the firm with experience valuable to their ability to perform the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>CLIENT CONTACT (Name and Phone #)</th>
<th>CONSULTANT'S Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT PERFORMANCE OF THE PROJECT MANAGER

List below a minimum of 1, maximum of 3 current or recently completed projects that are similar to or provide experience valuable to performance of the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>CLIENT CONTACT (Name and Phone #)</th>
<th>ROLE OF THE PROPOSED PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITMENTS OF PROJECT MANAGER AND KEY STAFF

Include information on key staff of prime and subconsultants as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED COMMITMENTS Next 12 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Client X</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>Client X</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project C</td>
<td>Client Y</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project D</td>
<td>Client Z</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Project Related Duties</td>
<td>Your Firm</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Staff Person A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Staff Person B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed By: ____________________  (Consultant’s Name)  Date Completed: ____________________
A. G. Lichtenstein & Associates
Mr. Richard C. Kreppel, P.E.
45 Eisenhower Drive
Paramus NJ 07652
201-368-0400

STV Incorporated
Mr. Joseph J. Zarriello, P.E.
820 Bear Tavern Road
Suite 105
Trenton NJ 08628-1021
609-530-0300

Harold E. Pellow & Associates, Inc.
Mr. Harold E. Pellow
17 Plains Road
Augusta NJ 07822
973-948-6463

HNTB Corporation
Mr. Thomas J. Hicks
330 Passaic Ave.
Fairfield NJ 07004
973-227-6460

Maser Consulting, P.A.
Mr. Joseph A. Dopico
30 Freneau Ave. (Rt. 79)
Matawan NJ 07747
732-583-5900

Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers, Inc.
Mr. William A. Lazarek
2 Executive Drive
Suite 590
Fort Lee NJ 07024
201-363-1400

Bergmann Associates
Mr. Alfred M. Trotta
44 Hudson Place
Hoboken NJ 07030
201-653-2898

T & M Associates
Mr. C. Bernard Blum Jr.
11 Tendall Road
Middletown NJ 07748
732-671-6400

Raytheon Infrastructure Services, Inc.
Mr. Michael J. Marchelletta
Bldg 508, Carnegie Center
Princeton NJ 08540
609-720-2000

Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Mr. Rod Pello
33 Washington Street
9th Floor
Newark NJ 07102
973-824-6216

McFarland-Johnson, Inc.
Mr. Joseph J. Schiavo, P.E.
730 North Broad St.
Northwood Pavilion
Woodbury NJ 08096
609-845-0529
Parsons, Brickerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Mr. Michael Della Rocca
One Penn Plaza
New York NY 10019
212-465-5000

Edwards and Kelcey, Inc.
Mr. Michael Binkert
299 Madison Avenue
P.O. Box 1936
Morristown NJ 07962-1936
973-267-0555

Schoor, DePalma, Inc.
Mr. Henry Ney
P.O. Box 900
200 State Highway 9
Manalapan NJ 07726
732-577-9000

URS Greiner Woodward Clyde, Inc.
Mr. William D. Colon
Mack Centre II
Mack Centre Crive
Paramus NJ 07652-3905
201-262-7000

Parsons Brinckerhoff-FG, Inc.
Mr. Gregory Soriano
506 Carnegie Center Blvd.
Princeton NJ 08540
609-734-7000
Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc.
Mr. Glen D. Vasquez
126 South state Street
Newtown PA 18940
215-968-9300

Urban Engineers, Inc.
Mr. Joseph M. Pavlik
Kevon Office Center
2500 McClellan Ave, Ste 200
Pennsauken NJ 08109
609-663-5550

Goodkind & O'Dea, Inc.
Mr. Louis Robbins
60 Feronia Way
P. O. Box 1708
Rutherford NJ 07070
201-438-6166

Buchart-Horn, Inc.
Mr. George D. Barnes, P.E.
Suite 200, 2 Eves Drive
Marlton NJ 08053
609-983-0110

Steinman, Boynton, Gronquist, & Birdsall, Inc.
Mr. Rod Pello
33 Washington St., 9th Floor
Newark NJ 07102
973-824-6216
Frederic R. Harris, Inc.
Mr. Glen Kartalis
485B U.S. Route 1 South
Iselin NJ 08830
732- 636-4990

McCormick, Taylor & Associates, Inc.
Mr. James C. Wiggans
51 Haddonfield Rd
Suite 200
Cherry Hill NJ 08002
609-486-2100

BAC Killam
Mr. Gerard Kroner
27 Bleeker St.
P.O. Box 1028
Millburn NJ 07041-1028
973-379-7110

Vollmer Associates LLP
Mr. Charles S. DiMarco
Mack Centre 1
365 West Passaic Street
Rochelle Park NJ 07662-3017
201- 587-9040

Taylor, Wiseman & Taylor
Mr. Thomas M. Howell
124 Gaither Drive
Suite 150
Mount Laurel NJ 08054
609- 235-7200
APPENDIX F

Qualifications
Francine F. Arnold, Architectural Historian, Historic Structures Group Coordinator
M.A., Historic Preservation, Graduate School of Fine Arts, University of Pennsylvania, in progress
B. A., General Arts and Science, Concentrations in Fine Arts and Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University, 1990
Meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History.
Twelve years of experience in historic research, inventory, and evaluation of historic structures and archaeological resources in the Middle Atlantic region.

Elizabeth C. Harvey, AICP, Architectural Historian
M.S., Historic Preservation, University of Pennsylvania, 1997
B.A., Sociology and Urban Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1993
Meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History.
Four years of professional experience in historic research and evaluation of above-ground historic resources for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Received certification from the American Institute of Certified Planners in July 2001.

Jennifer M. Holl, Architectural Historian
M.A., American History, Certificate in Museum Studies, University of Delaware, 2001
B.A., American History, Minor in Biology, Denison University, 1999
Meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History.
Two years of experience in historic preservation research, inventory, and evaluation of above-ground historic resources for the National Register of Historic Places.

Lara A. Otis, Architectural Historian
M.A., Historic Preservation Planning, Cornell University, 2002
B.A., History/French, College of William and Mary, 1999
Meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History
Prior experience conducting cultural resource survey work for the Town of Ithaca, New York, and has attended restoration field school at Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest.

Kathleen M. Post, Historic Research Assistant
Certificate, Historic Preservation, Bucks County Community College, Pennsylvania, in progress
Four years of experience in historic preservation research, inventory, and evaluation of above-ground historic resources for the National Register of Historic Places.

Charles A. Richmond, Historic Structures Specialist
M.A., American Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, 2000
B.A. Major-History/Minor-Political Science, Thiel College, 1992
Meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History.
Five years conducting research for historic structures and archaeological projects and establishing contexts for cultural resource studies across the state of Pennsylvania.